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PREFACE

In the mid-1970's, a number of issues regarding regional planning in Wisconsin coalesced, and significant controversy developed. Governor Patrick J. Lucey was faced with a series of policy questions regarding the future of regional planning. To help the Governor shape his position, a small group of advisors prepared an analysis of regional planning organizations, their strengths and weaknesses, and outlined policy alternatives. The group consisted of Stephen M. Born, State Planning Director, Department of Administration; George A. James, Director, Bureau of Regional Planning and Community Assistance, Department of Local Affairs and Development; Roger L. Schrantz, Director, Bureau of Planning and Budget, Department of Administration; and Harold C. Jordahl, Jr., Professor of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Wisconsin--Extension and then-Chair of the Natural Resources Board. The group met over a period of several months, reviewed earlier studies, prepared drafts for discussion, and on January 15, 1975, submitted a confidential report and set of recommendations to Governor Lucey.

Based on the report and ensuing discussion within the Lucey administration, several actions were taken: 1) the administration clarified its view of the primary mission and constituency of regional planning commissions — i.e., to serve local governments; 2) the basis for gubernatorial appointments to regional planning commissions was altered to better reflect a local vs. state orientation and the filling of regional planning commission vacancies was accelerated; 3) state financial aids to help support regional planning were sustained; and 4) state agencies tried to better cooperate with regional planning agencies and programs, e.g., coastal management, water quality, transportation, economic development, energy conservation. Decisions with regard to seeking statutory change were deferred, given the intensive legislative inquiry and activity going on during this period.

Many of the issues addressed in the report are relevant today, and in fact will be relevant whenever "regionalism" is discussed. Thus, we are reprinting the document with the expectation that it will serve as a useful analysis of regional planning for planners, policy makers, and citizens concerned with the economic health, vitality, and future of the state. The report serves as a benchmark evaluation of regional planning as of 1975. The validity of our observations on the strengths and weaknesses of regional planning commissions should now be examined seven years later.

An appendix in the original document containing a list of pending Governor's appointments to regional planning commissions has been deleted. We have added two appendices not included in the original report to the Governor. The first appendix is a speech by Gaylord A. Nelson in 1959 dealing with regional planning for southeastern Wisconsin. Nelson, more than any other recent governor, believed strongly in planning. He provided intellectual and political leadership for a southeastern Wisconsin commission and commissions which eventually encompassed all but five counties of the state.
The second appendix is a portion of a report titled, "Issues in Regionalism: A Discussion and Analysis," by Harold C. Jordahl, Jr. and David H. Spitz, Research Associate, (March, 1977). We have included this document because it summarizes and analyzes three other significant studies dealing with regionalism prepared during this period. They were as follows:

1. "Regional Planning in Wisconsin: Next Steps?" a Report by Fred A. Clarenbach, consultant to the Wisconsin Department of Local Affairs and Development, May, 1976.


Although not included in this document, the following reports published during the 1970's dealt with regional planning and will be of interest to those concerned with planning issues:


The report to Governor Lucey, the appendices, and the above references are excellent summaries of regionalism in Wisconsin during the 1958-1975 era. Annual reports of Regional Planning Commissions are another excellent source of information and are available at the Wisconsin Legislative Reference Library or the State Historical Society.

A more complete history of Wisconsin planning efforts can be found in reports prepared by University of Wisconsin-Extension for use at professional development conferences held for those Extension faculty who program in planning.


3. "Historical Perspectives III: Adoption of the 1967 Shoreland and
Flooding Zoning Law in Wisconsin," Alan Fish, Timothy R. Henderson, and Richard A. Lehmann, University of Wisconsin-Extension, Department of Governmental Affairs and Department of Urban and Regional Planning, 1978.

4. "Historical Perspectives IV," (1979) a draft report dealing with the county forest program in Wisconsin, has been revised and broadened in scope by Harold C. Jordahl, Jr. and will be published by University-Extension in 1982.


These reports are available at the University of Wisconsin-Extension Library in Madison.

Since 1975, the following events affecting regional planning have occurred:

- the Office of State Planning and Energy has been abolished. At one time this office performed an important policy analysis and coordination role for the governor, and worked closely with the legislature and regional planning commissions.

- the Department of Local Affairs and Development has been abolished and replaced by a Department of Development. Technical assistance to regional planning organizations has been reduced.

- state funds for regional planning commissions were eliminated in 1982. (The legislature intended this for only one year; hopefully the funds will be restored in the next biennium.)

- under the "New Federalism," federal financial assistance to state, regional and local planning has been either cut drastically or eliminated. Examples of cuts affecting regional organizations include programs dealing with environmental management and pollution abatement, outdoor recreation, and economic development. In addition, eliminating categorical grants or grouping them into block grants and weakening or dropping planning requirements has weakened the financial base for regional planning commissions. Faced with federal cut-backs, some regional organizations are operating at greatly reduced levels and their future existence is tenuous. The future of some regional commissions, formed with the encouragement of the Federal government in the 1960's, is in doubt.

- regional planning commissions formed a Council of Regional Planning Organizations (CORPO) in the 1970's; a full-time executive director was hired subsequently to staff the office. Presently, a private attorney serves as a part-time executive director, and the Dane County Regional Planning Commission provides administrative support. The Council continues to function as an advocate for regional planning.

- regional planning commissions have increased their capacity to serve
local units of government. For example, local units make extensive use of southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission's computer system.

— many of the mid-1970's withdrawals from regional planning commissions have been reversed.

— although the state legislature has had the benefit of the information and reports referenced in this preface recommending needed changes in sub-state regionalism, no serious legislative consideration has been given to statutory change.

— the federal requirement that federal projects relate to regional plans is now being revised (A-95). This may lead to 50 different state review processes of federal grants, and will make coordination difficult, especially in multi-state metropolitan areas.

— the economic recession and cuts in federal aids are placing increasing pressures on local governments to provide vital services through increased property taxes. Regional organizations are in part funded by local governments' property tax revenues and thus may be vulnerable to cutbacks.

— on the other hand, regional planning commissions have good promise to play key roles in the solutions to several current policy concerns: strengthening of infrastructure public works; economic development; tourism and recreational development. Commissions have a solid record of accomplishment in these areas as well as in provision of specialized services to municipalities on an economically shared basis.

The need for effective regional planning in the decade of the 1980's is greater than when Nelson stumped the state in 1958 persuading citizens that planning paid. Our 1975 report argues this case, and we believe that the rationale is equally valid today.

Stephen M. Born, Professor
Harold C. Jordahl, Jr., Professor
Department of Urban and Regional Planning
University of Wisconsin-Extension

October, 1982
RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction. The purpose of this summary is to provide an overview of regional planning in Wisconsin, an assessment of its performance to date and the present situation, and recommendations for executive action. We have met frequently throughout 1974, and these recommendations represent our collective thinking and consensus; in many cases, they incorporate the views of several other agency and University persons. We are strongly in favor of dealing with the set of issues related to regional planning by means of firm Executive Office action, and leadership, as opposed to an open and never-ending intergovernmental debate on "Where goes planning?".

Several factors argue that the Governor should act now on regional planning.

1. Withdrawals continue--to not act decisively is to allow the regional planning institution to collapse by default, and we will argue here that an areawide planning capability must be maintained. Otherwise, ad hoc intergovernmental arrangements will evolve, each to meet a specific fragmented need.

2. Imminent near-crisis funding situation for several RPC's--provision of local funding of RPCs [66.945 (14) (c)]\(^1\) in those regions (at least four) where a majority of the area has withdrawn is creating a confrontation situation legally, financially and politically.

3. Representation continues to be highly controversial--several governor's

\(^{1}\)Wisconsin Statutes
appointments are overdue; there is also the likelihood of legislation being introduced to change the representation formula.

4. And in the absence of a program—what rationale supports the Governor's budget recommendations.

Good planning pays. In times of fiscal constraint, the potential value of sound planning is greatest. On the whole, regional planning has demonstrated benefits, but remedial changes are badly needed; we cannot afford to delay addressing the issues and to achieve greater returns from the expenditure.

Our Conclusions. We conclude that regional planning is not working very well, and in some areas its very existence is threatened. The original model for regional planning was premature, and in some respects, a myth.

We see four general courses of possible action:

1. Maintain status quo—we are opposed to this option. Withdrawals will continue, eventually some RPCs will be threatened with folding, there will continue to be no positive state policy to guide state actions with regard to RPCs, the Legislature will be prodded into fragmented action*, and our fiscal investment in regional planning will not pay dividends.

2. Abandon regional planning—by budgetary and other legislative action, terminate RPCs, or reduce them to regional information and technical assistance centers; we reject this option because we think the case for regional planning in some form is totally persuasive, and that areawide planning is needed both at the state and local level.

3. Strengthen RPCs, reform their composition, give them real power--

*Representative Schneider told the Council of Regional Planning Organizations on January 10, 1975 he would submit a resolution calling for a study of regional planning, which is a fine long-term idea, except that in the interim, several commissions could be dismantled by withdrawals and dissolution activity.
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the planning law reform direction. This is unrealistic now, and probably an unreal alternative for the next few years. In their current doldrums, RPCs would not support such a change.

4. By a series of incremental actions, tie regional planning to the reality of 1975; free RPCs from the schizophrenia of being creatures of the state, regional agencies, and servants of local interests. All these roles are not possible—we propose that RPCs carry only one regional banner—that of the collective local interest.

The RPCs say they exist to help locals plan on an economically efficient scale. We agree. They say that RPCs are advocates and mediators of local interest—collective and individual, representing that local interest to the state and federal agencies. We agree with that. Under attack and fighting for survival, RPCs argue that they are only advisory, and looking to the one easily identified constituency that they tenuously have, insist that they advocate and protect the local interest. And we agree with that, too. RPCs become more and more locally-oriented because they have to. We are not abandoning regionalism; we are simply acknowledging what we believe to be realities—that regional planning now must first serve local interests, and the state's interest is often at odds with local interest. Efforts at regionalism will require yet another tact—that of allowing "regional constituencies" to develop around issues that citizens perceive to be problems; i.e., air, water, and solid waste pollution, parks, open spaces, etc.; even when this is accomplished the regional interest may differ from the state's. We seek a more effective state/regional partnership—not by delegation—but by cooperating, sharing, compromising, and helping from a position that doesn't abdicate the state's interest.

How?

1. The Governor's regional planning commission appointment power, the
the "state staff option"\(^2\) in four of the nine commissions, increasing levels of state funding for regions, new directives for areawide planning in water quality management, and growing emphasis on state involvement in such things as landfill regulation, levy limitations, land use policy, and grant administration all tend to support a growing notion that regional planning is part of a state scheme to impose greater centralization and additional control over local governments. The Governor should dispel this false notion by calling on local governments to solve their shared problems in concert with each other within the "strictly advisory" framework of regional planning, and to use the RPC as the advocate for collective local interest in state and federal decision-making. He might point out that if local governments do not act to solve the areawide problems facing their citizens, the state will be called in to do the job. In statements and speeches, by the Governor, by us and Tony Earl\(^3\) and Bill Bechtel\(^4\), we say that RPCs are instruments to express common local interests. We say that it is in the local interest to develop strong RPCs so that the local interest can be forcefully expressed when state or federal decisions are being made. The motto adopted by the National Association of Councils that "Regionalism is local power" has validity.

This sets the state policy on regional planning and the tone.

2. Prepare to modify the pattern of representation on RPCs. This has been a controversial issue. It is one manifestation of dissatisfaction

\(^2\) State Agency personnel were assigned to RPCs with collaborative budget arrangements.

\(^3\) Tony Earl, then Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR)

\(^4\) Bill Bechtel, then Secretary, Department of Local Affairs and Development (DLAD)
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²State Agency personnel were assigned to RPCs with collaborative budget arrangements
³Tony Earl, then Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
⁴Bill Bechtel, then Secretary, Department of Local Affairs and Development (DLAD)
with RPC performance, moreso because it is a more "affectable" target. Legislative and local governmental thoughts on changes have focused on: a) increased town representation, b) greater elected official involvement, and c) Governor's appointments. The rationale for Governor's appointments has been to try to insure the presence of a "state/regional" perspective on the RPCs, and to enhance the opportunity for minority group participation. In practice, the appointment power has been of little significance. Regional commissioners do not perform differently because they have been appointed by the Governor, and it is virtually impossible to distinguish behavior based on source of appointment. If RPCs become local (vs. state) instruments, the Governor would give up his appointment power. A modified representation system would have to be developed which included concerns for minority representation and proportional representation. Specific steps include:

a. filling existing vacancies on RPCs (there are currently four) and defer on making reappointments.

b. indicate Governor's willingness to re-examine the representation/appointments question, and seek the counsel of the RPCs and localities on the issue. Ask for interested entities to provide him with a policy statement within 45 days, with specific reference to his appointment authority, proportional representation, and the manner in which commission membership will reflect minority representation. Instruct agencies to draft appropriate legislation, based on state policy on RPCs plus advice of respondents.

c. introduce statutory change.
3. We must demonstrate financially that we have not abandoned RPCs or regionalism. However, in this time of recession, inflation, and state revenue shortfall it would be quixotic to delude ourselves that state aids for RPCs can be increased much, if at all. In fact, aids may need to be decreased—but if so this should be on a proportionate basis with other program cuts; perhaps less so to symbolically emphasize, at very limited "increased" costs, the state commitment to regional planning. Moreover, the Governor should ensure continued strong, local financial support of regional planning by maintaining the fiscal authority provided in the statutes (in 1974 counties were "charged" $713,976 for the support of RPCs, while the state provided $339,000 of funds plus a one-time supplement of $265,000). To implement the basic policy context for RPCs, state funds to RPCs should be allocated on a formula based on minimal required support plus "local effort."

4. A policy of close state cooperation with RPCs should be enunciated. The Governor should offer the assistance of the State Planning Office as well as the DLAD planning staff in support of the regional planning programs. He should actively encourage all state agencies to work with regional planning agencies. For example, DOT\textsuperscript{5} or DNR might locate some district planning people in RPC offices for the development of regionalized state plans—to cooperate and share information, but not to compromise vital state interests. State activities should be to advise and assist RPCs in the development of programs and to coordinate state agency involvement, when requested, in the technical

\textsuperscript{5}Department of Transportation.
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---

5 Department of Transportation
aspects of developing regional plans. In setting up new programs, e.g., economic planning, efforts should be made to relate to and involve RPCs, but as expressors of local interests and concerns. Coastal Zone Management and "208" planning\textsuperscript{6} are examples of this new cooperative approach. Finally, University Extension should be required to give high priority to planning education and information programs and to strong citizen involvement in planning activities. An Executive Order may be an appropriate mechanism to accomplish these goals.

Also, the concepts of state staff options must be changed. No longer should it be a way to bring state influences to bear of RPCs. Instead, it should simply be an optional professional recruiting service for RPCs—and one that is not pushed.

5. The regional planning statute should be revised to:
   a. alter representation as in 2 (above)
   b. change the requirement for preparing comprehensive regional plans ("shall" to "may"); this would facilitate newer RPC's efforts to emphasize local assistance, education efforts, and constituency-building in the early years when the RPCs are most vulnerable.

Consideration should also be given to the following statutory changes:
   a. Eliminate the option of any local government to withdraw from an RPC; given the clearly defined local orientation of the RPC, and the benefits to local governments within a region, "free-loading" and non-participation are unacceptable. Allow existing dissolu-

\textsuperscript{6} "208" planning: planning for point and non point areawide water quality programs.
tion provisions, i.e., a majority of the units of local governments and a majority of the counties, to remain in force.

b. the advisory review function of RPCs be broadened to include review of major projects financed wholly or in part with state funds (similar to present A-95 review of Federal-funded projects). This would provide a formal coordination/involvement mechanism for the collective local voice to express itself via the RPC on state-sponsored or initiated actions.

6. Finally, the Governor should reaffirm his conviction that regional planning is an effective aid in reaching solutions to problems transcending local unit boundaries and plan for the use of scarce natural and man-made resources within the "strictly advisory" framework of the existing regional planning statute. Regional planning and local planning are not duplicative and both must be carried out in the spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding. If this process does not work, and only the people will ultimately decide this, stronger alternatives will be developed to reach solutions. These alternatives have generally included stronger central controls and less local autonomy and independence.

The Governor must stress the "service to local units of government" aspect of regional planning commissions. The not-so-subtle message has to be that regions exist to serve local interest and points of view. RPCs are governed by area people, often locally elected officials, with few, if any, links to the state. There is no "hocus pocus" about regionalism; it is no magic process to finding solutions to areawide problems. Regional planning combines state and local technical staff work, political compromise and lots of hard work on
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the part of locally elected officials, who, in the final analysis, must implement the plans and live with the results.

These are the first steps in constructing a viable and realistic regional planning program. The steps all say that RPCs are collective and individual local advocates, and provide for some adjustments in state policies and practices that are negative to that concept. The body of this report provides the background and basis for this set of recommendations.
WISCONSIN'S ORIGINAL REGIONAL PLANNING MODEL

Regionalism, simply stated, is a concept that recognizes that areas exist that incorporate many local jurisdictions, in which there are a common set of characteristics--social, economic, environmental, historical--and a common set of problems and opportunities. Moreover, regions, defined by whatever indices, can be differentiated from each other. Implicit in the idea is that this common set of factors gives rise to regional constituencies. The efforts to bring the resources of all levels of government and the private sector to deal with those problems which are more than local but less than statewide in scope and scale involves regional planning and decision-making.

During the mid-1950's, Wisconsin adopted a model for regional planning. The model recognized the following: first, RPCs could provide professional planning capability to local units of government to deal with local problems; second, RPCs could develop plans for those problems that transcended the boundaries of local units of government; and third, that RPCs could develop regional plans within a framework of state comprehensive planning.

In the early 1960s, Wisconsin joined a handful of other states in re-initiating state comprehensive planning. At the same time, a vigorous program was launched to establish RPCs to achieve the above three goals. With a decline in interest in state planning during the mid and latter 1960s, the emphasis shifted, and RPCs' primary role was to plan for regional problems. Some thought was given at the state level to using a mosaic of regional plans as the basis for a state comprehensive plan. A history of regional planning in Wisconsin, from its inception to the present, is included as Appendix I.
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The model said that state government, perhaps the federal government, and local governments should delegate some of their planning responsibilities to the RPCs. Implied in the model is that not only can RPCs serve local and regional needs, but that they could be trusted as fully responsible state planning agents as well. In this respect, if the RPC is to serve the partial role of a state planning agent, there should be some state influence over the agency; hence, gubernatorially-appointed members, control over the distribution of state planning dollars, and state staff options.

Also implicit in the model was the premise that with the application of skilled professional planning techniques to masses of data, all parties to a regional planning decision--state agencies, local governments, the private sector--will recognize the validity of the plan, and act in the wise and responsible fashion that benefits everybody. Moreover, political constituencies would form to support such efforts. In short, there are no conflicting interests, simply inadequate information that confuses people. Therefore, a well-staffed, well-informed RPC would serve the shared objectives of all parties. Finally, the model embraced the notion that most, if not all, planning in a region should be done by the RPC; this "umbrella" concept would frown on separate health planning, manpower planning, or criminal justice planning.
FIFTEEN YEARS OF REGIONAL PLANNING--AN ASSESSMENT

In this section, we examine some of the accomplishments of regional planning, some of its current problems and their causes, and our assessment of the current status of regional planning, including an evaluation of the original model and its relevance today.

Accomplishments. It has been argued that regional planning can help solve immediate problems confronting local governments and in providing direction for future growth. Regional planning can assist local governments by providing:

—A forum for continuing discussion of shared community problems and a mechanism for regional policy-making to deal with those problems.
—A means of providing local officials with insight into the broader effects of local decisions.
—A common spokesman with the combined weight of its members in dealing with state or federal government agencies.
—An opportunity to coordinate certain multi-county functional planning activities—including sewer and water, land use, transportation, recreation and open space facilities.
—A mechanism directing local officials to sources of technical and financial aid and for qualifying them for certain federal and state grants.
—A source of assistance to local governments on planning-related matters, such as using U.S. Census information, application of zoning and other development controls, counsel on requirements of certain regulatory agencies, and conduct of local comprehensive planning programs.
—A means of effecting significant savings through better-planned development.
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—A source of assistance to local governments on planning-related matters, such as using U.S. Census information, application of zoning and other development controls, counsel on requirements of certain regulatory agencies, and conduct of local comprehensive planning programs.

—A means of effecting significant savings through better-planned development.
—The ability to achieve some "economies of scale" in performing certain functions, by pooling needed staff resources, office space, and equipment expenditures.

Accomplishments in some of these areas are difficult to specify and demonstrate; in fact some of the real achievements of RPCs in the area of mediation and coordination of local activities are necessarily "behind-the-scenes." In spite of their many problems, RPCs have a substantial record of tangible achievements; the following represent some of the more significant:

—All commissions, with the exception of the recently-organized Bay-Lake and newly-created North Central commissions, have established detailed and extensive data/informational bases for their respective regions. This activity has not only served the commissions in the preparation of the various elements of their regional plans, but has also provided to the local units of government within the regions substantial and greatly needed data on which to make planning determinations on behalf of their own localities.

—in Southeastern Wisconsin, a number of major projects proposed in the regional plan have been implemented. Just a few of these include: the creation of the Harrington Beach and Pike Lake State Parks and six county parks; significant environmental corridors have been purchased in Menomonee Falls and Root River frontage; the construction of all but 6.7 miles of the recommended 292.4 miles of freeway; and the agreement by 12 communities in the Upper Fox River Basin to consolidate sewerage treatment facilities at two major plants. In addition, the Root and Fox River Watershed Plans prepared by the Commission have been adopted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as official basin plans.

—as a result of an Overall Economic Development Plan prepared by the
NWWRP&DC, the ten-county region has been designated by the U.S. Economic Development Administration an Economic Development District and has received to date federal loans and grant totaling $8,800,000.

—For every dollar spent on comprehensive planning by the NWWRP&DC, approximately $50 was returned in development grants. In one of the counties, the ratio was an approximate $80 return for every dollar spent on planning.

—in the Mississippi River Region, the Commission assisted in the development of a comprehensive metropolitan plan for the LaCrosse Area and in the receipt of $17 million in federal sewer and water facilities grant and $1.3 million in open space grants to the region.

—As a result of plans prepared by the former NEWRPC, many highly significant wetland areas in the now East Central Region have been preserved as wildlife habitat and important stream recharge areas, including the Mukwa Marsh State Wildlife Reserve in Waupaca County.

—Important county parks in Outagamie, Winnebago and Waushara were purchased and major stream bank stabilization projects on the Wolf River were completed as a result of NEWRPC planning.

—Park and open space plans developed by the Fox Valley COG have led to the development of a number of area park and recreational facilities in the Fox Cities. The reservation of rights-of-ways eight to ten years in advance of construction by a number of municipalities in the Fox Valley for the Tri-County expressway was recommended and actively promoted by the Fox Valley COG and has resulted in untold dollar savings for the
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area.

—The Dane County Commission's park acquisition and improvement plans have been implemented by a large number of municipalities as have its recommendations on highway, street and airport improvements.

—In the Southwest and Northwest regions, the commissions have been instrumental in helping to prevent railroad abandonments, a problem which poses a great threat to the rural areas of the state.

Problems and Some Causes. The above list of accomplishments is convincing evidence that the investment in regional planning has not been for naught; many positive things have happened because of the efforts of RPCs. But in recent years there have been growing indications of problems in the regional planning system, and increasing public unrest about the institutions and products of regional planning. And the problems of RPCs are much more pervasive than the allegations and activities of a relatively small group of right-wing extremists.

Local governmental relationships. Although not true throughout the state, relationships between RPCs and local governments generally have been deteriorating; concomitantly, the perceptions that local governments have of RPCs have changed. From an original conception of RPCs as local assistance centers and vehicles for localities to interact in areawide problem-solving and planning, local interests more and more perceive RPCs as creatures of the state. The Governor's RPC appointment powers, increasing state funding for the RPCs, and growing state involvement in areawide water quality management, landfill regulations, land use policy, and grant administration all tend to heighten suspicions that regional planning is part of a state scheme to impose additional controls over local governments. If not creatures of the state, many localities see these advisory regional agencies as forerunners of regional governments, which threaten to usurp local powers (the theme of Mrs. Meves and the right-wing
extremists groups\textsuperscript{10}). These are, to some degree, perceptual rather than actual problems. A far more significant reason for the decay in local government—RPC relations has been the failure of many RPCs to recognize the importance of good and continuous relationships with local governments. One of the major fortis of the Southeastern Wisconsin RPC, the most successful RPC in the state, has been its close working relationships, including the extensive provision of technical assistance and professional planning services, with local governments. In contrast, the 1974 withdrawal of Green Lake County from the East-Central RPC was not because of opposition to planning (just the opposite was true), but because there had hardly been an appearance by the ECRPC\textsuperscript{11} in the county, with no indication that any of the RPC planning program was addressed to the needs of Green Lake County. The same situation prevails in many other areas, unfortunately; although in existence for one-two years, some of the newer RPCs have not even visited counties and major municipalities within their jurisdictions to explain what they might be able to do and to seek feedback. Of course, working with the various levels of local government is difficult and complex (and time-consuming) work. There are inevitable intra-regional conflicts between rural and urban interests, or between big cities and the rest of the region (the Fox River Valley history is most illustrative). The fact that no consensus position is possible—that no collective interest exists—does not absolve an RPC from relating closely to involved local governments. Where mediation is not possible, RPCs should identify and clarify the nature of inter-local conflicts. In any case, close working relationships with local governments are essential.

\textsuperscript{10} Mrs. Meves, who was leader of a right wing political group in Southeast Wisconsin

\textsuperscript{11} East Central Regional Planning Commission
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Utility and Use of Plans. In some RPCs, there has been a failure to demonstrate the utility of RPC plans to local governments. Statutory requirements and the predilections of professional planners have given rise to the false notion that doing local planning and comprehensive regional planning are mutually exclusive (certainly a planner who spends half his time working on an urban mass transit plan for Racine is better able to recognize and deal with the complexities of a regional transportation plan for Southeastern Wisconsin!). Where "comprehensive regional planning" has been pursued to the exclusion of local planning assistance, there is inevitably some detachment from the immediate concerns of local people and local skepticism about the utility of the plan.

One of the major failings of regional planning has been the failure to get plans implemented; this problem has both local and state dimensions. State agencies have largely been reluctant to delegate their planning to RPCs. The DOT contract with SEWRPC\(^{12}\) to prepare a highway plan for the region is often cited as an example of the original model working, i.e., that RPCs could develop regional plans within a framework of state agency planning. But there are not many other examples, and state agencies—recognizing the differing perspectives, constituencies, and staff capabilities—aren't willing to delegate the planning/implementation responsibilities. DNR provides a good illustration. SEWRPC spent years and more than a million dollars on their regional sewerage system plan, adopted in 1974 by the commission. The DNR Board has not acted on the plan yet, but at best is likely to endorse it in principle. An endorsement of this kind is not binding, and there is little likelihood that the plan will affect the allocation of funds and funding priorities for sewage treatment

\(^{12}\)Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
plant and appurtenant construction in Southeastern Wisconsin. In fact, no
bonus points are awarded in the DNR's funding priority formula for the existence
of an adopted regional plan. DNR's position is not unsound. DNR was not a
genuine party to preparing the plan, and the final plan addresses the regional--
as opposed to the inter-regional, statewide--public interest. With the state
public trust doctrine on DNR's shoulders, how can they delegate the responsibil-
ity for making inter-regional decisions to any RPC? When assigned the responsibil-
ity for water pollution control by Federal laws, how can they allow this
responsibility to be delegated to the more vulnerable (closer to the "polluters")
RPC? And other state agencies which aren't constitutionally entrusted have their
own mini-public trust to be concerned about. In sum, state agencies have been
rather reluctant to implement plans prepared by RPCs.

The track record of local governments in implementing regional plans is
not much better. As noted previously, there have been some successes. In some
cases, there are greatly differing conclusions regarding the "success" of a
given plan; the SEWRPC land use plan is a case in point. SEWRPC has invested
millions of dollars in planning, has a massive data bank, an able staff, an
active commission, an elaborate planning process, has invested untold hours
and effort in implementation persuasion, and is reputedly one of the five best
planning organizations in the nation. Yet eight years after the SEWRPC land
use plan was adopted, most local governments failed to really use it--and half
of all development is unplanned and costly sprawl. Was the SEWRPC plan not
closely followed because it was a "bad" plan? No, it was a pretty good plan.
The regional interest simply gave way to overwhelming local constituent pres-
sures and parochial municipal economics. Of course, those people who view the
plan as relatively successful ask what would have happened in those communities
that made use of the plan in its absence? At present, neither the state nor
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The track record of local governments in implementing regional plans is not much better. As noted previously, there have been some successes. In some cases, there are greatly differing conclusions regarding the "success" of a given plan; the SEWRPC land use plan is a case in point. SEWRPC has invested millions of dollars in planning, has a massive data bank, an able staff, an active commission, an elaborate planning process, has invested untold hours and effort in implementation persuasion, and is reputedly one of the five best planning organizations in the nation. Yet eight years after the SEWRPC land use plan was adopted, most local governments failed to really use it—and half of all development is unplanned and costly sprawl. Was the SEWRPC plan not closely followed because it was a "bad" plan? No, it was a pretty good plan. The regional interest simply gave way to overwhelming local constituent pressures and parochial municipal economics. Of course, those people who view the plan as relatively successful ask what would have happened in those communities that made use of the plan in its absence? At present, neither the state nor
local governments appear to perceive the RPC's perspective and objectives as their own, and accordingly are unwilling to delegate any substantial power to RPC's and implement their plans.

These examples illustrate another dimension regarding the utilization of RPC plans—one that poses basic questions about the validity and applicability of the original regional planning process. Implied in the model is the premise that with the application of skilled professional planning techniques to masses of data, all parties to a planning decision will recognize the truth of the professional plan, reach a consensus, and act accordingly. There are no conflicting interests or values—only an absence of adequate information for decision-making. SEWRPC's physical development plans typify this "technocratic" approach to planning. Herein lies one of the serious flaws in the model, and a real deterrent to plan implementation. Planning is information and professionalism, but planning often becomes the management of conflict. If RPCs fail to assume this role—mediating inter-local differences, where possible, and helping to clearly define these intra-regional conflict issues for resolution by a higher level of government—then plan implementation is thwarted.

Even where RPC boundaries have created more-or-less homogeneous regions, regional constituencies are hardly homogeneous entities, where they exist at all. Milwaukee-Racine-Kenosha are unlikely to share identical concerns and values with the less-urban portions of the SEWRPC jurisdiction; the same holds for the cities of the Fox River Valley. Moreover, regional constituencies form with regard to particular problems within a region—air pollution, the St. Croix River, etc.—and the various problems have different lifespans as well as different geographic boundaries. And further complicating regional planning and plan implementation is the simple fact that the boundaries of some RPCs do not fit well with the definition of a region.
Representation. Another symptom of dissatisfaction with regional planning is the ongoing controversy about representation. Arguments have focused on the question of equitable representation on the Commission of towns, or large cities, or minorities. There has been substantial concern about Governor's appointments; on the one hand these appointments support the concept that RPCs are advisory, and not a proportionally-constituted governmental body; on the other hand, these appointments fuel the fires of those who contend that RPCs are creatures of the state. Ostensibly in response to constituency pressures, several legislators have threatened to introduce legislation altering the representation formula on the RPCs. However, this volatile issue appears to be an expression of regional planning malfunctioning, rather than a cause of the problem; it has been highly visible because it appears to be a "reachable" part of the RPC.

Other Factors. The above is not an exhaustive list of problems with regional planning and their causes. Other factors include: the separation of regional planning assistance responsibilities from state planning functions, which produced a loss in overall focus for regional planning; assistance from the state to RPCs placed heavy emphasis on building strong institutional capability rather than on problem-solving—when the institution was well established there were unanswered questions about what it does, and how effectively it does it; the creation and strengthening of functional, areawide regional planning entities (criminal justice, manpower, health care, etc.) confused the institutional picture at the local level; and strong, effective citizen participation and planning education programs were neglected, and the opportunity to develop political constituencies largely lost.

The Withdrawal Phenomenon. The most significant problem confronted by RPCs during the past two years has been the withdrawal of many units of government from membership in existing regions. A recent survey of the chief elected
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Other Factors. The above is not an exhaustive list of problems with regional planning and their causes. Other factors include: the separation of regional planning assistance responsibilities from state planning functions, which produced a loss in overall focus for regional planning; assistance from the state to RPCs placed heavy emphasis on building strong institutional capability rather than on problem-solving—when the institution was well established there were unanswered questions about what it does, and how effectively it does it; the creation and strengthening of functional, areawide regional planning entities (criminal justice, manpower, health care, etc.) confused the institutional picture at the local level; and strong, effective citizen participation and planning education programs were neglected, and the opportunity to develop political constituencies largely lost.

The Withdrawal Phenomenon. The most significant problem confronted by RPCs during the past two years has been the withdrawal of many units of government from membership in existing regions. A recent survey of the chief elected
official in local governments which have voted to withdraw, reveals that it was not the right-wing Wisconsin Legislative and Research Committee, Inc., which was responsible for withdrawals. Regional planning was perceived by those elected officials who voted to withdraw as being imposed by the state, poorly representative of town government, dominated by the Governor, and the first step to bigger government.

The significance of the withdrawals is shown in Tables 1 and 2, and Figure 1. It is the newer regions, which have not had an opportunity to fully function, where most of the withdrawals have occurred.

Importantly, few cities and villages have withdrawn and only three counties, although several more counties have come very close to the required two-thirds majority necessary for withdrawal. The fact that as of January 1, 1975 local governmental units with a combined 1970 population of 170,136 will have withdrawn from regional planning commissions, a total which is a small percentage of the total population ultimately influenced by regional commissions is of little solace. These units represent a much larger percentage of the area of the regions, and the funding of RPCs from counties where a majority of the county has withdrawn is forcing a legal and fiscal confrontation. The dissatisfaction with regional planning is significant and is symptomatic of a much larger phenomenon--general discontent with the state getting involved in anything perceived as a "local" problem.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1973</th>
<th>1974</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>25,559</td>
<td>1,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi River</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>9,856</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>19,471</td>
<td>31,944</td>
<td>5,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central (Dane County)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>18,020</td>
<td>29,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>35,245</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Lakes</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>17,827</td>
<td>37,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern (Adams County)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>28,705</td>
<td>141,431</td>
<td>76,412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Totals are for named years only and are not cumulative.

2 Data includes only the number of local governments known to be withdrawing effective 1/1/75 as of January 14, 1975.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1973</th>
<th>1974</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>25,559</td>
<td>1,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi River</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>9,856</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>19,471</td>
<td>31,944</td>
<td>5,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central (Dane County)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>18,020</td>
<td>29,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>35,245</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Lakes</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>17,827</td>
<td>37,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern (Adams County)</td>
<td>9,234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE TOTALS¹</td>
<td>28,705</td>
<td>141,431</td>
<td>76,412²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Totals are for named years only and are not cumulative.

²Data includes only the number of local governments known to be withdrawing effective 1/1/76 as of January 14, 1975.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1970 Population**</th>
<th>Total Persons Withdrawn As of 1975</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>25,559</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi River</td>
<td>237,000</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>9,856</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>314,766</td>
<td>51,415</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County</td>
<td>290,272</td>
<td>18,020</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>35,245</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Lakes</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>17,827</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern</td>
<td>1,740,000</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams County</td>
<td>9,234</td>
<td>9,234</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL                 | 4,042,272         | 170,136                           | 4.2%            |

**87.6% of all persons in the State of Wisconsin are residing within the jurisdiction of an RPC.
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Some Conclusions. It is not surprising that it took several years for it to become evident that the regional planning model was not working very well. Flaws in the original model did not become apparent in the absence of conflict; only when the planning process exposed conflict issues and opposing interests, when state administrative districts were formed that posed jurisdictional threats, or when competing areawide councils (manpower, health, etc.) were formed—did strains begin to show. Based on our assessment of the past 15 years of regional planning in Wisconsin, the following conclusions appear valid:

1. The regional planning law, s. 66.945, has enabled the creation of eight multi-county and one single county RPCs. The state has played a significant role in creating the institutions, supporting them financially and to some degree, programatically.

2. RPCs have developed, especially where there has been sufficient time for maturation, into organizations which to varying degrees have helped formulate solutions to areawide problems. They have been of value in articulating area goals and objectives, which have been accepted and worked toward—with the help of state and federal funds. The planning programs carried on by the RPCs are numerous, often required by the federal government as a prerequisite for funding, and not without concrete results.

3. There is confusion as to what regional planning is and as to who is the political constituency of the RPCs. Do they plan for local governments, state agencies, the Governor, other planners? The problem has been exacerbated by the absence of a clear state policy and executive leadership on the issue.

4. The withdrawal phenomenon is symptomatic of a significant distrust of
bigger-than-local government and a fear that regional planning com-
mission membership threatens local self-determination. The withdrawal
of many units of local government from RPC membership has neither
involved a large percentage of population nor many units from older
commissions, but has vividly demonstrated that RPCs are not viewed
as advocates of local points of view. Opposition to RPCs will con-
tinue as long as local governments, particularly towns and villages,
feel they are under-represented, relatively unaffected by areawide
problems, and threatened by federal and state programs and policies
affecting their sense of local self-government.

5. The array of problems confronting RPCs is indicative of some genuine
malfunctions in the system. Perhaps too much was expected from the
original model. RPCs cannot serve many masters; their primary clients
must be local units of government, which ultimately are responsible
for implementation of plans. The notion of a broad popular regional
constituency within the boundaries of a RPC must be abandoned; a high
priority must be assigned to developing working relationships and
building political constituencies with local governments. Effective
"regional planning" must be recognized as, at least in many cases,
the management of conflict; RPCs can mediate intra-regional conflicts,
or at a minimum, clearly define the conflictory issues.

6. We conclude that the original model for regional planning in Wisconsin
is not viable in 1975; remedial changes are needed to avoid the "status
quo" outcome described at the beginning of this paper.
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AREAWIDE PLANNING MUST BE MAINTAINED

Regional planning provides the vehicle to deal with issues and problems that transcend the boundaries of individual local governments, but which are of interest to them. If the RPC institution were abandoned, a substitute would have to be devised to solve areawide problems. Furthermore, federal requirements for the coordination of Federal investments, to insure consistency with other public investments in an area, argue for the maintenance of an areawide planning function. From a state perspective, if RPCs are clearly identified as representatives of local interests, they are an administratively efficient mechanism for relating planning programs and other activities to the 1844 separate local units of government.

Areawide planning is also of benefit to local governments. It provides them with a needed forum to discuss differences in development objectives and priorities, and a means of working towards acceptable compromise solutions. RPCs are a vehicle for making varied technical assistance, prohibitively costly for many individual units of government, readily available to these same communities. RPCs that are strongly representative of local governmental interests and points of view, would seem to provide a much more acceptable means for dealing with regional issues and making appropriate recommendations to state and federal program agencies, than having these agencies make program decisions from Madison or Washington. These institutions offer the opportunity for regional consensus building and the expression of collective local interest with a more effective and forceful voice.

In short, regional planning serves a vital function in an intergovernmental
system of planning and management. To function effectively, RPCs must be freed of constraints imposed by a model which is no longer viable. The most recent statements regarding state "position" on regional planning commissions are contained in an exchange of correspondence between East Central Wisconsin RPC, state agencies, and the Executive Office (Appendix II). The position taken herein is completely in agreement with the Governor's and agencies' responses, as well as recent Governor speeches to the effect that regional planning must serve local governments.
system of planning and management. To function effectively, RPCs must be freed of constraints imposed by a model which is no longer viable. The most recent statements regarding state "position" on regional planning commissions are contained in an exchange of correspondence between East Central Wisconsin RPC, state agencies, and the Executive Office (Appendix II). The position taken herein is completely in agreement with the Governor's and agencies' responses, as well as recent Governor speeches to the effect that regional planning must serve local governments.
AN ALTERNATIVE MODEL

If areawide planning must be continued, what are the options? Continuation of the existing situation is not tenable; it is wasteful, counterproductive with regard to doing effective planning, and appears to be leading ultimately to the collapse of the regional planning system. The planning law reform alternative (similar to the "Umbrella" Multi-jurisdictional Organizations--UMJO's--recommended by the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations), which would place all planning functions within a region under one organization, preferably with more than simple advisory powers, is politically unrealistic. The other end of the spectrum--a separate, special, areawide planning body for every needed function (health care, criminal justice, transportation, etc.) leads to increasing governmental fragmentation and proliferation, diffusion of accountability, loss of continuity in planning, and surrendering the degree of planning programs consolidation that's been achieved to date. What choices are there?

Our recommended model capitalizes on existing institutions and provides for bringing RPCs into alignment with the realities of 1975 by a series of individually modest actions. It primarily involves the recognition, via policy statement and governmental actions, that RPCs are advocates of local governments, and serve their individual and collective interests. Our model recognizes that RPCs cannot fulfill this role, and simultaneously function as representatives of state interest. Moreover, the model recognizes that effective planning requires more than the creation of a well-developed and technically sound plan, i.e., that conflict management is an important dimension of the planning process. Our recommendations were detailed in the opening section of this report.
IMPLICATIONS AND POLITICAL FEASIBILITY OF NEW "MODEL"

Possible Local Governmental Implication. Saying the RPCs are local advocates won't make it so. Specific steps are needed to build a strong local advocacy capability within the RPCs. Saying that RPCs won't be given additional powers doesn't answer the riddle and mish-mash of 1844 counties, cities, villages, and towns each exercising their powers in a fragmented, contradictory way. We need a better definition of localism, and which local units the RPCs will be most responsive to and advocates for.

One choice is the counties—to strengthen the role, responsibility and capability of counties in the whole range of physical development guidance and controls. Counties provide the broader perspective needed for better physical development, yet are local enough to not be the distant, bureaucratic state. And the Walworth and Columbia County experience show that counties can do it.

This builds on what has been emerging state policy. One-man, one-vote court decisions making counties more representative of urban needs. The emergence of the county executive. The option of county level property assessment. New county responsibilities in solid waste management. The development of 51.42 mental health boards. Moreover, counties will likely be the basic building blocks for emerging state policies and programs. Human service boards, if done, will likely center at the county level. AJR-1 agricultural land preferential taxation will likely focus on the counties. New metropolitan transportation instruments will likely be organized by the counties. Emerging as well as past state policies emphasize building the role and competency of counties.

Lodging more responsibilities with the counties will mean, in part, a
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One choice is the counties—to strengthen the role, responsibility and capability of counties in the whole range of physical development guidance and controls. Counties provide the broader perspective needed for better physical development, yet are local enough to not be the distant, bureaucratic state. And the Walworth and Columbia County experience show that counties can do it.

This builds on what has been emerging state policy. One-man, one-vote court decisions making counties more representative of urban needs. The emergence of the county executive. The option of county level property assessment. New county responsibilities in solid waste management. The development of 51.42 mental health boards. Moreover, counties will likely be the basic building blocks for emerging state policies and programs. Human service boards, if done, will likely center at the county level. AJR-1 agricultural land preferential taxation will likely focus on the counties. New metropolitan transportation instruments will likely be organized by the counties. Emerging as well as past state policies emphasize building the role and competency of counties.

Lodging more responsibilities with the counties will mean, in part, a
transfer of powers from the municipalities and towns in the counties. The town board veto issue will need to be handled differently than in the past. We've talked about a modified position: counties prepare the basic guidelines and framework. Towns could then develop detailed plans within that context. If they elect not to, the county would assume that role. Much the same process could be employed with incorporated municipalities.

There may also need to be some transfer of state powers to the counties, to show that the concept is state decentralization as well as local centralization. One candidate might be subdivision controls, with broader review responsibilities and one-stop controls in the counties.

As this concept of enlarged county responsibility takes form it clearly will mean that counties will need to spend more to carry out their new responsibilities. Counties are best off in taxing pressures, so some new local funding should be possible. But it probably will require some new state money as well. To some extent, state money can be packaged from existing sources, but more will likely be needed. As a way of building greater RPC local responsiveness, some state controlled planning funds might be allocated to the counties. Counties could then choose to do their own planning directly, or contract with RPCs to do it for them. If done by the RPCs, the planning would clearly be more responsive to the counties.

All this forces RPCs to better develop their local constituency if they are to survive. More than today, RPCs will need to be locally visible and perceived to be locally responsive. The RPC executive director will need to be more of a planning-oriented politician than a professional planner. Our model would have a more politically oriented executive director who is planning oriented--like a Wally Bauman13--and a professional chief of planning--like a

---

13 Chairman, Dane County Regional Planning Commission
Bill Kroll\textsuperscript{14}. Although not labelled this way, the George Berteeau-Kurt Bauer\textsuperscript{15} combination fits this model in many ways.

The state needs local advocate RPCs, and should help solidify their proper role. One way might be to work with RPCs as the local advocate spokesman, to instill in local governments a conviction that they can most effectively influence state policies through their RPCs. Another is to delegate to RPCs the "working out" of particulars within state policies. Yet another is to transfer many local technical assistance functions from the state to RPCs.

**State-level Implications.** Adoption of the "new" regional planning model will also clarify state agency roles. In the state's Coastal Zone Management Program and "208" Water Quality Management, state interests wanted heavy regional involvement, but weren't willing--for good reasons--to fully delegate state authorities to RPCs. When tomorrow's CZM Program or 208 comes along, we won't be bound to pay homage to the mythical model. We won't argue about whether we delegate state authorities to RPCs--they are locally-oriented institutions. Such programs are state responsibilities, and institutional mechanisms must protect the state's obligation, while also truly involving RPCs as the voice to express regionalized local interest. In effect, conflict and controversy may be institutionalized as "regional interests" are dealt with at the state level in budget decisions, grant allocations, etc. A clear definition of local-state conflict areas, however, should generate better alternatives for future decision-making.

State agency functional and comprehensive planning will require strengthening
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The state needs local advocate RPCs, and should help solidify their proper role. One way might be to work with RPCs as the local advocate spokesman, to instill in local governments a conviction that they can most effectively influence state policies through their RPCs. Another is to delegate to RPCs the "working out" of particulars within state policies. Yet another is to transfer many local technical assistance functions from the state to RPCs.

State-level Implications. Adoption of the "new" regional planning model will also clarify state agency roles. In the state's Coastal Zone Management Program and "208" Water Quality Management, state interests wanted heavy regional involvement, but weren't willing--for good reasons--to fully delegate state authorities to RPCs. When tomorrow's CZM Program or 208 comes along, we won't be bound to pay homage to the mythical model. We won't argue about whether we delegate state authorities to RPCs--they are locally-oriented institutions. Such programs are state responsibilities, and institutional mechanisms must protect the state's obligation, while also truly involving RPCs as the voice to express regionalized local interest. In effect, conflict and controversy may be institutionalized as "regional interests" are dealt with at the state level in budget decisions, grant allocations, etc. A clear definition of local-state conflict areas, however, should generate better alternatives for future decision-making.

State agency functional and comprehensive planning will require strengthening

14 Executive Director, Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission
15 Chairman and Executive Director respectively of the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
at the regional or district level. Within the context of statewide policies and objectives, regionalized planning for state programs should probably take place—by state staff at the administrative district level. At the district level, the details of regionalized state plans could be tied into local interest plans prepared by RPCs, or points of discord clearly identified.

We are now experimenting with the new regional planning model in the Coastal Zone and 208 joint state-level councils. These councils, if there is adequate and aggressive state involvement, are cumbersome but may work. This approach demands significant, ongoing state agency policy level investment—and that's realistic to expect for only a handful of programs or councils. We should continue to experiment with this approach, but consider it to be a test that should be evaluated before further application. Its workability is probably limited to the start-up of new programs. And with other programs over the horizon, we should probably experiment with yet other models—so that three years from now we can pick and choose from what seems to be the best of several experiments.

In many ways this new planning model rationalizes a series of organizational decisions made in the past. The split of DOA and DLAD planning responsibilities now begins to make more sense. If RPCs aren't state planning agents, but are local advocate planning agents, then we don't have a split of state planning responsibilities among two agencies. If DLAD's mission is local advocacy, and RPC's are local advocates, then DLAD's role makes sense. Similarly, the areawide functional planning councils—health, manpower, criminal justice, etc., are a means of expressing an areal plan for basic state responsibilities. Such functional agencies should be separate from the local advocate RPCs. That wasn't true when RPCs served both state and local interests.

**Political feasibility.** The steps we recommend are incremental; collectively,
however, they represent a substantial shift in direction for regional planning and a firming up of state policy. The many issues related to regional planning are complex and could be debated by the professional and academic planning community for years. We do not favor an unending dialog as a means of resolving the present RPC dilemma. A strong Executive Office sense of direction, coupled with state agency leadership, can firmly establish the course of and policy for RPCs. **There is little risk.** All of our recommendations appear to be consistent with public and political sentiment...i.e., the plight of RPCs, support of localism, more productive public investments, resolution of the "representation question". For reasons cited previously, action cannot be deferred. We believe that although the planning organization issue has a relatively low status on most political priority lists, that decisive action on this issue now will pay fiscal and institutional dividends for many years to come, and if successfully executed, will be a positive accomplishment of the Administration.
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APPENDIX I
AN OVERVIEW HISTORY OF REGIONAL PLANNING IN WISCONSIN

This appendix provides an outline of activities which, taken together, help to describe the past and present of regional planning in the state. The focus is on a 15-year period going back to 1960. This is further divided into five-year segments. Each segment is outlined and characterized.

Also included are tables and maps. The maps are self-explanatory and relate directly to the periods. The tables contain information which further describes the present status of the regional planning commissions.

A. Pre-1960

During the late 1950's there were several significant developments at the national, state, and local level that were to have an important effect on the evolution of regional planning in Wisconsin. These included the following:

--The establishment of the Federal 701 comprehensive planning assistance program in 1959, which provided federal financial support for comprehensive planning at the state, regional, and local levels. The "701" program became the major non-local source of funding for areawide planning efforts in the years to follow.

--The state adopted the present regional planning statutes (66.945) in 1959--providing a broad planning advisory mandate for regional planning commissions and requiring that regional commissions prepare a master plan for the physical development of their service area.

--Governor Gaylord Nelson champions resource planning and environmental
Figure 1
REGIONAL PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS - 1960

Figure of Wisconsin showing regional planning commissions in the northwestern and southeastern regions of the state.
protection as key priorities of his administration. Helps create a favorable environment for comprehensive planning at all levels of government.

--Department of Resource Development established. Department initiates a broad state planning effort and during the early and middle sixties becomes very active, assisted by "701" funds, in promoting and supporting regional and local planning efforts within the state.

--Milwaukee Metropolitan Study Commission established in 1958--a major recommendation of the commission is that a seven-county regional planning commission be established to serve Southeastern Wisconsin.

--In addition, two areawide planning organizations form prior to 1960--the Fox Valley Regional Planning Commission in the Appleton/Neenah-Menasha area (1956) and the Northwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission which initially forms as a five-county body in 1959.

B. 1960-1965

The period can be characterized as a very active period for planning at all levels within the state--state planning, through DRD\textsuperscript{16}, regional planning with the creation of four areawide agencies, and numerous new local planning efforts were initiated throughout the state. Among the more significant developments during the period relative to regional planning were:

--The establishment of four regional planning commissions. The rationale for their establishment was clearly related to perceived complex areawide problems. Regional planning was looked upon by participating local governments as the most logical vehicle for dealing with areawide development matters.

--Southeastern Wisconsin RPC (1960) grew out of the findings and

\textsuperscript{16}Department of Resource Development
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recommendations of the Milwaukee Metropolitan Study Commission.

--Wolf River Basin RPC (1962) developed from the recommendations of a special legislative study committee concerned with the problems of the Wolf Basin.

--Brown County RPC (1962) -- a recognition of the growing metropolitan development concern of the Green Bay-Brown County area.

--Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission (1964) -- resulted from concerns of local and state officials over development issues relative to the River and to economic development.

--The "state staff option concept" was initiated. The state planning agency, at the request of an RPC, provided resident professional staff to the commission (Northwest RPC and Wolf River RPC).

--DRD's statewide comprehensive planning program peaks during the period-- program provides strong administrative and program support for regional planning. Statewide population and economic analysis, environmental/recreational resource analysis, and other studies provide informational and technical framework for regional planning.

--The federal government initiates areawide planning requirements for highway construction grants in metropolitan areas-- provides strong impetus for SEWRPC program and for a cooperative planning effort between the Wisconsin Highway Commission and the regional planning agency.

--An active comprehensive local planning assistance program develops during the period-- 701 funds provide the financial impetus; the state planning agency (DRD) actively promotes the program.

C. 1965-1970

This period showed relatively heavy federal direction in substate districting and areawide and regional planning. Examples of federal initiative
Figure 3
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include:

--The Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966; Section 204 of the act called for the creation of metropolitan area-wide planning and federal loan and grant review agencies.
--The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968; Title IV of the act prompted substate organization to carry out federal intent to allocate federal aid in accordance with state, regional and local comprehensive plans.
--OMB Circular A-95 of 1969; stimulated a system of state, regional and metropolitan planning and development clearinghouses.
--The newly created DHUD underwrote the state's effort to organize multi-county regional planning agencies through use of "701" money and through support of the concept that metro areas can be wrapped within non-metro areas for regional planning.

During this period state activity highlights include:

--Kellett reorganization and resultant splitting of state planning from local and regional planning assistance.
--Creation of the DLAD, in 1967, which houses the regional planning assistance function.
--Passage of Executive Order 10 (system of substate uniform districts) 1969; however, there was limited administrative follow-up to the districting order and most state agencies have made only limited moves to decentralize planning and decision-making.

During the period DLAD steps up its efforts to organize regional planning agencies. The period saw the following:

--1966, five counties added to the NWRPC
--1967, creation of the Wausau Area RPC
1967, name change of the Wolf River RPC to NEWRPC and creation of the Fox Valley COG

1969, creating of the Rock Valley Metropolitan Council and the Head of the Lakes COG

1969-70, organization of the SNWRPC

The 1969-71 biennium saw expansion of the state planning aids program from $40,000 to $200,000 with the bulk of the new money to go to regional planning.

The period was further characterized by a number of struggles involving regional planning; not the least of which was the urban/rural emphasis problem. The argument centered in the Fox Valley area, but its influence spread and caused major problems throughout the end of this period and into the next. (AB-734, for example, disbanding of Fox Valley COG and NEWRPC.)

D. 1970-1975

The period has been characterized by rather dramatic organizational activities and changes. Four new regions were established while three areawide agencies were dissolved; an attempt to organize the last remaining region (South Central) has not been successful. Local planning activity is low (relative to its 1960's status)—state and federal financial support is almost unavailable, due to both federal and state disillusionment with local planning. A strong localism trend characterizes the last half of the period and helps to frustrate state efforts in land use planning legislation and is a factor in numerous rural governmental units withdrawing from regional planning agencies. Some of the more specific developments and events of the period include:

Establishment of new regional commissions—West Central (1971), Bay
--1967, name change of the Wolf River RPC to NEWRPC and creation of the Fox Valley COG

--1969, creating of the Rock Valley Metropolitan Council and the Head of the Lakes COG

--1969-70, organization of the SWWRPC

The 1969-71 biennium saw expansion of the state planning aids program from $40,000 to $200,000 with the bulk of the new money to go to regional planning.

The period was further characterized by a number of struggles involving regional planning; not the least of which was the urban/rural emphasis problem. The argument centered in the Fox Valley area, but its influence spread and caused major problems throughout the end of this period and into the next. (AB-734, for example, disbanding of Fox Valley COG and NEWRPC.)

D. 1970-1975

The period has been characterized by rather dramatic organizational activities and changes. Four new regions were established while three areawide agencies were dissolved; an attempt to organize the last remaining region (South Central) has not been successful. Local planning activity is low (relative to its 1960's status)—state and federal financial support is almost unavailable, due to both federal and state disillusionment with local planning. A strong localism trend characterizes the last half of the period and helps to frustrate state efforts in land use planning legislation and is a factor in numerous rural governmental units withdrawing from regional planning agencies. Some of the more specific developments and events of the period include:

--Establishment of new regional commissions--West Central (1971), Bay
Lake (1972), East Central (1972), and North Central (1973).

--The long-standing fight between the Northeastern Wisconsin RPC and Fox Valley COG ends. The new East Central RPC is the replacement—but the fight left deep scars which will take considerable time to heal.

--The Attorney General rules that councils of government (COGs) can't do regional planning and thus are not eligible for state planning aids.

--Governor Lucey directs DLAD to undertake broad study of regional planning law—DLAD proposals call for a broader role for RPCs (umbrella concept, etc.)—reaction is cool and nothing further develops from them.

--State staff option appears to stabilize in the latter half of the period—several additional staff are added in the region—DLAD role becomes more one of administrative support rather than technical program support.

--A statewide organization of regional/areawide planning agencies which formed in 1969 dissolves in 1971 largely as a result of organizational struggles within the state. The group reconstitutes itself in 1973 and is now meeting on a bi-monthly basis. The general purpose of the group, the Council of Regional Planning Organizations (CORPO), is to promote the broad objectives of regional planning agencies. The organization is influenced by the strong leadership of its Chairman, the Chairman of SEWRPC, Mr. George Berteau.

--The State Planning Office begins to develop a programmatic interest in RPCs again. Much of the renewed interest stems from the agency's evolving roles in land use planning, coastal zone management, state development policy and 208 water-quality planning, plus new management.
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## Summary Data

### Wisconsin Regional Planning Commissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Date of Origin</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number of Counties</th>
<th>1974 Major Work Program Elements</th>
<th>Professional Staff Size</th>
<th>1974 Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source &amp; Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Regional Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Plan, Transportation Plan, Open Space Plan, Housing Plan, Public Works, Environmental Quality, Base Mapping, Data Base &amp; Monitoring Project, Intergovernmental Coordination, Public Information &amp; Citizen Participation, Clearinghouse Review</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$328,335</td>
<td>Local - 25.7% State - 15.8% Federal - 58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay-Lake Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Regional Planning Studies, Regional Data Base, Local Issues, Coastal Zone Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$176,000</td>
<td>Local - 41.5% State - 31.2% Federal - 27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>324,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Preparation of Prospectus, Status of Planning, Initiation of Regional Data Base, Citizen Participation &amp; Education Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Local - 0 State - 50% Federal - 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Date of Origin</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number of Counties</th>
<th>1974 Major Work Program Elements</th>
<th>Professional Staff Size</th>
<th>1974 Budget</th>
<th>Budget Source &amp; Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Regional Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Plan, Transportation Plan, Open Space Plan, Housing Plan, Public Works, Environmental Quality, Base Mapping, Data Base &amp; Monitoring Project, Intergovernmental Coordination, Public Information &amp; Citizen Participation, Clearinghouse Review</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$328,335</td>
<td>Local - 25.7% State - 15.0% - DLAD Wis. DOT DNR Federal - 58.5% - HUD U.S. DOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay-Lake Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Regional Planning Studies, Regional Data Base, Local Issues, Coastal Zone Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$176,000</td>
<td>Local - 61.5% State - 31.2% - DLAD Wis. DOT                                 Federal - 27.3% - UGLRC HUD D. of Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>324,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Preparation of Prospectus, Status of Planning, Initiation of Regional Data Base, Citizen Participation &amp; Education Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Local - 0 State - 50% - DLAD Federal - 50% - HUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Date of Origin</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Number of Counties</td>
<td>1974 Major Work Program Elements</td>
<td>Professional Staff Size</td>
<td>1974 Budget</td>
<td>Budget Source &amp; Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning &amp; Development Commission</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Land Use Planning, Environmental Planning, Transportation Planning, Housing Technical Assistance, Local Planning Assistance, Recreation Planning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$241,540</td>
<td>Local - 20.3% DLAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State - 29.4% DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wis. DOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal 50.3% HUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Land Use Data and Planning, Sewer and Water Planning, Population and Economic Data Compilation and Analysis, Solid Waste Management, Transportation Plan, Natural Resource Inventory and Plans, Economic Development Planning, Regional Housing Element, Program Coordination, Advisory Services and Technical Assistance, Urban Area Planning, Public Information and Citizen Participation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$160,710</td>
<td>Local - 47.1% DLAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State - 22.2% DLR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal 31.7% HUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>237,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Regional Housing Element, Local Planning &amp; Management Activities, Regional Program Development, Public Information &amp; Education Citizen Participation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$91,500</td>
<td>Local - 26.2% DLAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State - 43.4% DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal 30.4% HUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Date of Origin</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Number of Counties</td>
<td>1974 Major Work Program Elements</td>
<td>Professional Staff Size</td>
<td>1974 Budget</td>
<td>Budget Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan&lt;br&gt;County and Regional Land Use Plan&lt;br&gt;Regional Recreation Plan&lt;br&gt;Economic Development Planning&lt;br&gt;Regional Housing Plan&lt;br&gt;Community Facilities Plan&lt;br&gt;Citizen Participation and Policy Development&lt;br&gt;Advisory Services and Technical Assistance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$99,727</td>
<td>Local - 20.3%&lt;br&gt;State - 49.1% - DLAD&lt;br&gt;Wis. DOT&lt;br&gt;Federal - 30.6% - HUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,740,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Information Base&lt;br&gt;Planning for Land Use&lt;br&gt;Planning for Movement of People and Goods&lt;br&gt;Planning for Protection of the Environment&lt;br&gt;Planning for Housing&lt;br&gt;Planning for Community Development&lt;br&gt;Technical Services and General Administration</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$1,221,000</td>
<td>Local - 41.3%&lt;br&gt;State - 12.0% - DNR&lt;br&gt;DLAD&lt;br&gt;Wis. DOT&lt;br&gt;Federal - 46.7% - HUD&lt;br&gt;U.S. DOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>290,272</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regional Growth and Development&lt;br&gt;Transportation Planning&lt;br&gt;Environmental and Natural Resources&lt;br&gt;Community Services</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$497,879</td>
<td>Local - 47.6%&lt;br&gt;State - 5.8% - DLAD&lt;br&gt;Wis. DOT&lt;br&gt;Federal - 46.6% - U.S. DOT&lt;br&gt;HUD&lt;br&gt;EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Date of Origin</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Number of Counties</td>
<td>1974 Major Work Program Elements</td>
<td>Professional Staff Size</td>
<td>1974 Budget</td>
<td>Budget Source &amp; Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan&lt;br&gt;Regional Recreation Plan&lt;br&gt;Economic Development Planning&lt;br&gt;Regional Housing Plan&lt;br&gt;Community Facilities Plan&lt;br&gt;Policy Development Advisory Services and Technical Assistance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$99,727</td>
<td>Local - 20.3%&lt;br&gt;State - 49.1% - DLAD&lt;br&gt;Federal - 30.6% - HUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,740,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Information Base&lt;br&gt;Planning for Land Use&lt;br&gt;Planning for Movement of People and Goods&lt;br&gt;Planning for Protection of the Environment&lt;br&gt;Planning for Housing&lt;br&gt;Planning for Community Development&lt;br&gt;Technical Services and General Administration</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$1,221,000</td>
<td>Local - 41.3%&lt;br&gt;State - 12.0% DNR&lt;br&gt;DOT&lt;br&gt;Federal - 46.7% - HUD&lt;br&gt;U.S. DOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>290,272</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regional Growth and Development&lt;br&gt;Transportation Planning&lt;br&gt;Environmental and Natural Resources&lt;br&gt;Community Services</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$497,879</td>
<td>Local - 47.6%&lt;br&gt;State - 5.8% - DLAD&lt;br&gt;DOT&lt;br&gt;Federal - 46.6% - U.S. DOT&lt;br&gt;HUD&lt;br&gt;EPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
--DLAD and DOA develop an integrated 701 planning application for the first time in 1974.

--The regional clearinghouse review function is broader in scope and extended to include non-metropolitan regional planning agencies as well as metropolitan. Seven regional commissions have achieved clearinghouse status to date.

--A number of rural townships and a few small villages pass resolutions to withdraw from the jurisdiction of regional planning commissions. Most of the withdrawals tend to come from areas where commissions are very new and have had little chance to show their usefulness. Opposition is coming from active right-wing extremist groups. The strong localism orientation is also a factor. To date approximately 207 local units have passed resolutions to withdraw; this represents about four percent of the total state population within regional planning jurisdictions--88 percent of the state's population is served by regional planning commissions (see attached map and table).

--A growing number of RPCs seek designation as Economic Development Districts (EDD) (one operating, three more authorized and two in the application process).

--State financial support of regional planning increases from $200,000 per biennium to $668,000, plus a one-time supplement of $265,000 in fiscal 1974. However, the number of regions and program demands also increase greatly.

--HUD financial support becomes unstable, and actually declines; the Ford Administration appears to be leaning toward abandonment of the HUD "701" program; the mood in Congress is uncertain.
APPENDIX II

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN
EAST CENTRAL WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING
COMMISSION, STATE AGENCIES, AND
EXECUTIVE OFFICE REGARDING
STATE POLICY ON REGIONAL PLANNING
June 25, 1974

Mr. Norman Clapp
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
4802 Sheboygan Avenue
Madison, WI  53702

Dear Mr. Clapp:

During the past year, a number of communities who are members of East Central have been seriously questioning the reasons for their present participation in East Central, and why they need to remain as an active member. As a part of our agency's response to these circumstances, we are soliciting the clearly defined policies of several state and federal agencies regarding regional planning commissions.

In the State of Wisconsin, regional planning commissions in general, and this agency in particular, have a number of apparent duties and responsibilities to the communities within its jurisdiction to fulfill certain planning related obligations. We would like a clarification of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation's policy toward the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission regarding both required programs and expected program participation to be undertaken by this agency for its communities.

We are also most interested in determining who would fulfill these planning requirements if East Central did not perform these functions.

The following is a very brief enumeration of our perceived transportation related major duties and responsibilities to those communities within our jurisdiction:

1. The Federal Highway Act of 1962 requires that a comprehensive, cooperative, and continuing transportation planning process be active and certified for every SMSA. East Central is currently performing this function for the Appleton-Oshkosh SMSA and is giving technical assistance to the Fond du Lac Area Transportation Study.
2. The Unified Work Program, which is a required prerequisite for any US-DOT funded transportation planning in an SMSA, is currently prepared by East Central for both the three SMSA counties and the remaining seven counties within this region. Submission of a unified work program is a condition for meeting the provisions of Title 23, U. S. Code, Section 134; Section 9 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 as amended; and Section 13 of the Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970.

3. Every two years Congress requires that a "national transportation needs study" be undertaken for the entire country as one of the bases for Federal appropriations for transportation related construction and other capital expenditures. East Central did the latest study for the SMSA portions of the region.

4. Through the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 a new category of street and highway aid (Federal Aid Urban System) was created for urban areas (communities over 5,000 population). East Central, as a Section 134 agency designated by the Governor, has worked with WDOT Districts 2, 3 and 4 to designate the urban area boundaries and the facilities for this aid system.

5. UMTA requires an approved "Planning Determination" as a prerequisite to the granting of any planning or capital improvements to a community for public transit purposes. East Central has obtained this Planning Determination for its jurisdiction.

6. WDOT has several programs in which East Central is assumed to be either an active participant or one of the prime review agencies. These programs are the State Airport Plan, Wisconsin Action Plan, Interim State Transportation Plan, and the State Long-Range Transportation Plan.

If you should have any questions, please contact us as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Woodrow H. Smith
Chairman
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2. The Unified Work Program, which is a required prerequisite for any US-DOT funded transportation planning in an SMSA, is currently prepared by East Central for both the three SMSA counties and the remaining seven counties within this region. Submission of a unified work program is a condition for meeting the provisions of Title 23, U. S. Code, Section 134; Section 9 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 as amended; and Section 13 of the Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970.

3. Every two years Congress requires that a "national transportation needs study" be undertaken for the entire country as one of the bases for Federal appropriations for transportation related construction and other capital expenditures. East Central did the latest study for the SMSA portions of the region.

4. Through the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 a new category of street and highway aid (Federal Aid Urban System) was created for urban areas (communities over 5,000 population). East Central, as a Section 134 agency designated by the Governor, has worked with WDOT Districts 2, 3 and 4 to designate the urban area boundaries and the facilities for this aid system.

5. UMTA requires an approved "Planning Determination" as a prerequisite to the granting of any planning or capital improvements to a community for public transit purposes. East Central has obtained this Planning Determination for its jurisdiction.

6. WDOT has several programs in which East Central is assumed to be either an active participant or one of the prime review agencies. These programs are the State Airport Plan, Wisconsin Action Plan, Interim State Transportation Plan, and the State Long-Range Transportation Plan.

If you should have any questions, please contact us as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Woodrow H. Smith
Chairman
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August 5, 1974

Mr. Woodrow H. Smith, Chairman
East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Zuelke Building
103 West College Avenue
Appleton, Wis. 54911

Dear Mr. Smith:

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to your letter of June 25 requesting a statement of Department policy with regard to regional planning commissions in Wisconsin.

Basically the Department's policy is to recognize the emerging role of regional planning commissions in the state and to promote the creation of state-regional partnerships for transportation planning purposes. These partnerships should desirably combine the financial and technical assistance capabilities of the Department with a regional staff capability supported by local involvement and citizen participation. The regional planning commission thus serves to meld the viewpoints of local units of government within the region on issues of areawide significance in the transportation planning process.

This current policy has evolved from almost 15 years of experience with regional planning commissions dating back to the early 1960's when the first formal written agreements addressed themselves to:

(1) the preparation of regional land use-transportation plans in accordance with S. 66.945, Wisconsin Statutes

(2) meeting the urban planning requirements of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962.

More recently, emphasis in state-regional agreements is being placed on:

(1) integration of planning for regional and state transportation networks

(2) definition of changing regional transportation demands brought about by changes in population density, land development, and transportation technology
(3) obtaining and/or retaining the eligibility of local units of government for federal transportation aids

(4) guiding the staged development of transportation facilities to serve the region.

The Department's "Action Plan for Transportation Development", prepared in accordance with the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970 and published in January, 1974, provides further direction concerning the evolving state-regional partnership in transportation planning. The Action Plan proposes that the Department's Transportation Planning Council develop a long-range, all-mode state transportation plan to meet the needs of the state and its rural, urban, and metropolitan communities. Regional planning commissions are being asked to co-sponsor public involvement activities for the state transportation planning process and to give their comment and counsel during the development of alternative all-mode state plans. Regional policies and plans will be included in statewide transportation proposals as appropriate. On May 29, 1974, Mr. Robert T. Huber, Chairman of the Department's Transportation Planning Council wrote you to formally request your Commission's participation in the initial phase of the state transportation planning effort. Specifically, he asked that your agency co-sponsor an Area Planning Conference for the purpose of receiving public comment on the draft Interim State Transportation Plan. It is our earnest hope that each established regional planning commission will choose to participate in this process and help to communicate the shared needs and interests of local units of government within their respective regions.

Statewide and regional transportation planning will become even more closely tied together in the future by means of the Department's new financial assistance program to support rural regional planning efforts in Wisconsin. The Department has already executed contracts with the Northwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning & Development Commission and the Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission to support regional work programs covering a variety of special regional interests including jurisdictional highway planning studies for rural counties, accommodating increased recreation travel demands, local planning assistance for small communities and assessment of existing regional rail service. It is anticipated that the regional planning commission efforts in these matters will be directly supportive of the Department's statewide planning efforts and vice-versa.

This Department has been involved in cooperative planning with your Commission since its creation in August, 1972. The first order of business then, of course, was completion of the Fox Valley Area Transportation Study which
(3) obtaining and/or retaining the eligibility of local units of government for federal transportation aids

(4) guiding the staged development of transportation facilities to serve the region.

The Department's "Action Plan for Transportation Development", prepared in accordance with the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970 and published in January, 1974, provides further direction concerning the evolving state-regional partnership in transportation planning. The Action Plan proposes that the Department's Transportation Planning Council develop a long-range, all-mode state transportation plan to meet the needs of the state and its rural, urban, and metropolitan communities. Regional planning commissions are being asked to co-sponsor public involvement activities for the state transportation planning process and to give their comment and counsel during the development of alternative all-mode state plans. Regional policies and plans will be included in statewide transportation proposals as appropriate. On May 29, 1974, Mr. Robert T. Huber, Chairman of the Department's Transportation Planning Council wrote you to formally request your Commission's participation in the initial phase of the state transportation planning effort. Specifically, he asked that your agency co-sponsor an Area Planning Conference for the purpose of receiving public comment on the draft Interim State Transportation Plan. It is our earnest hope that each established regional planning commission will choose to participate in this process and help to communicate the shared needs and interests of local units of government within their respective regions.

Statewide and regional transportation planning will become even more closely tied together in the future by means of the Department's new financial assistance program to support rural regional planning efforts in Wisconsin. The Department has already executed contracts with the Northwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning & Development Commission and the Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission to support regional work programs covering a variety of special regional interests including jurisdictional highway planning studies for rural counties, accommodating increased recreation travel demands, local planning assistance for small communities and assessment of existing regional rail service. It is anticipated that the regional planning commission efforts in these matters will be directly supportive of the Department's statewide planning efforts and vice-versa.

This Department has been involved in cooperative planning with your Commission since its creation in August, 1972. The first order of business then, of course, was completion of the Fox Valley Area Transportation Study which
we initiated with the former Fox Valley Council of Governments. As you know, we are required by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1973 to have an areawide planning partner to engage in continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning within the state's urbanized areas as defined by the U.S. Bureau of Census including the Appleton-Oshkosh urbanized areas. The Governor has on our recommendation currently designated the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission as the Metropolitan Planning Agency for the purposes of complying with federal law and for the purpose of receiving financial assistance for planning from the modal administrations of the U.S. Department of Transportation. At the present time we are not aware of any alternative agency that could perform metropolitan transportation planning in the Appleton-Oshkosh urbanized area except this Department itself. Based on the recent successful completion of the initial phase of the Fox Valley Area Transportation Study involving a fine cooperative effort of our respective staffs, it is certainly my hope that our current partnership in metropolitan planning can be a continuing one. We look to your staff, for example, to provide continuing surveillance of land use development in the Fox Valley in order that the initial transportation plan may be reviewed on a periodic basis and adjusted to meet unforeseen circumstances. Our current agreement also contemplates your Commission's involvement in the continuing phase of the Fond du Lac Area Transportation Study. Your agency's efforts in the preparation of federally required Unified Work Programs for transportation planning assistance funds, national transportation study needs estimates for your region, and review of Federal Aid Urban Highway System recommendations is also considered by this Department to be most important to the continued effectiveness of metropolitan planning in your region.

Another Department objective is that all communities with existing urban transit service remain eligible for federal transit development aids. We are pleased to note the recent announcement of the U.S. Urban Mass Transportation Administration's grant of technical planning assistance funds to your agency to prepare the local transit development programs required for federal capital grant funds. Our transit operating assistance programs for East Central community bus systems will also be well served by this planning activity, an activity by the way which would be quite difficult to undertake with existing Department staff.

In regards to other modes of transportation which serve both the rural and urban portions of your region such as airports, intercity bus, motor carriers, railroads, waterborne activities, pipelines, and bikeways, it is our opinion that local units of government would do well to seek the assistance of your agency in defining needs which cross community lines. At the present time we have asked your commission to represent local units of government in East Central Wisconsin on the Department's State Airport System Plan Advisory Committee. It is likely that we will consult you concerning the development of other individual statewide modal plans.
This brings us now to the crucial question of whether in light of all of the above, the state of Wisconsin and its local units of government need regional planning commissions. It is apparent to this Department that intercity transportation facilities by definition serve areas or regions rather than localities. They connect places and meet common rather than individual travel needs. Still, how the State chooses to interact with local units of government, is a local as well as a state decision. As local units choose to speak as a group such as through a regional planning commission, their common interests are being recognized. At no time, however, could we suggest that local units may not speak as individuals. Therefore, it is not the intent of this Department to require local units of government to act through regional planning commissions in order to become eligible for state and federal transportation aids except as federal law demands that we do so. Rather the Department has traditionally considered local organization for planning to be a matter of local option within statutory limits. In the final analysis, the local units of governments within East Central Wisconsin must understand and weigh the benefits and responsibilities of active membership in a regional planning commission. I hope the information provided in this letter will be helpful in your discussions with local officials and citizens on this most important matter.

Sincerely,

Norman M. Clapp

N. M. Clapp
Secretary

NMC:ng
CC: Governor Lucci
This brings us now to the crucial question of whether in light of all of the above, the state of Wisconsin and its local units of government need regional planning commissions. It is apparent to this Department that intercity transportation facilities by definition serve areas or regions rather than localities. They connect places and meet common rather than individual travel needs. Still, how the State chooses to interact with local units of government, is a local as well as a state decision. As local units choose to speak as a group such as through a regional planning commission, their common interests are being recognized. At no time, however, could we suggest that local units may not speak as individuals.

Therefore, it is not the intent of this Department to require local units of government to act through regional planning commissions in order to become eligible for state and federal transportation aids except as federal law demands that we do so. Rather the Department has traditionally considered local organization for planning to be a matter of local option within statutory limits. In the final analysis, the local units of governments within East Central Wisconsin must understand and weigh the benefits and responsibilities of active membership in a regional planning commission. I hope the information provided in this letter will be helpful in your discussions with local officials and citizens on this most important matter.

Sincerely,

Norman M. Clapp

N. M. Clapp
Secretary

NMC:ng
CC: Governor Luccy
June 25, 1974

Mr. Charles M. Hill, Sr., Secretary
Department of Local Affairs and Development
123 West Washington Avenue
Madison, WI 53703

Dear Mr. Hill:

During the past year, a number of communities who are members of East Central have been seriously questioning the reasons for their present participation in East Central, and why they need to remain as an active member. As a part of our agency's response to these circumstances, we are soliciting the clearly defined policies of several state and federal agencies regarding regional planning commissions.

In the State of Wisconsin, regional planning commissions in general, and this agency in particular, have a number of apparent duties and responsibilities to the communities within its jurisdiction to fulfill certain planning related obligations. We would like a clarification of the Department of Local Affairs and Development's policy toward the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission regarding both required programs and expected participation to be undertaken by this agency for its communities.

We are also most interested in determining who would fulfill these planning requirements if East Central did not perform these functions.

The following is a very brief enumeration of our perceived DLAD related major duties and responsibilities to those communities within our jurisdiction:

1. Coordinate efforts and programs that have a significant impact on East Central and local units of government within its jurisdiction.

2. Coordinate activities which are primarily concerned with intergovernmental arrangements, especially those that occur in specific local areas within this region and also within the East Central area.
3. DLAD provides both funding support and performs a number of administrative functions for regional commissions, such as acting as the "701" applicant to HUD for ECWRPC. At the present time one of DLAD's funding priorities is regional planning commissions.

If you should have any questions, please contact us as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Woodrow H. Smith
Chairman

WHS:RCW:ag
3. DLAD provides both funding support and performs a number of administrative functions for regional commissions, such as acting as the "701" applicant to HUD for ECWRC. At the present time one of DLAD's funding priorities is regional planning commissions.

If you should have any questions, please contact us as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Woodrow H. Smith
Chairman

WHS:RCW:ag
July 29, 1974

Mr. Woodrow Smith, Chairman
East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
103 West College Avenue
Appleton, Wisconsin 54911

Dear Mr. Smith:

We have reviewed your letter of June 25 in which you posed several questions relative to the Department of Local Affairs and Development's policy in regards to regional planning commissions and the expectations the Department has for them.

As I am sure you are aware, our agency has a statutory mandate to encourage and promote the formation and development of regional and metropolitan planning agencies within the state and to provide continuing guidance and assistance to them. One of the Department's highest priorities of the last several years has been to actively encourage the establishment of multi-county regional planning agencies that would serve all the state's local governments. With a few notable exceptions, this organizational objective has largely been achieved. Our concern now is more directed toward the programs of the commissions, specifically as to how we can assist in strengthening them to better serve local governments and resolve key regional/areawide issues. This is a more difficult task than the organizational one—it obviously involves more resources, both technical and financial, a high level of communication and cooperation between local, regional and state agencies, it involves issues which are often political, very sensitive and potentially divisive, and quite frankly, it's going to take a quite a bit of time to build the process.

So that there is no misunderstanding, however, regional planning is still and will continue to be one of DLAD's highest priority programs.

This priority will continue to be reflected in our administration of the State Regional Planning Grant Program and in 701 federal planning assistance funds. State regional planning aids which amounts to $339,000 annually, are used solely to support regional planning. Most of the federal 701 funds that we administer are used to support the areawide planning agencies; wherever possible we have tried to closely relate grants to local planning agencies to the programs of the respective regional planning commission.
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In answer to your more specific questions we expect each regional planning agency to actively work toward fulfilling its statutory mandate of adopting a comprehensive plan for the physical development of the region—it is our interpretation of this requirement that the emphasis should be on building the regional planning process. We define this process as one which depends on strong local government control of and involvement in the planning activities carried on by the planning agency. Part and parcel of this process is the clear understanding that the planning policy developed by the agency is strictly advisory to local governments and to the state and federal governments. Furthermore, we look to your Commission to develop a regional planning process that will lead to the establishment of rational development guidelines that can be adopted and implemented by local units of government and endorsed and implemented by appropriate state and federal agencies. The river basin concerns of the Fox-Wolf river system are the type of matters that we would expect your agency to address.

We see the regional planning commission as the logical vehicle for coordinating various local planning efforts within the region.

We also feel that another important function of regional planning agencies is to develop a strong planning assistance program. A few years ago this Department had a very substantial local planning assistance program, however, we felt that local assistance could be carried out more effectively on a continuous basis at the local and regional level. Thus, one of the objectives of our regional planning organizational effort was to establish agencies which would develop a local planning assistance component to serve its constituent units; during this transition our capability to provide local planning assistance has become very limited.

Another important responsibility that we feel regional planning commissions must fulfill is to develop the necessary planning capability to satisfy various federal planning requirements so that local units of government within the region are eligible for vital development grants and so that scarce public monies are used in a judicious manner.

One important question you raised in your letter was how would the planning needs of the area be met if there was no regional planning agency. There is no simple answer to your question. I believe, however, that the state would have to play a much stronger planning role—possibly the state would undertake some form of centralized regional planning. The need to deal with multi-jurisdictional planning and development issues would still exist, in fact, these concerns are going to continue to become more complex. Local governments operating independently have a poor track record in dealing with areawide issues. Local planning assistance to areas which probably can't afford a staffed local planning agency, such as Marquette, Green Lake, Waushara counties, etc., would probably need to be served by a strengthened
In answer to your more specific questions we expect each regional planning agency to actively work toward fulfilling its statutory mandate of adopting a comprehensive plan for the physical development of the region—it is our interpretation of this requirement that the emphasis should be on building the regional planning process. We define this process as one which depends on strong local government control of and involvement in the planning activities carried on by the planning agency. Part and parcel of this process is the clear understanding that the planning policy developed by the agency is strictly advisory to local governments and to the state and federal governments. Furthermore, we look to your Commission to develop a regional planning process that will lead to the establishment of rational development guidelines that can be adopted and implemented by local units of government and endorsed and implemented by appropriate state and federal agencies. The river basin concerns of the Fox-Wolf river system are the type of matters that we would expect your agency to address.

We see the regional planning commission as the logical vehicle for coordinating various local planning efforts within the region.

We also feel that another important function of regional planning agencies is to develop a strong planning assistance program. A few years ago this Department had a very substantial local planning assistance program, however, we felt that local assistance could be carried out more effectively on a continuous basis at the local and regional level. Thus, one of the objectives of our regional planning organizational effort was to establish agencies which would develop a local planning assistance component to serve its constituent units; during this transition our capability to provide local planning assistance has become very limited.

Another important responsibility that we feel regional planning commissions must fulfill, is to develop the necessary planning capability to satisfy various federal planning requirements so that local units of government within the region are eligible for vital development grants and so that scarce public monies are used in a judicious manner.

One important question you raised in your letter was how would the planning needs of the area be met if there was no regional planning agency. There is no simple answer to your question: I believe, however, that the state would have to play a much stronger planning role—possibly the state would undertake some form of centralized regional planning. The need to deal with multi-jurisdictional planning and development issues would still exist, in fact, these concerns are going to continue to become more complex. Local governments operating independently have a poor track record in dealing with areawide issues. Local planning assistance to areas which probably can't afford a staffed local planning agency, such as Marquette, Green Lake, Waushara counties, etc., would probably need to be served by a strengthened
state planning assistance function. There is also a serious question whether or not federal planning requirements could be met in the absence of an areawide planning agency. Cities such as Appleton, Oshkosh, Fond du Lac and possibly others could lose their eligibility for mass transit funds, for example.

In addition, I believe the quality of state functional planning efforts would suffer from the absence of strong local government viewpoints that the regional planning commission brings to state programs, i.e., state transportation planning.

Of course, another possibility could involve the creation of another regional agency to replace the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission. The agency might have different boundaries, membership composition, etc.

I believe this summarizes our feelings on this matter; I hope these comments are helpful to you. Mr. George A. James, Director of our Bureau of Regional Planning and Community Assistance, or his staff, would be happy, I am sure, to continue discussions on this matter. We support your organization and the local control it represents and frankly are concerned with the alternatives your organization's demise would force on local governments.

Sincerely,

Charles M. Hill, Sr.
Secretary

cc: Department of Administration
    Department of Transportation
    Department of Natural Resources
    Mr. George A. James
Mr. Lester Voigt, Secretary  
Department of Natural Resources  
Box 450  
Madison, WI  53702

Dear Mr. Voigt:

During the past year, a number of communities who are members of East Central have been seriously questioning the reasons for their present participation in East Central, and why they need to remain as an active member. As a part of our agency's response to these circumstances, we are soliciting the clearly defined policies of several state and federal agencies regarding regional planning commissions.

In the State of Wisconsin, regional planning commissions in general, and this agency in particular, have a number of apparent duties and responsibilities to the communities within its jurisdiction to fulfill certain planning obligations. We would like a clarification of the Department of Natural Resources' policy toward the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission regarding both required programs and expected program participation to be undertaken by this agency for its communities.

We are also most interested in determining who would fulfill these planning requirements if East Central did not perform these functions.

The following is a very brief enumeration of our perceived DNR related duties and responsibilities to those communities within our jurisdiction.

1. Under PL 92-500, a portion of East Central's region (the Fond du Lac to Green Bay urban industrial complex) may become designated as a "208" wastewater management planning area and this agency is being viewed as an important contributor to this planning effort.

2. In the proposed Level B plan for the Fox-Wolf River Basin,
Mr. Lester Voigt, Secretary  
Department of Natural Resources  
Box 450  
Madison, WI  53702

Dear Mr. Voigt:

During the past year, a number of communities who are members of East Central have been seriously questioning the reasons for their present participation in East Central, and why they need to remain as an active member. As a part of our agency's response to these circumstances, we are soliciting the clearly defined policies of several state and federal agencies regarding regional planning commissions.

In the State of Wisconsin, regional planning commissions in general, and this agency in particular, have a number of apparent duties and responsibilities to the communities within its jurisdiction to fulfill certain planning obligations. We would like a clarification of the Department of Natural Resources' policy toward the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission regarding both required programs and expected program participation to be undertaken by this agency for its communities.

We are also most interested in determining who would fulfill these planning requirements if East Central did not perform these functions.

The following is a very brief enumeration of our perceived DNR related duties and responsibilities to those communities within our jurisdiction.

1. Under PL 92-500, a portion of East Central's region (the Fond du Lac to Green Bay urban industrial complex) may become designated as a "208" wastewater management planning area and this agency is being viewed as an important contributor to this planning effort.

2. In the proposed Level B plan for the Fox-Wolf River Basin,
DNR anticipates East Central's participation in this program.

3. East Central performs a review function for various DNR associated projects such as shoreline management, dredging in water bodies, and the diking along shorelines.

4. DNR is the State's lead agency in following through on the Federal Flood Disaster Act of 1973. East Central is also participating with DNR in this program and rendering certain technical assistance to local government.

5. DNR has given funding support to East Central for its regional open space program. One of the purposes of this program is to obtain or maintain eligibility for certain types of open space projects.

If you should have any questions, please contact us as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Woodrow H. Smith, Chairman

WHS:RCW:ag
July 2, 1974

Mr. Woodrow H. Smith, Chairman
East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
701 West College Avenue
Appleton, Wisconsin 54911

Dear Mr. Smith:

Various members of my staff have reviewed your letter regarding DNR-related duties and responsibilities of the East Central Regional Planning Commission. They all agreed that this is a good descriptive summary.

I would like to add that this Department has repeatedly gone on record as viewing regional planning commissions as the important connecting link between state policies and decisions and local government actions which implement the state guidelines.

If there is anyway that we can assist you in your efforts to point out the value of regional planning to local governments, don't hesitate to call on us.

Very truly yours,

L. P. Voigt
Secretary

cc: A. D. Oell
July 2, 1974

Mr. Woodrow H. Smith, Chairman
East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
100 West College Avenue
Appleton, Wisconsin 54911

Dear Mr. Smith:

Various members of my staff have reviewed your letter regarding DNR-related duties and responsibilities of the East Central Regional Planning Commission. They all agreed that this is a good descriptive summary.

I would like to add that this Department has repeatedly gone on record as viewing regional planning commissions as the important connecting link between state policies and decisions and local government actions which implement the state guidelines.

If there is anyway that we can assist you in your efforts to point out the value of regional planning to local governments, don't hesitate to call on us.

Very truly yours,

L. F. Voigt
Secretary

cc: A. D. Call
June 26, 1974

The Honorable Patrick J. Lucey
Governor, State of Wisconsin
State Capitol
Madison, WI 53701

Dear Governor Lucey:

During the past year, a number of communities who are members of East Central have been seriously questioning the reasons for their present participation in East Central, and why they need to remain as an active member. As part of our agency's response to these circumstances, we are soliciting a clearly defined policy statement from several State and Federal agencies regarding regional planning commissions.

In the State of Wisconsin, regional planning commissions in general, and this agency in particular, have a number of apparent duties and responsibilities to the communities within its jurisdiction to fulfill certain planning related obligations. We would like to obtain from you a policy statement indicating your reasons for promoting total coverage of the State with regional planning commissions and your reasons for supporting the work efforts of regional planning agencies. What programs are we required to carry out relative to our statutory mandate and what level of programming do you feel should be undertaken by this agency for its communities?

We are also most interested in determining who would fulfill these planning requirements if East Central did not perform these functions.

Sincerely,

Woodrow H. Smith
Chairman

WHS:RCW:ag
August 8, 1974

Mr. Woodrow H. Smith, Chairman
East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
103 West College Avenue
Appleton, Wisconsin 54911

Dear Mr. Smith:

I have reviewed and considered the questions posed in your letter of June 26.

As indicated by the substantially increased funding support for regional planning agencies during my administration, and more recently, by my efforts at procuring state replacing of funding outbacks in the Annual Review Budget legislation, I have a strong interest in the development of effective, progressiveareawide planning programs in Wisconsin.

Regional planning offers a real opportunity to deal with issues and problems that transcend the boundaries of individual local governments, but which are of common interest to them. It provides local governments with a needed forum to discuss differences in development objectives and priorities and a means of working towards acceptable compromise solutions. Further, it is a vehicle for making varied technical assistance, prohibitively costly for many individual units of government, readily available to these same communities. Regional planning commissions, which are strongly representative of local governmental interests and points of view, would seem to provide a much more acceptable means for dealing with regionwide issues and making appropriate recommendations to state and federal program agencies, than having these agencies make program decisions from Madison or Washington, without benefit of regional consensus-building and direction-setting processes.

One apparent alternative to the Regional Planning Commission appears to be direct negotiation by the appropriate state or federal agency with each of the several local units of government involved. This appears a quite cumbersome and ineffective process, particularly for such problems as air and water quality, coastal zone management, regional transportation planning and other pressing issues.
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Mr. Woodrow H. Smith, Chairman
East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
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Appleton, Wisconsin 54911

Dear Mr. Smith:

I have reviewed and considered the questions posed in your letter of June 26.

As indicated by the substantially increased funding support for regional planning agencies during my administration, and more recently, by my efforts at procuring state replacing of funding outbacks in the Annual Review Budget legislation, I have a strong interest in the development of effective, progressearcwide planning programs in Wisconsin.

Regional planning offers a real opportunity to deal with issues and problems that transcend the boundaries of individual local governments, but which are of common interest to them. It provides local governments with a needed forum to discuss differences in development objectives and priorities and a means of working towards acceptable compromise solutions. Further, it is a vehicle for making varied technical assistance, prohibitively costly for many individual units of government, readily available to these same communities. Regional planning commissions, which are strongly representative of local governmental interests and points of view, would seem to provide a much more acceptable means for dealing with regionwide issues and making appropriate recommendations to state and federal program agencies, than having these agencies make program decisions from Madison or Washington, without benefit of regional consensus-building and direction-setting processes.

One apparent alternative to the Regional Planning Commission appear to be direct negotiation by the appropriate state or federal agency with each of the several local units of government involved. This appears a quite cumbersome and ineffective process, particularly for such problems as air and water quality, coastal zone management, regional transportation planning and other pressing issues.
Regional Planning Commissions can serve an important role in developing and promoting a regional perspective reflective of local governmental positions on such issues.

It is my understanding that several state agencies have also received communications from you. I have directed them to consider my general support for regional planning in the preparation of their responses.

Sincerely,

PATRICK J. LUCEY
GOVERNOR

PJL: jto
cc: Charles M. Hill, Sr., Dept. of Local Affairs and Development
    Joe Nusbaum, Dept. of Administration
June 25, 1974

Mr. Joe E. Nusbaum  
Department of Administration  
E-114 State Office Building  
One West Wilson Street  
Madison, WI  53702

Dear Mr. Nusbaum:

During the past year, a number of communities who are members of East Central have been seriously questioning the reasons for their present participation in East Central, and why they need to remain as an active member. As a part of our agency's response to these circumstances, we are soliciting the clearly defined policies of several state and federal agencies regarding regional planning commissions.

In the State of Wisconsin, regional planning commissions in general, and this agency in particular, have a number of apparent duties and responsibilities to the communities within its jurisdiction to fulfill certain planning obligations. We would like a statement of the Wisconsin Department of Administration policy toward the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission regarding both required programs and expected program participation to be undertaken by this agency for its communities.

We are also most interested in determining who would fulfill these planning requirements if East Central did not perform these functions.

The following is a very brief enumeration of our perceived DOA related duties and responsibilities to those communities within our jurisdiction.

1. East Central was designated by the Federal Office of Management and Budget as a metropolitan clearinghouse for its total ten-county area. As such, East Central has been designated as the local agency responsible for performing the necessary notifications, reviews, and comments for those Federally aided programs which come under the A-95 process.
June 25, 1974

Mr. Joe E. Nusbaum
Department of Administration
B-114 State Office Building
One West Wilson Street
Madison, WI 53702

Dear Mr. Nusbaum:

During the past year, a number of communities who are members of East Central have been seriously questioning the reasons for their present participation in East Central, and why they need to remain as an active member. As a part of our agency's response to these circumstances, we are soliciting the clearly defined policies of several state and federal agencies regarding regional planning commissions.

In the State of Wisconsin, regional planning commissions in general, and this agency in particular, have a number of apparent duties and responsibilities to the communities within its jurisdiction to fulfill certain planning obligations. We would like a statement of the Wisconsin Department of Administration policy toward the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission regarding both required programs and expected program participation to be undertaken by this agency for its communities.

We are also most interested in determining who would fulfill these planning requirements if East Central did not perform these functions.

The following is a very brief enumeration of our perceived DOA related duties and responsibilities to those communities within our jurisdiction.

1. East Central was designated by the Federal Office of Management and Budget as a metropolitan clearinghouse for its total ten-county area. As such, East Central has been designated as the local agency responsible for performing the necessary notifications, reviews, and comments for those Federally aided programs which come under the A-95 process.
2. DOA carries out the State's A-95 responsibilities and concurs with OMB that regional clearinghouse jurisdictions are designated on the basis of logical, rational districts for which area-wide comprehensive planning should be, or is being carried out. East Central, the designated A-95 Clearinghouse is responsible for the performance of the A-95 review functions for all local governmental jurisdictions within the East Central jurisdiction.

3. The Department of Administration is the State's lead planning agency and the applicant for all HUD 701 funds which are channeled through the State. As such, East Central's requested 701 funds form a part of ODA's total application package.

4. DOA's Overall Program Design, which was submitted to HUD on May 17, 1974, enumerates a number of program areas in which regional planning commissions' participation is anticipated. Those areas in which regional planning commission roles are specifically stated are: 100. State Development Policy Planning; 200. State Land Use Planning; 300. Planning Coordination; Review of Federal and State Program Planning Liaison; 600. Regional and Area-wide Planning; 700. Local Planning; 900. Housing; and 1100. Planning Grants to Subapplicants. East Central does expect to participate in several of these program areas.

If you should have any questions, please contact us as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Woodrow H. Smith
Chairman

W: RCW: ag
July 24, 1974

Mr. Woodrow H. Smith, Chairman
East Central Wisconsin Regional
Planning Commission
103 West College Avenue
Appleton, Wisconsin 54911

Dear Mr. Smith:

I have reviewed your letter of June 25, 1974 in which you raise a number of questions on interagency program relationships between the Department of Administration and the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission.

With respect to Commission responsibilities under Circular A-95, I refer you to the memorandum of June 3, 1974 from the Wisconsin State Clearinghouse (attached). Your point number two generally abstracts this document, but I would like to add one further clarification: Point number three of the June 3 memo indicates that the Commission has responsibility for all areas for which it has been designated the clearinghouse. If some areas are no longer participating members of the Commission, we would still expect you to perform the clearinghouse functions in those areas because they are a part of the "regional rationale" from which the original regional boundaries were devised. If the Commission, does not desire to continue this function, the U.S. Office of Management and Budget should be notified, and notification and review responsibilities will revert to the State Clearinghouse in Madison.

The State Planning Grant Application has been jointly developed by the Departments of Administration and Local Affairs and Development, although our department formally files the application. We are commenting only on those areas of the application which relate to our operating programs.

In both the State Development Policy and Land Use Planning elements of our program, we view the regional planning commission as an important institutional mechanism for gaining public exposure and discussion of program policy alternatives. This is an important ingredient in determining state policies. When policy has been established in a number of substantive areas, we believe that the regional planning commission will be instrumental in the further detailing of these policies, tailoring them to the unique objectives, needs, and priorities of the region, and working with local governments who will be the major policy implementing agents.
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Mr. Woodrow H. Smith, Chairman
East Central Wisconsin Regional
Planning Commission
103 West College Avenue
Appleton, Wisconsin 54911

Dear Mr. Smith:

I have reviewed your letter of June 25, 1974 in which you raise a number of questions on interagency program relationships between the Department of Administration and the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission.

With respect to Commission responsibilities under Circular A-95, I refer you to the memorandum of June 3, 1974 from the Wisconsin State Clearinghouse (attached). Your point number two generally abstracts this document, but I would like to add one further clarification: Point number three of the June 3 memo indicates that the Commission has responsibility for all areas for which it has been designated the clearinghouse. If some areas are no longer participating members of the Commission, we would still expect you to perform the clearinghouse functions in those areas because they are a part of the "regional rationale" from which the original regional boundaries were devised. If the Commission, does not desire to continue this function, the U.S. Office of Management and Budget should be notified, and notification and review responsibilities will revert to the State Clearinghouse in Madison.

The State Planning Grant Application has been jointly developed by the Departments of Administration and Local Affairs and Development, although our department formally files the application. We are commenting only on those areas of the application which relate to our operating programs.

In both the State Development Policy and Land Use Planning elements of our program, we view the regional planning commission as an important institutional mechanism for gaining public exposure and discussion of program policy alternatives. This is an important ingredient in determining state policies. When policy has been established in a number of substantive areas, we believe that the regional planning commission will be instrumental in the further detailing of these policies, tailoring them to the unique objectives, needs, and priorities of the region, and working with local governments who will be the major policy implementing agents.
Mr. Woodrow H. Smith, Chairman
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July 24, 1974

I believe that regional planning commissions perform a number of specific and important functions. Some issues and problems require solutions of a "greater-than-local" governmental nature. While these probably could be handled at the state level, it would seem more appropriate that they be dealt with at the regional level, where the decisions are made closer to the citizens and where representatives of local interests can meet together to arrive at a consensus. Regional planning commissions can provide this forum.

From an administrative standpoint, RPC's provide an opportunity for efficient programmatic negotiation for state and federal agencies, when a number of local governments are involved. In such programs as Coastal Zone Management or "208" Areawide Water Pollution Control Planning, the multiplicity of local governments could make planning very complex and cumbersome. The RPC can work with local governments to identify the range of interests and priorities to be defined in these kinds of programs.

Finally, I am convinced that true economies of scale can be achieved in the provision of technical planning services to local governments by the RPC. Many local governments which have neither sufficient workload nor adequate resources to hire their own planner can, through their participation in the RPC, receive the planning assistance that they need. Moreover, the quality of planning and the focus it takes will be consistent throughout the region.

We look forward to a continuing and effective working relationship with the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission in our State Planning and other program efforts.

Sincerely,

Joe E. Nusbaum
Secretary

Attachment
Date: June 3, 1974

To: Metropolitan/Regional A-95 Clearinghouses in Wisconsin

From: Garrett A. Nielsen
Wisconsin State Clearinghouse

Subject: Metropolitan/Regional Clearinghouse Jurisdiction

Recent discussions with the U.S. Office of Management and Budget with respect to defining areas of A-95 Clearinghouse jurisdiction have resulted in the following policy clarifications:

1. A-95 Metropolitan/Regional Clearinghouse jurisdictions are designated on the basis of logical rational geographies for which areawide comprehensive planning should be, or is being carried out;

2. Generally these designations are made to areawide planning agencies (in Wisconsin, Regional Planning Commissions) and usually these designations are coterminous with the areas covered by RPC's for comprehensive planning purposes;

3. The Regional Planning Commission will be responsible for the performance of the A-95 notification, review and comment functions for all local governmental jurisdictions within the boundaries of the area for which the RPC is the designated A-95 Clearinghouse.

I am attaching a current roster of Wisconsin A-95 Clearinghouses and the areas for which they have jurisdiction. If you have any additional questions or need further clarification on this matter, please feel free to contact me.
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Wisconsin State Clearinghouse

Subject: Metropolitan/Regional Clearinghouse Jurisdiction

Recent discussions with the U.S. Office of Management and Budget with respect to defining areas of A-95 Clearinghouse jurisdiction have resulted in the following policy clarifications:

1. A-95 Metropolitan/Regional Clearinghouse jurisdictions are designated on the basis of logical rational geographies for which area-wide comprehensive planning should be, or is being carried out;

2. Generally these designations are made to area-wide planning agencies (in Wisconsin, Regional Planning Commissions) and usually these designations are coterminous with the areas covered by RPC's for comprehensive planning purposes;

3. The Regional Planning Commission will be responsible for the performance of the A-95 notification, review and comment functions for all local governmental jurisdictions within the boundaries of the area for which the RPC is the designated A-95 Clearinghouse.

I am attaching a current roster of Wisconsin A-95 Clearinghouses and the areas for which they have jurisdiction. If you have any additional questions or need further clarification on this matter, please feel free to contact me.
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Attachment
APPENDIX III

1959 GOVERNOR GAYLORD NELSON SPEECH
A REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
FOR SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN AREA
A Regional Planning Agency
For Southeastern Wisconsin Area*

GOVERNOR GAYLORD NELSON

Gaylord Nelson is serving his first term as governor of the State of Wisconsin. He was a state senator for ten years prior to his election to state-wide office in 1958. While in the state senate he represented the metropolitan area of Wisconsin's capital city, Madison. He was a leader, while in the legislature, for action in behalf of metropolitan and regional problems.

Planning, a thankless job, produces criticism and resentment among many directly affected. Yet it is undoubtedly one of the most important tasks of government. It may well be the most important domestic function. If America is spared the ravages of war, the kind of life that future citizens enjoy will depend to a great extent upon the efforts of planners.

The planner of Milwaukee's great park system, Charles Whitnall, is remembered with reverence. Those parks have become a part of the way of life in Milwaukee. What kind of industrial morass would Milwaukee be without them? There are many other examples of farsighted planning, unappreciated in their day, that have made cities great, or, in failure, have destroyed them.

Planning is a European concept, and still is regarded by many as un-American. It is perhaps a contravention of the traditional American pioneering spirit, the untrammeled, wasteful exploitation of natural resources that was possible and profitable in the days when there was an unexplored frontier. But the factor that made planning necessary in Europe long ago is now making it necessary in the United States. It is the planner who is the pioneer today. That factor is population. No one likes to face the facts of population growth, and no one likes to pay its price. But this fact must be faced, and the price must be paid. And unless Americans plan now to meet the problems that growth brings, the price will be higher.

Wisconsin has been trying to do this kind of planning at the state level. There are more people with more cars and with more

time for recreation and with better highways, while there are only so many lakes, rivers and forests. And many of the cities in Wisconsin have had planning programs, some of them highly successful in their day. These programs, for the most part, involved planning within a governmental unit with arbitrary, artificial boundaries. It was evident some years ago that planning which stopped at the city limits was inadequate.

PLANNING AT THE STATE LEVEL

But the problem this posed was difficult. Extension of planning brought planners into conflict with local pride, disruption of settled ways of life, economic advantage and vested interests. These conflicts remain.

Consider the meaning of the phrase—"the outskirts of town." It is in universal use in this country; it connotes shanties, trash heaps, garish, cheap commercial ventures, physical and moral squalor. It represents the failure to carry planning to its proper limits, and the inability to solve the political problems that this kind of planning brings. For planning is a political problem. It is a political problem even within the limits of a city. Political problems constitute the primary obstacle to the success of the work of Wisconsin's Metropolitan Study Commission in Milwaukee County. It is the paramount problem confronting those who have been so bold as to attack the problem of regional planning.

An individual with the total power in his own hands would have little difficulty in planning successfully. But the price of this kind of planning is more than most want to pay. However, planning can succeed within the framework of democracy, and it has; England affords examples. But it is far from easy. How to persuade the inhabitants of a region to see that some regional interests are more important to them than their narrow municipal interests; how to stimulate imagination to perceive the long range benefits than can accrue from regional planning, especially when the short range effect might be unpleasant from a neighborhood or individual view; how to overcome the competitive jealousies of rival cities or villages. These are some of the problems faced in attempting to do regional planning. These are problems expressed in terms of political opposition.
time for recreation and with better highways, while there are only so many lakes, rivers and forests. And many of the cities in Wisconsin have had planning programs, some of them highly successful in their day. These programs, for the most part, involved planning within a governmental unit with arbitrary, artificial boundaries. It was evident some years ago that planning which stopped at the city limits was inadequate.
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But the problem this posed was difficult. Extension of planning brought planners into conflict with local pride, disruption of settled ways of life, economic advantage and vested interests. These conflicts remain.

Consider the meaning of the phrase—"the outskirts of town." It is in universal use in this country; it connotes shanties, trash heaps, garish, cheap commercial ventures, physical and moral squalor. It represents the failure to carry planning to its proper limits, and the inability to solve the political problems that this kind of planning brings. For planning is a political problem. It is a political problem even within the limits of a city. Political problems constitute the primary obstacle to the success of the work of Wisconsin's Metropolitan Study Commission in Milwaukee County. It is the paramount problem confronting those who have been so bold as to attack the problem of regional planning.

An individual with the total power in his own hands would have little difficulty in planning successfully. But the price of this kind of planning is more than most want to pay. However, planning can succeed within the framework of democracy, and it has; England affords examples. But it is far from easy. How to persuade the inhabitants of a region to see that some regional interests are more important to them than their narrow municipal interests; how to stimulate imagination to perceive the long range benefits than can accrue from regional planning, especially when the short range effect might be unpleasant from a neighborhood or individual view; how to overcome the competitive jealousies of rival cities or villages. These are some of the problems faced in attempting to do regional planning. These are problems expressed in terms of political opposition.
The automobile is probably the most important reason for the decentralization of cities. It has made labor mobile. It has spread homes forty and fifty miles from the place of work, scattered subdivisions in the middle of farm areas, changed cottage areas to commuter zones, provided an incentive for industries and other businesses to move to the country. It has made a mess of many areas outside cities. It has resulted in pollution of streams and lakes, created new knots of traffic congestion, lowered water tables and boosted property tax rates to the sky as influxes of families with children created new needs for schools. Without planning, changes like these take place so swiftly that residents despair.

FACTORIES AND TRAFFIC IN THE COUNTRY

Local governments struggle with these problems, usually in vain. Zoning ordinances are enacted. Subdivision control ordinances regulate development in limited areas. But most of these efforts come too late, and most of them control neighborhoods too small in area to have any real effect. The resulting hodgepodge development is resented by the older inhabitants of the area, who want to avoid changing their ways. It is disappointing to the newer residents, who fled crowded city areas for suburban life, only to discover that factories, traffic and slums have followed them into the country.

These are the disheartening aspects of life in sprawling urban areas such as the seven-county region of southeastern Wisconsin, an area that contains Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha. Planning can do much to forestall these developments. Planning can preserve natural beauty, and there is a great deal of natural beauty to preserve. Planning can spread the school tax burden, screen the factories from the homes, preserve the water table, stave off pollution and provide for efficient movement of traffic.

The people are going to continue to pour into areas such as this. Make no mistake about that. Some persons would like to try to prevent this, but they cannot. They can, however, through planning, provide that the influx will be orderly. The way of life will change, if growth is planned, but it will not be destroyed. There are advantages in regions like southeastern Wisconsin. One of them is industrial prosperity. Properly viewed, prosperity is regional rather than municipal. Southeastern Wisconsin will be prosperous, for this rel-
atively small, crowded area is the heart of Wisconsin’s industrial strength, and the whole state’s prosperity depends on the area.

When industrialists look at the potential labor supply in this region, boundary lines are ignored. There are Walworth county residents who work in Milwaukee, Ozaukee county residents who work in Kenosha. There will be even more of this mobility as highways improve. Some day the rivalries between communities in southeastern Wisconsin will be considered laughable. Today, however, they constitute a serious impediment to joint action. An example is the Bong air base site, recently abandoned by the U. S. Air Force after an abortive construction start. Advisers have thought that the best use of that area probably would be for industrial development, and the governor’s office has offered suggestions to the national government along that line.

This may or may not turn out to be the best use for this area, but it certainly is a possibility worth exploring. The criterion for the decision on the use of the Bong site should be regional prosperity; foolish fears that the site might attract an industry from one of the cities in the region, or that an industry which might locate at Bong might have located in another city should not stand in the way of Bong’s development. If Bong is prosperous, Milwaukee will be prosperous, and so will Racine and Kenosha.

BACKGROUND OF RIVALRY

It is against this background of intra-regional rivalry and political difficulty that Wisconsin is trying to establish a regional planning agency in its southeastern, seven-county region. This area, containing the industrial and commercial muscles of the state, has a population of 1,535,700 in a land area of 2,628 square miles; it is the fastest growing portion of Wisconsin, and is described as the “hot corner.” It contains nearly half the state’s taxable property and generates far more in state taxes than it requires in state services.

Quite apart from the specific problems to which regional planning would direct its energies in this area, an operating agency would have several goals and tasks:

1. There is great need to co-ordinate the application of state programs and policies within this region. Commonly, each agency of state government operates with parochial vision, apparently unconcerned about the
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BACKGROUND OF RIVALRY

It is against this background of intra-regional rivalry and political difficulty that Wisconsin is trying to establish a regional planning agency in its southeastern, seven-county region. This area, containing the industrial and commercial muscles of the state, has a population of 1,535,700 in a land area of 2,628 square miles; it is the fastest growing portion of Wisconsin, and is described as the “hot corner.” It contains nearly half the state’s taxable property and generates far more in state taxes than it requires in state services.

Quite apart from the specific problems to which regional planning would direct its energies in this area, an operating agency would have several goals and tasks:

1. There is great need to co-ordinate the application of state programs and policies within this region. Commonly, each agency of state government operates with parochial vision, apparently unconcerned about the
capacity of its program to mesh with programs of other agencies. There is typically no central co-ordination or broad policy for program execution within the region. The following oft-quoted statement made by an assistant attorney general in a 1951 meeting of the Wisconsin Natural Resources Committee of State Agencies illustrates the problem:

"I have been caught in the cross-fire between agencies on a great many occasions, in problems in the use of water for recreation, power, irrigation, and particularly now of drainage in respect to potatoes. . . . In these different problems, you will have one case when the Department of Agriculture tells farmers to go ahead and dam up the streams to get water to grow potatoes, the conservation commission says leave it alone, it is a beautiful spot. The soil conservation (committee) program is trying to preserve the land for their purposes. . . . (Professor) Penn (University of Wisconsin) urges irrigation . . . the public service commission wants a dam built."

Partially related to state activities is the paramount need for regional transportation planning that will integrate and co-ordinate development of highways, expressways, airports, harbor facilities, mass transit, rail and bus transport, and trucking. Scores of agencies presently work at regional transportation, but often at cross purposes for want of regional policies, information, and plans. Fractured transportation planning is expensive to government at all levels, and to business, industry, private individuals and the transportation companies. Equally important, the absence of regional planning tends to retard economic expansion through failure to correct area-wide transportation disadvantages.

2. Every region needs an official agency that can articulate its goals and development objectives to state and national governmental agencies. Equipped with penetrating studies and well-thought-out plans, a regional planning agency can speak with intelligence about state highway locations, wetlands preservation, parks development, and pollution and watershed control.

3. Particularly essential is the need for a regional agency that can co-ordinate the separate and conflicting activities of municipalities within the region. This is especially evident in such public works fields as sewerage, storm water drainage, water supply, highway construction, parks, airport development, and flood control. The line shot by a surveyor’s transit before the Civil War has little bearing on shifts in population, economic structure and municipal service requirements.

4. There is for southeastern Wisconsin a poverty of economic and ecologic base data and studies of land use and development capacities that can be tapped by the utilities, governmental agencies, industrial and commercial firms, and developers. The sustained collection, analysis, and pub-
lication of such information is an appropriate and vital function of a regional planning agency. Before any regional industrial development program can get under way, for example, four basic tasks foundational to planning must be executed:

(a) An inventory must be made of the basic facts of the region gained through unbiased examination of the region's water, power, fuel, manufacturing, transportation, labor training, manpower, and other resources.

(b) An awareness must be articulated of economic trends of the region and an evaluation made of long-term local and regional income and market patterns and technological trends for specific industries.

(c) Differential costs analysis must be executed, that is, the determination of the difference in regional costs of fuel and power, water, raw materials and supplies, transportation, labor and capital investment for each particular project.

(d) Final selection must be made of the types of industry that can most logically locate in the communities of the region on the basis of lower production and distribution costs, market growth potential or other particularly favorable operating conditions.

It is evident that all of this basic research for industrial development depends on regional concepts.

5. In communities too small or without sufficient funds to maintain planning staffs or retain consultants, a regional agency can extend assistance on local master planning, subdivision control and zoning. Local assistance work should be handled in moderation, however, since this kind of work frequently causes a regional agency staff to dilute its energies and overlook its broader regional objectives.

These tasks find their ultimate expression in a regional general plan that treats all relevant aspects of regional development on an area-wide basis. Specifically, the elements of the plan should include:

1. A general land use plan that establishes principal land use configurations. Such a plan must be based on a series of thoughtful economic and ecologic base studies and a comprehensive land use inventory.

2. A related general transportation plan that treats all aspects of transportation, from highways to port development to airport construction.

3. A public facilities plan that includes parks, water supply, sewerage, drainage, schools, hospitals, and other facilities.

4. A natural resources program with emphasis on water, land, forests and wildlife.

5. A capital improvements program containing recommendations to
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appropriate governmental agencies about the timing and level of capital spending required to meet the regional plan targets.

6. A program of sustained liaison and consultation with constituent local units to give the daily advice and information required in general plan implementation.

The suggested general regional plan, it should be stressed, is not a rigid master plan. Instead, it is a fluid expression of regional goals; it is a process and a framework for regional development. The elements underpinning the general plan need continued re-evaluation, and the economic and other studies foundational to it require constant revision. New circumstances, new problems and unforeseen opportunities will emerge, and the general planning process must be capable of embracing these. In southeastern Wisconsin, a regional planning agency will have several immediate problems, in addition to the tasks previously listed:

Initially, concentrated attention will have to be given the problems of metropolitan sprawl, with its uneconomic, unattractive consequences. Secondly, there is the problem of development of a disposition plan for the 5,500-acre Bong air base site in Kenosha and Racine counties. Upon cancellation of construction contracts, the region had suddenly thrust upon it problems of drainage control, loss of tax base and future land use. Third, there is the task of developing a north-south circumferential expressway around metropolitan Milwaukee, and of planning a new industrial highway linking the lakeshore counties. Fourth, completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway has brought new patterns of traffic and trade and new opportunities for economic development. Finally, there is need to develop co-operation with the recently created Northeastern Illinois Regional Planning Commission for the solution of mutual problems confronting metropolitan Lake Michigan industrial centers.

Southeastern Wisconsin now has the statutory framework for creation of an effective regional planning agency. Under 1955 legislation improved by the 1959 legislature, the governor is empowered to create a regional planning agency following petition of a local governing body within the region, a public hearing, and consent of governing bodies representing fifty percent of the equalized taxable property within the region. In the case of the proposed
seven-county agency, each of the seven-county boards would ap-
point one member of the commission, and the governor would
appoint seven, half of whom have "experience in local government
in elective or appointive offices or who are professionally engaged
in advising local governmental units in the fields of land use plan-
ning, transportation, law, finance or engineering." Once estab-
lished, the commission would derive its budget from property taxes
not exceeding .003 percent of the equalized value of the constituent
units.

To date, three of the seven counties, representing 79.9 percent
of the regional equalized property value and 78.8 percent of the
regional population, have petitioned for creation of an agency. Es-
stablishment of a commission for southeastern Wisconsin, regardless
of its precise boundaries, thereby appears assured.
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This paper discusses three recent reports on regional planning and on intergovernmental relations in Wisconsin. The reports are, Regional Planning in Wisconsin: Next Steps?, May 1976, by Fred A. Clarenbach, a consultant for DLAD; Reevaluating Regionalism, November 1976, by the Subcommittee on Regional Planning of the Assembly Committee on Municipalities (commonly known as the Wahner report); and, the Final Report of the Commission on State-Local Relations and Financing Policy, March 1977 (commonly known as the Wallace Commission report).

The Clarenbach and Wahner reports focus directly on regional planning issues and on the roles of regional planning commissions (RPC's) and counties in dealing with those issues. The Wallace Commission report discusses regional issues as one part of its entire evaluation of state-local relations; and it emphasizes the county role in dealing with any issues of a regional nature. All three reports propose changes in the powers of RPC's and/or counties. The proposals of the Wahner Committee are being prepared in the form of a bill and should be presented before the State legislature shortly. No similar legislative action has yet been taken on either the Clarenbach or Wallace Commission reports.

Analysis of regional issues can be very tricky. Initial consideration must be given to such questions as what are regional problems and how is a region defined. The answers to these questions will help determine who should have regional responsibilities--RPC's, counties, or some other body. Further decisions must be made as to the scope of responsibility of any regional body and to the powers of that body to advise other governmental units on regional issues or to implement action by itself.

All three reports agree that problems of a regional nature do exist, but they differ in their proposals for dealing with regional issues. This paper will consider each report's response to several key questions:

1. Who should serve as a regional agency--RPC, county, or some other body?

2. How shall regional agencies be created and operated - how much flexibility shall local units of government (county and/or town, village and city) have in creating or dissolving one or more regional arrangements. Also, how shall local governments and other bodies be represented in any regional arrangement?

3. What shall a regional agency be empowered to do - shall it be advisory or have the power to implement action?
4. Are any provisions suggested for better coordination and cooperation between regional agencies and other local, regional, state and federal units of government?

5. How much will any new regional arrangement cost and how will it be paid for?

The purpose of the Clarenbach report is to analyze the role of RPC's and to suggest ways that they can be improved. As a result, the Clarenbach report puts RPC's in a more favorable light than do the other two reports. Clarenbach focuses on maintaining and improving existing RPC's by increasing their stability, clarifying their powers, and strengthening coordination with state and federal agencies and governments. He places little emphasis on a separate regional role for counties.

The main proposal of the Clarenbach report for increasing stability is that counties shall be the only units of RPC's for purposes of creation, withdrawal, or dissolution. In practice, little change would take place in procedures for creation of RPC's since existing regional arrangements already cover most of the State. However, withdrawals might be significantly affected since towns, villages, and cities could no longer withdraw on their own. Withdrawals would be allowed to occur only at the county level by two-thirds vote of a county board. Similarly, dissolution of an RPC would require a two-thirds vote of a county board. If counties, including a majority of the population and equalized value petition for dissolution, then the governor must order the dissolution.

Clarenbach further emphasizes the desirability of viable and stable regional agencies in his proposal for RPC's voting membership. Each RPC would be allowed the flexibility to determine its own form of membership. However, initial county input would still be important as any membership arrangement must be approved by the majority of county boards. One specific Clarenbach suggestion is that some non-official citizen members should be encouraged.

Clarenbach's proposals focus more on the above matters of form and representation of RPC's than on the actual powers of RPC's. Clarenbach feels that RPC's primary role as developer and coordinator of regional plans and advisor to local governments is substantially correct. Preparation of an advisory master plan would still be required (although it might be relabeled as a "general framework" plan). However, RPC's would lose some of their flexibility in describing what would go into a master plan. Clarenbach suggests that land use and development, transportation, and environmental management should all become required elements of the plan while other issues would remain optional.

Clarenbach places some emphasis on coordinative aspects of RPC's. He encourages increased provision of funds and technical assistance by state functional agencies. Also, RPC's should cooperate with the state in an integrated grant request from the federal government. It should be noted that Clarenbach emphasizes improvements in cooperation with state and federal actors, but he suggests no solution for local cooperation where many of the RPC's current problems lie.
4. Are any provisions suggested for better coordination and cooperation between regional agencies and other local, regional, state and federal units of government?

5. How much will any new regional arrangement cost and how will it be paid for?

The purpose of the Clarenbach report is to analyze the role of RPC's and to suggest ways that they can be improved. As a result, the Clarenbach report puts RPC's in a more favorable light than do the other two reports. Clarenbach focuses on maintaining and improving existing RPC's by increasing their stability, clarifying their powers, and strengthening coordination with state and federal agencies and governments. He places little emphasis on a separate regional role for counties.

The main proposal of the Clarenbach report for increasing stability is that counties shall be the only units of RPC's for purposes of creation, withdrawal, or dissolution. In practice, little change would take place in procedures for creation of RPC's since existing regional arrangements already cover most of the State. However, withdrawals might be significantly affected since towns, villages, and cities could no longer withdraw on their own. Withdrawals would be allowed to occur only at the county level by two-thirds vote of a county board. Similarly, dissolution of an RPC would require a two-thirds vote of a county board. If counties, including a majority of the population and equalized value petition for dissolution, then the governor must order the dissolution.

Clarenbach further emphasizes the desirability of viable and stable regional agencies in his proposal for RPC's voting membership. Each RPC would be allowed the flexibility to determine its own form of membership. However, initial county input would still be important as any membership arrangement must be approved by the majority of county boards. One specific Clarenbach suggestion is that some non-official citizen members should be encouraged.

Clarenbach's proposals focus more on the above matters of form and representation of RPC's than on the actual powers of RPC's. Clarenbach feels that RPC's primary role as developer and coordinator of regional plans and advisor to local governments is substantially correct. Preparation of an advisory master plan would still be required (although it might be relabeled as a "general framework" plan). However, RPC's would lose some of their flexibility in describing what would go into a master plan. Clarenbach suggests that land use and development, transportation, and environmental management should all become required elements of the plan while other issues would remain optional.

Clarenbach places some emphasis on coordinative aspects of RPC's. He encourages increased provision of funds and technical assistance by state functional agencies. Also, RPC's should cooperate with the state in an integrated grant request from the federal government. It should be noted that Clarenbach emphasizes improvements in cooperation with state and federal actors, but he suggests no solution for local cooperation where many of the RPC's' current problems lie.
Clarenbach's overall proposals are fairly modest and would require relatively few changes in regional relationships. Funding responsibilities at local and state levels would also remain fairly similar to the current situation, though the integrated grant program would attempt to increase the federal share of funding.

While the Clarenbach report supports the continuation of most existing RPC's, the Wahner report encourages a wider range of choice in providing for regional planning arrangements. Emphasis would be on the county as the initial decision-maker in choosing a desired form of regional planning. One county option would be to remain in existing RPC's, but membership and withdrawal provisions of the regional commissions would be modified. However, counties could also choose to plan on their own and would be granted increased planning and implementation powers. In addition, all local governments---towns, villages, and cities as well as counties---could plan and act cooperatively under intergovernmental contract provisions. The only limits to this regional planning flexibility are that in specified areas, multi-county planning agencies must be established.

Several changes would occur under the RPC option. The most important change is that the Wahner Committee, like Clarenbach, would establish counties as the only units of RPC's. Thus, local withdrawals would be prevented. However, county withdrawal would require only a 1/2, not 2/3, vote of the county board. Dissolution would be by decision of the RPC itself. A specific proposal on membership is that RPC Commissioners would be county board supervisors.

The Wahner Committee's above proposals on the form of RPC's would not clearly strengthen or weaken the regional commissions. Counties as sole units would improve stability, but a 1/2 county vote for withdrawal would in turn weaken stability. RPC flexibility would be diminished by proposals such as the requirement that only county board supervisors would serve as RPC commissioners. The only clear implication is that counties would have both stronger participation in RPC's and easier opportunity to withdraw.

If counties chose the option of planning on their own, several planning and implementation powers would be strengthened. First, counties could plan for their entire area, not just unincorporated areas. However, cities and villages could continue to plan for their areas. A major problem could arise in that the Wahner committee suggests no procedure for reconciling any conflicts between city and village and county plans.

A second proposal is that county boards may condition subdivisions on adopted county plans. However, counties already have subdivision approval powers and it is unclear how this proposal would strengthen them. Third, county boards may condition sewer extensions on adopted county plans. This proposal would provide a definite increase in county powers. Here, though, coordination would be required with the state because of DNR's increasing involvement in water-quality related problems, including sewer extensions.
A notable omission is any proposal for increased county zoning powers. Though the problems of town veto are discussed, its removal is not specifically suggested. Similarly, though increased county planning powers in incorporated areas are suggested, zoning powers in those areas would not be changed.

The main theme of the Wahner report seems to be flexibility for counties in choosing how they will plan and implement action on any required issues. Membership in RPC's is optional and is easily discontinued. The use of any of the above powers - planning in all areas, review of subdivisions, and of sewer extensions - is at the discretion of the county board. In line with this flexibility the Wahner committee also supports increased use of intergovernmental contract provisions. Currently such contracts only apply to specific services, but the Wahner committee would allow general planning powers to be included. Thus, any local unit of government could contract with any other unit for cooperative planning purposes. However, intergovernmental contracts face certain practical difficulties. Each unit of government must approve any joint function and questions of representation, financing, and periodic renewal of agreements can arise constantly.

The Wahner committee's main restriction on counties' general planning flexibility is the requirement that multi-county metropolitan areas must have a single areawide planning agency. The exact boundaries of these areas are unclear but at least three metropolitan areas in the state would be affected - Milwaukee, Appleton-Oshkosh, and Eau Claire. The major difference in the treatment of the multi-county metropolitan planning agencies is that they would be represented on a one person/one vote basis rather than on an equal county basis. The result would be a shift from a predominantly suburban influence to an urban influence.

One likely result of the Wahner report's emphasis on increased planning flexibility - including proposals for counties' potentially greater powers and strengthened intergovernmental contract provisions is that many more planning bodies would be created. The Wahner committee does not consider how much greater the overall cost throughout the State might be, but it does offer some suggestions on how any planning costs would be paid for. The report says that state funds would match local funds. Thus, some local funds must be generated for planning purposes if state aid is to be received. The report continues that state funds would be apportioned on a sliding scale basis with greater amounts going to the less populous, poorer counties. However, if such counties are to have more than a minimal planning capacity then the size of the state matching proportion may have to be fairly high or the sliding scale fairly steep.

The Wallace Commission, like the Wahner committee, emphasizes the role of the county. The commission, too, says that some recognition should be given to RPC's but it makes no further comments on what the role of RPC's should be. The commission's comments on county planning are only one part of a suggested general strengthening of county administrative capacity, service provision, and planning ability. The suggestions are based on two underlying themes - that
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The Wallace Commission, like the Wahner committee, emphasizes the role of the county. The commission, too, says that some recognition should be given to RPC's but it makes no further comments on what the role of RPC's should be. The commission's comments on county planning are only one part of a suggested general strengthening of county administrative capacity, service provision, and planning ability. The suggestions are based on two underlying themes - that
many services and activities have outgrown a local (town, village or city) nature and may better be handled at a higher level of government, and that activities should be carried out as often as possible by general-purpose governments rather than special purpose districts. The logical unit for many services and activities, including planning, becomes the county.

In order to increase the county's role, the Wallace commission suggests several changes in general county powers. First, counties should not be granted legislative home rule because the potential friction with home rule powers of cities and villages would be too great. However, counties should be granted administrative home rule to facilitate the implementation of any specifically legislated powers. The second major change is that counties should be allowed, but not required, to appoint rather than elect some of its major administrative offices. The suggestion would provide counties with a new organizational option designed to improve administrative capability, but it would leave the actual choice of organization to each individual county.

The Wallace Commission also suggests specific changes in county planning and zoning powers. Each county would be required to develop a "County Land Use and Development Plan". The suggested planning process is fairly complex but essentially consists of initiation of plans at the local level, coordination and resolution at the county level, and when necessary, mediation and final resolution by the State. Initial plans for incorporated areas are developed by the cities and villages themselves while plans for unincorporated areas are developed by the county in cooperation with towns. The entire planning process is very impressive on paper, and if it brings about increased communication between various cities, villages, and the county then it might well be successful. However, it is also possible that the process would prove too cumbersome, that conflicts would flare up continuously, and that the State would be called in too often to provide solutions.

After developing a fairly comprehensive planning process, the Wallace Commission suggests a somewhat inconsistent zoning procedure. Counties, again in cooperation with towns, would have to zone in consistency with the adopted county plan in unincorporated areas. However, city and village zoning need not be consistent with the adopted county plan in incorporated areas. No reason is given for this double standard. A final question is what county "cooperation" with towns in planning and zoning would mean. The extent of the town's role is unclear including whether it would retain any veto power over county zoning ordinances.

The proposals of the Wallace Commission, like those of the Wahner committee, would increase the amount of planning taking place at the county level. Again, the cost of that increased planning capacity is unclear. In addition, State planning costs might increase because of its mediating role in the preparation of county development plans. State and local responsibilities for raising any additional planning funds are unclear. The Wallace Commission suggests that
any county-provided services should pay for themselves, but the com-
mmission does not offer any fund-raising method for planning functions.
Also, the commission does not specifically suggest any state matching
fund or sliding scale arrangement. In both the Wallace Commission
and Wahner Committee proposals, the cost of increased planning ac-
tivity, especially at the county level should be more clearly examined
before any legislative action is taken.

by

Harold C. Jordahl, Jr.
Regional Planning Specialist, and
Professor, Dept. of Urban &
Regional Planning

and

David Spitz
Research Associate

March 1977

Made possible through a DLAD-IPA grant.
any county-provided services should pay for themselves, but the com-
misson does not offer any fund-raising method for planning functions. 
Also, the commission does not specifically suggest any state matching 
fund or sliding scale arrangement. In both the Wallace Commission 
and Wahner Committee proposals, the cost of increased planning ac-
tivity, especially at the county level should be more clearly examined 
before any legislative action is taken.

by

Harold C. Jordahl, Jr. 
Regional Planning Specialist, and 
Professor, Dept. of Urban & 
Regional Planning

and

David Spitz
Research Associate

March 1977

Made possible through a DLAD-IPA grant.
MATRlX IDENTIFYING EXISTING POWERS OF RPC's
and LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT and PROPOSALS FOR CHANGES

The following matrix describes existing powers of RPCs, counties; cities and villages, towns, and other units of government; and it describes changes in those powers suggested by the Clarenbach, Wahner Committee, and Wallace Commission reports. Contents include the following:

1. General Authorization and Relation to Other Units of Government
2. Planning Powers
3. Implementation Powers - Zoning
4. Implementation Powers - Subdivision
5. Special Functions - Sewer Systems and Sewer Extensions
6. Special Functions - Shorelands and Floodplains
7. Special Functions - Soil and Water Conservation Districts
8. Other Powers - A-95 Review
9. Other Powers - Levy Power and Other Sources of Funding
10. Other Powers - Referral Requirements
11. Adopting an Initial Zoning Ordinance
12. Amending a Zoning Ordinance

Various points are underlined throughout the matrix. Underlined points include (1) major proposals by Clarenbach, the Wahner Committee, and the Wallace Commission, (2) major questions regarding both what is said by the three reports and what the implications would be, and (3) any existing or potential state powers in relation to local and regional planning and regulation.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. General Authorization and Relationship to Other Units of Government.</td>
<td>The Governor or his agent may create a regional planning commission (RPC) upon proper petition or approval by local government units. Counties have been encouraged but not mandated by the state to participate in RPC's. RPC's are created to serve &quot;regional&quot; interests but may also provide local planning assistance and/or support state interests. Their proper role in relation to state and local government is subject to varied interpretation.</td>
<td>Historically, counties were created as servants of the state without any inherent rights to self-determination. In more recent practice, counties have been granted considerable powers to provide local services and perform other specified functions. Yet, county powers, both legislative and administrative, still fall short of the broad general grant of power (home rule) given to cities and villages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1A. Changes suggested by the Clarenbach Report. | The primary role of RPC's should be more clearly defined as agent and spokesman for local actors in a regional setting. A related role is that of a workable partner in local-regional-state-federal planning. |  |

| 1B. Changes suggested by Wahner Report. | The problems of an RPC's dual relationship with state and local governments is recognized, but no clear suggestions are offered. One problem in representing local governments is described as the lack of commonality among local interests in many current RPC's. | Counties should be strengthened, but general authority remains the same. See specific changes in planning and implementation powers. |

<p>| 1C. Changes suggested by the Wallace Report. |  | Counties should be strengthened, but they should not be granted legislative home rule powers because of potential friction with cities |</p>
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| 1B. Changes suggested by Wahner Report. | The problems of an RPC's dual relationship with state and local governments is recognized, but no clear suggestions are offered. One problem in representing local governments is described as the lack of commonality among local interests in many current RPC's. | Counties should be strengthened, but general authority remains the same. See specific changes in planning and implementation powers. |

| IC. Changes suggested by the Wallace Report. | | Counties should be strengthened, but they should not be granted legislative home rule powers because of potential friction with cities |
Cities and villages perform some state functions, but they come into existence at the request of their inhabitants to perform local services. Cities and villages are granted a basic degree of independence from the state (home rule) with limitations listed rather than powers specified.

Towns, like counties, perform functions assigned by the state and also provide local services. Towns may only do what the legislature specifically authorizes, and they do not possess the broad grant of powers given to cities and villages. Towns, by resolution of the town meeting, may adopt village powers.

(1) **Intergovernmental Contracts** - Any state, state department or agency, city, village, town, county, RPC, or certain special districts may contract with others for provision of services or the joint exercise of any statutory power. Each participating unit must contract with each other unit. Powers of the contractual arrangement are limited to those of the weakest unit. (2) **Metropolitan** units of government may participate in intergovernmental contracts, but no other special arrangements or powers are provided.

(1) See specific changes in planning powers. (2) Multi-county metropolitan areas should be treated distinctly from other locations. Multi-county agencies would be required in these areas for planning purposes. Representation should be on a one person–one vote basis.

Towns should not be allowed to adopt village powers. Towns in urbanizing areas should find alternative means to provide necessary services.

The state legislature should create incentives for governmental units in an area to consolidate and create an areawide form of government.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Planning Powers</td>
<td>(1) An RPC shall make a master plan for its region (no timetable for completion or adoption of the plan is required).</td>
<td>(1) A county may exercise planning power through one of the following committees or commissions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) The plan may include physical, social, and/or economic development of the region.</td>
<td>(a) A County Rural Planning Committee may report on, advise, and make proposals on parks, transportation facilities, reservation of land for public use, etc. to the county board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) The plan shall be advisory. Consistency is required between adopted RPC plans and plans of local government units or special districts only in certain specific cases (Metropolitan Sewer Districts and Soil and Water Conservation Districts).</td>
<td>(b) A County Park Commission may replace a county rural planning committee and retain all of the committee's powers. The park commission has certain additional implementation powers (see subject 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) An RPC may provide advisory planning assistance to local government units.</td>
<td>(c) A County Planning and Zoning Committee may be created by the county board, or any previously established committee may be designated as such. The committee shall prepare a county development plan for unincorporated areas and for incorporated areas who agree by resolution to be included (no timetable is required).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any adopted city or village master plan shall be included without change. The plan shall be submitted to the county board and, if approved, shall be advisory to public and private decision-makers.
2. Planning Powers

(1) An RPC shall make a master plan for its region (no timetable for completion or adoption of the plan is required).

(a) The plan may include physical, social, and/or economic development of the region.

(b) The plan shall be advisory. Consistency is required between adopted RPC plans and plans or projects of local government units or special districts only in certain specific cases (Metropolitan Sewer Districts and Soil and Water Conservation Districts).

(2) An RPC may provide advisory planning assistance to local government units.

(1) A county may exercise planning power through one of the following committees or commissions:

(a) A County Rural Planning Committee may report on, advise, and make proposals on parks, transportation facilities, reservation of land for public use, etc. to the county board.

(b) A County Park Commission may replace a county rural planning committee and retain all of the committee's powers. The park commission has certain additional implementation powers (see subject 3).

(c) A County Planning and Zoning Committee may be created by the county board, or any previously established committee may be designated as such. The committee shall prepare a county development plan for unincorporated areas and for incorporated areas who agree by resolution to be included (no timetable is required).

Any adopted city or village master plan shall be included without change. The plan shall be submitted to the county board and, if approved, shall be advisory to public and private decision-makers.
(1) A city may exercise planning power through one of the following boards or commissions:

(a) The city council may create a City Plan Commission which shall prepare and adopt a master plan. Jurisdiction includes all land within the city plus that area outside the city that the commission deems related to the city's development. However, in any county with a regional planning department, the outside areas may be included only with the consent of the county board. The adopted plan shall be advisory to the city plan commission and the city council.

(b) A City Park Board or Board of Public Land Commissioners may be designated to perform the planning functions of a City Plan Commission.

(2) Villages may adopt the same powers as the City Plan Commission.

(1) Towns may adopt village powers and prepare plans in the same manner (There is no apparent consistency requirement between any town plans and county plans that may affect the same area).

(2) Towns may create a Town Park Commission which shall study and report to the town meeting within two years on parks, open space, highways, etc.

(1) According to a ruling by the State Attorney General, any planning undertaken under the intergovernmental contract provision must be directly related to specific projects. More general intergovernmental planning powers belong solely to the RPC's.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2A. Changes suggested by the Clarenbach Report.</td>
<td>Continue requirement for preparation of a master plan (or &quot;general framework plan&quot;). Make land use and development, transportation, and environmental management required elements of the plan. <strong>Inferred:</strong> continue local planning assistance, but reaffirm the emphasis on regional planning wherever the political climate permits.</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B. Changes suggested by the Wahner Report.</td>
<td>Retain RPC's with their current planning powers as one of several planning options available to counties. <strong>Make preparation of a master plan optional.</strong> <strong>Inferred:</strong> Advisory status should be maintained. Consistency requirements are discouraged, but their removal is not specifically suggested. Presumably existing consistency requirements could be retained.</td>
<td>Require all counties to have some planning capacity on their own, in an RPC, or in some other multi-county arrangement. Allow counties to plan for their entire territory, including incorporated areas. <strong>Inferred:</strong> County planning agencies would continue to plan for unincorporated areas. County agencies could choose whether to plan for incorporated areas and would not have to adopt the plans of those governments without change. Questions: (1) <strong>Will smaller, poor counties have the desire and resources to carry out good planning on their own? How much state aid would be required?</strong> (2) Will any consistency between plans be required if both county and city or village prepare plans for the same incorporated area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A. Changes suggested by the Clarenbach Report.</td>
<td>Continue requirement for preparation of a master plan (or &quot;general framework plan&quot;). Make land use and development, transportation, and environmental management required elements of the plan. Inferred: continue local planning assistance, but reaffirm the emphasis on regional planning wherever the political climate permits.</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B. Changes suggested by the Wahner Report.</td>
<td>Retain RPC's with their current planning powers as one of several planning options available to counties. Make preparation of a master plan optional. Inferred: Advisory status should be maintained. Consistency requirements are discouraged, but their removal is not specifically suggested. Presumably existing consistency requirements could be retained.</td>
<td>Require all counties to have some planning capacity on their own, in an RPC, or in some other multi-county arrangement. Allow counties to plan for their entire territory, including incorporated areas. Inferred: County planning agencies would continue to plan for unincorporated areas. County agencies could choose whether to plan for incorporated areas and would not have to adopt the plans of those governments without change. Questions: (1) Will smaller, poor counties have the desire and resources to carry out good planning on their own? How much state aid would be required? (2) Will any consistency between plans be required if both county and city or village prepare plans for the same incorporated area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY &amp; VILLAGE</td>
<td>TOWN</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intergovernmental contracts would be a poor replacement for RPC's for performing planning functions. Questions of representation, financing, functions, withdrawal, and periodic renewal of agreements could be highly divisive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inferred:** Although counties would have the option to plan for incorporated areas, cities and villages could still prepare their own plans.

**Questions:** Would city and villages be more likely to seek planning coordination or planning assistance from counties than from RPC's? How would the planning relationship be affected if the county had strong implementation powers?

(1) The intergovernmental contract statute would be revised to permit any combination of units of government to undertake areawide planning on mutually agreed terms.

**Question:** Would the large number of required individual agreements inhibit the planning process under intergovernmental contracts? Note the limitations cited above by Clarenbach. Also how would any overlap between these plans and RPC plans be handled?

(2) Multi-county metropolitan planning agencies would be required. Options would include continued RPC membership, participation in "intergovernmental councils" or some other arrangement. Powers of intergovernmental councils would include: required consistency of special district actions with council plans, and advisory review of plans of municipalities and functional planning agencies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2C. Changes suggested by the Wallace Report. | Advisory RPC's should be continued, but their relationship to the detailed planning process for counties, cities and villages, and towns is not specified. **Question:** With no involvement in the process of coordinating plans, would the RPC's role become primarily to provide technical planning assistance to local governments? | (1) Some form of planning should be required.  
(2) The state would provide broad development objectives which would serve to resolve any city and village-county conflicts. The state should also provide financial and planning aid to all local governments.  
(3) The county would prepare a "County Land Use and Development Plan". In unincorporated areas, the county would plan in cooperation with towns (see question under town column). In incorporated areas, the county would accept city and village plans when not in conflict, and would refer plans back to the affected cities and villages when they conflict. Subsequently, counties may offer compromises. If there is still no agreement, the state will make the final resolution.  
**Questions:** Is this bottom-up planning approach viable? Will conflicts be significant enough that greater state involvement than currently exists will be required to resolve differences? |
| 3. Implementation Powers ---Zoning | ---- | (1) Form of agency: The County Board may create a Planning and Zoning Committee or may designate any previously established committee to perform planning and zoning (e.g. County Park Commission, County Highway Committee, Rural Planning Committee).  
(2) Jurisdiction: A county planning agency may zone all unincorporated areas in the county. Zoning is effective |
### SUBJECT

#### 2C. Changes suggested by the Wallace Report.

Advisory RPC's should be continued, but their relationship to the detailed planning process for counties, cities and villages, and towns is not specified.

**Question:** With no involvement in the process of coordinating plans, would the RPC's role become primarily to provide technical planning assistance to local governments?

#### (1) Some form of planning should be required.

#### (2) The state would provide broad development objectives which would serve to resolve any city and village-county conflicts. The state should also provide financial and planning aid to all local governments.

#### (3) The county would prepare a "County Land Use and Development Plan". In unincorporated areas, the county would plan in cooperation with towns (see question under town column). In incorporated areas, the county would accept city and village plans when not in conflict, and would refer plans back to the affected cities and villages when they conflict. Subsequently, counties may offer compromises. If there is still no agreement, the state will make the final resolution.

**Questions:** Is this bottom-up planning approach viable? Will conflicts be significant enough that greater state involvement than currently exists will be required to resolve differences?

### SUBJECT

#### 3. Implementation Powers ---Zoning

(1) Form of agency: The County Board may create a Planning and Zoning Committee or may designate any previously established committees to perform planning and zoning (e.g. County Park Commission, County Highway Committee, Rural Planning Committee).

(2) Jurisdiction: A county planning agency may zone all unincorporated areas in the county. Zoning is effective
CITY & VILLAGE

Cities and villages would continue to prepare development plans within their own incorporated limits plus any accepted extraterritorial areas. Cities and villages should submit plans to affected local citizens to resolve conflicts. Cities and villages would have the first attempt at resolving conflicts with other municipalities.

TOWN

Towns shall cooperate with the county in preparing development plans for unincorporated areas.

Questions: What will "Cooperation" involve? Will towns be given a veto over county plans in addition to their current veto over county zoning?

OTHER

No special planning arrangements or powers are suggested under intergovernmental contracts or in metropolitan areas. Local governments, especially in metropolitan areas, are encouraged to consolidate. However, the new governmental units would follow the same planning procedure that is suggested for other county and local governments.

(1) Form of agency: The Council requests one of the following to act as the zoning agency: City Plan Commission, Board of Public Land Commissioners, or if neither exists, a City Plan Committee of the Council. Village officials have the same powers as city officials.

(2) Jurisdiction: (a) Cities and villages may

(1) Form of agency: Towns may create a Town Park Commission or, if none exists, a Town Zoning Committee to carry out zoning functions.

(2) Jurisdiction: (a) If a county zoning ordinance is adopted, town zoning is possible only with agreement of the county board. A town may adopt village powers, or a town may zone in accordance with an adopted RPC plan.
3A. Changes suggested by the Clarenbach Report.

3B. Changes suggested by the Wahner Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in towns only if approved by the town board. A new county zoning ordinance may supersede a town zoning ordinance (but it still requires town board approval). County jurisdiction continues in areas subsequently annexed until those areas are re-zoned by the municipality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The report states, "Counties also have the power to implement plans...Plans need to be implemented but they need to be implemented by general purpose units of government that are responsible to the public. Greater involvement of counties will facilitate this."

Inferred: It is unclear why the report states that counties can implement plans, since they can only zone in unincorporated areas and since any proposed zoning in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in towns only if approved by the town board. A new county zoning ordinance may supersede a town zoning ordinance (but it still requires town board approval). County jurisdiction continues in areas subsequently annexed until those areas are rezoned by the municipality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3A. Changes suggested by the Clarenbach Report.


The report states, "Counties also have the power to implement plans...Plans need to be implemented but they need to be implemented by general purpose units of government that are responsible to the public. Greater involvement of counties will facilitate this."

Inferred: It is unclear why the report states that counties can implement plans, since they can only zone in unincorporated areas and since any proposed zoning in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY &amp; VILLAGE</th>
<th>TOWN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zone within their own incorporated boundaries plus specified extraterritorial limits (see below). City and village zoning ordinances must be in accordance with a comprehensive plan. The exact requirements of this plan are not yet clear, but should involve areawide and long-range general land use consideration.</td>
<td>However, in either case, any new zoning ordinance must be approved by the county board. (b) If no county zoning ordinance is adopted, a town may (i) adopt village powers, (ii) zone in accordance with an adopted RPC plan, or (iii) petition the county to adopt a county zoning ordinance. If the county fails to act within a specified time period, the town board may proceed in developing its own ordinance. (c) Town representatives have a voice in any extraterritorial action that would affect them (see city and village column).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Inferred:** No specific changes are offered. The tone of the report suggests stronger county zoning powers, but it is questionable whether those powers would be extended to affect cities and villages as well as towns.

**Inferred:** Despite the general attitude towards strengthening county zoning powers, no removal of town "veto" power or other specific weakening of town zoning is suggested.
those areas is subject to
town veto. The report seems
to encourage stronger county
implementation powers, but
stops short of removing town
veto or offering any specific
steps to strengthen county
zoning. Two specific non-
zoning implementation powers
are strengthened, though (see
subdivision and sewer sec-
tions).

3C. Changes suggested by
The Wallace Report.

| 3.1. Adopting an Initial
Zoning Ordinance | --

(1) In unincorporated areas,
the county shall zone in con-
sistency with the adopted
county plan and in coopera-
tion with towns (see question
in town column).
(2) For county review powers
in incorporated areas, see
city and village column.

(1) The zoning agency (see #3)
shall draft a preliminary
zoning ordinance and shall
hold a public hearing on the
draft ordinance.
(2) Notice of such hearing
shall be by publication of a
Class 2 Notice.
(3) The zoning agency may
make any revisions as it
deems necessary (no new hear-
ing on the revisions is re-
quired) and it shall submit
the draft of the zoning or-
dinance to the County Board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>those areas is subject to town veto. The report seems to encourage stronger county implementation powers, but stops short of removing town veto or offering any specific steps to strengthen county zoning. Two specific non-zoning implementation powers are strengthened, though (see subdivision and sewer sections).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C. Changes suggested by The Wallace Report.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) In unincorporated areas, the county shall zone in consistency with the adopted county plan and in cooperation with towns (see question in town column). (2) For county review powers in incorporated areas, see city and village column.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Adopting an Initial Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) The zoning agency (see §3 shall draft a preliminary zoning ordinance and shall hold a public hearing on the draft ordinance. (2) Notice of such hearing shall be by publication of a Class 2 Notice. (3) The zoning agency may make any revisions as it deems necessary (no new hearing on the revisions is required) and it shall submit the draft of the zoning ordinance to the County Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Any city or village zoning ordinance that departs from the adopted county plan shall be submitted to the county for review and comment. A minority report says that by failing to require city and village zoning to be consistent with the adopted county plan, the elaborately developed planning process (which includes considerable city and village input) is made ineffective. The county review provision was a last minute compromise to try to encourage greater consistency without making it mandatory.

### Towns shall cooperate with counties for zoning in unincorporated areas.

**Question:** Again, the report does not specify the meaning of "cooperation". Would town participation be advisory only or would town veto power over county zoning be retained?

### (1) The zoning agency (see § 3) shall draft a preliminary zoning ordinance and shall hold a public hearing on the draft ordinance.

### (2) Ten days' written notice shall be given to the clerk of any municipality whose boundaries are within 1,000 feet of any lands included in the proposed plan and regulations.

### (3) The zoning agency shall submit the proposed ordinance to the city council.

### (1) The zoning agency (see §3) shall draft a preliminary zoning ordinance and shall hold a public hearing on the draft ordinance.

### (2) Notice of the hearing is not specifically required.

### (3) The zoning agency makes any changes and submits its final report to the town board.

### (4) The town board may accept or reject the zoning ordinance. It does not have the option to make changes or suggest alterations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) The County Board may adopt, reject, or return the ordinance to the zoning agency with recommendations for alteration. (5) Once adopted, the ordinance is still not effective until approved by the town.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1. A, B, and C. Changes suggested by the three reports

Inferred: No specific changes are suggested by any of the three reports. However, suggested changes in zoning powers and relationships among counties, cities and villages, and towns (see #’s 3B and 3C) would also affect the procedures for adopting a zoning ordinance.

3.2. Amending the Zoning Ordinance

(1) The County Board may amend the boundaries or regulations of the ordinance. (2) Petition for amendment may be made by: (a) Any affected property owner (b) The Town Board (c) Any member of the County Board (d) The county zoning agency (3) The county zoning agency shall call a public hearing. A class 2 notice shall be published and shall be sent to the town clerk of each town affected. (4) A protest may be made by owners of 50% of area to be altered or by owners of 50% of abutting areas. (5) Adoption of the amendment requires 3/4 vote of members of the county board present and voting.

3.2. A, B, and C. Changes suggested by the three reports

No specific changes are suggested by any of the three reports.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (4) The County Board may a-
| dopt, reject, or return the 
| ordinance to the zoning a-
| gency with recommendations 
| for alteration. 
| (5) Once adopted, the ordi-
| nance is still not effective 
| until approved by the town. 
| 3.1. A,B, and C. Changes 
| suggested by the 
| three reports | ----- | Inferred: No specific change 
| are suggested by any of the 
| three reports. However, 
| suggested changes in zoning 
| powers and relationships a-
| mong counties, cities and 
| villages, and towns (see §'s 
| 38 and 3C) would also affect 
| the procedures for adopting a 
| zoning ordinance. |
| 3.2. Amending the Zoning 
| Ordinance | ----- | (1) The County Board may a-
| mend the boundaries or regu-
| lations of the ordinance. 
| (2) Petition for amendment 
| may be made by: 
| (a) Any affected property 
| owner 
| (b) The Town Board 
| (c) Any member of the 
| County Board 
| (d) The county zoning agenc 
| (3) The county zoning agency 
| shall call a public hearing. 
| A class 2 notice shall be 
| published and shall be sent 
| to the town clerk of each 
| town affected. 
| (4) A protest may be made by 
| owners of 50% of area to be 
| altered or by owners of 50% 
| of abutting areas. 
| (5) Adoption of the amendment 
| requires 3/4 vote of members 
| of the county board present 
| and voting. |
| 3.2. A,B, and C. Changes 
| suggested by the three 
| reports | ----- | No specific changes are sug-
| suggested by any of the three 
<p>| reports |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY &amp; VILLAGE</th>
<th>TOWN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) It is unclear whether the city council may change the proposed ordinance prior to its adoption or rejection.</td>
<td>See comment in county column.</td>
<td>See comment in county column.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) The governing body may change the district and regulations.</td>
<td>The town board may change the boundaries or regulations of the ordinance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Petition - not specified</td>
<td>(2) Petition - not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Any person shall be given an opportunity to be heard. A class 2 notice shall be published. Ten days' written notice shall be given to the clerk of any municipality whose boundaries are within 1,000 feet of the land to be affected by the change.</td>
<td>(3) A hearing shall be granted to any interested person. A class 2 notice shall be published.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) A protest may be made by owners of 20% of area to be altered or by owners of 20% of abutting or facing area.</td>
<td>(4) A protest may be made by 20% of owners of frontage to be altered or by 20% of owners of rear or facing frontage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Adoption of the amendment requires a majority vote of the Town Park Commission or zoning committee.</td>
<td>(5) Adoption of the amendment requires a majority vote of the members of the governing body.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No specific changes are suggested by any of the three reports. No specific changes are suggested by any of the three reports.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Repealing or Repealing and Recreating a Zoning Ordinance.</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>The county board, by single ordinance, may repeal the zoning ordinance and reenact a &quot;comprehensive revision&quot; thereto, and may provide that existing ordinances remain in effect in towns for either a period up to one year or until comprehensive revision is approved by a town board, whichever period is shorter; if town board fails to approve the comprehensive revision within one year, neither existing ordinance nor comprehensive revision shall be in effect in that town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. A,B, and C. Changes suggested by the three reports.</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>No specific changes are suggested by any of the three reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Implementation Powers Subdivision</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>(1) Counties must have established a planning agency before preparing subdivision regulations. Otherwise, they may apply state standards. Regulations may cover lot sizes, street width, street and other improvements, lake access, etc. (2) Counties may prepare subdivision plans for unincorporated areas only. Any land within the extraterritorial jurisdiction of a municipality may not be included. Subdivision plans must be approved by affected towns and may then be adopted by the county board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Repealing or Repealing and Recreating a Zoning Ordinance.</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>The county board, by single ordinance, may repeal the zoning ordinance and reenact a &quot;comprehensive revision&quot; thereto, and may provide that existing ordinances remain in effect in towns for either a period up to one year or until comprehensive revision is approved by a town board, whichever period is shorter; if town board fails to approve the comprehensive revision within one year, neither existing ordinance nor comprehensive revision shall be in effect in that town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. A,B, and C. Changes suggested by the three reports.</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>No specific changes are suggested by any of the three reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Implementation Powers</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>(1) Counties must have established a planning agency before preparing subdivision regulations. Otherwise, they may apply state standards. Regulations may cover lot sizes, street width, street and other improvements, lake access, etc. (2) Counties may prepare subdivision plans for unincorporated areas only. Any land within the extraterritorial jurisdiction of a municipality may not be included. Subdivision plans must be approved by affected towns and may then be adopted by the county board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The council may repeal or repeal and reenact all or any part of district or other zoning regulations in accordance with procedure for adoption of zoning ordinance.

No specific changes are suggested by any of the three reports.

(1) Same as county.
(2) Cities and villages may regulate subdivisions within their corporate limits plus specified extraterritorial areas (within 3 miles for a 1st, 2nd, or 3rd-class city and 1-1/2 miles for a 4th class city or village). Extraterritorial subdivisions must be approved by both affected town board and the county planning agency if such agency employs a full-time zoning or planning administrator.

(1) Same as county.
(2) Towns must approve any county subdivision plan before it can be adopted (and vice versa).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4A. Changes suggested by the Clarenbach Report.</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B. Changes suggested by the Wahner Report.</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>The report states, &quot;County boards would be permitted to condition subdivision approvals on adopted county plans&quot;. Inflected: (1) In unincorporated areas, counties would no longer require town approval for subdivision plans. (2) The county subdivision power would include the option of county approval of subdivision regulations in incorporated areas. (3) In either case, the exercise of subdivision power would be at the option of the county board. An adopted county plan does not assure that a county board will wish to adhere to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C. Changes suggested by Wallace.</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Special Functions --Sewer Systems and Sewer Extensions.</td>
<td>The plans of a metropolitan sewer district shall be consistent with adopted plans of an RPC. This RPC &quot;power&quot; serves more as an aid towards improved cooperation than as a mandatory requirement imposed by the RPC.</td>
<td>(1) A county board may construct, acquire, and operate sewage disposal plants and systems. This power has apparently been little used. Counties may also purchase services through intergovernmental contracts. (2) The county planning function has no specific authority or approval power over sewer extensions. Instead, the state has developed certain guidelines in relation to water quality standards to review and approve sewer extensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A.</td>
<td>Changes suggested by the Clarenbach Report.</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B.</td>
<td>Changes suggested by the Wahner Report.</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The report states, "County boards would be permitted to condition subdivision approvals on adopted county plans". Inferred: (1) In unincorporated areas, counties would no longer require town approval for subdivision plans. (2) The county subdivision power would include the option of county approval of subdivision regulations in incorporated areas. (3) In either case, the exercise of subdivision power would be at the option of the county board. An adopted county plan does not insure that a county board will wish to adhere to it.

| 4C.     | Changes suggested by Wallace. | ------ |

5. Special Functions --Sewer Systems and Sewer Extensions. The plans of a metropolitan sewer district shall be consistent with adopted plans of an RPC. This RPC "power" serves more as an aid towards improved cooperation than as a mandatory requirement imposed by the RPC. (1) A county board may construct, acquire, and operate sewage disposal plants and systems. This power has apparently been little used. Counties may also purchase services through intergovernmental contracts. (2) The county planning function has no specific authority or approval power over sewer extensions. Instead, the state has developed certain guidelines in relation to water quality standards to review and approve sewer extensions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY &amp; VILLAGE</th>
<th>TOWN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See comment (2) in county column.</td>
<td>See comment (1) in county column.</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) (a) A city council or board of public works may provide for sewerage systems for all or part of the city plus for extraterritorial land that has been properly included under the zoning ordinance. The city may take any necessary legal actions to provide sewerage services.

(b) A city may direct the laying of sewers outside its corporate limits, subject to state regulations.

(2) Towns may adopt village powers and exercise the same sewerage authority.

(3) (a) Town boards, upon petition or sometimes on their own initiative, may create Town Sanitary Districts. DNR may also establish a town sanitary district if it deems necessary. Districts may only include unincorporated areas, but...

(1) Town boards may construct, operate, and finance sewerage systems or may purchase services.

(b) Towns may extend sewers outside their corporate limits subject to state regulations.

(2) Towns may adopt village powers and exercise the same sewerage authority.

(3) Town boards, upon petition or sometimes on their own initiative, may create Town Sanitary Districts. DNR may also establish a town sanitary district if it deems necessary. Districts may only include unincorporated areas, but...

(1) Any combination of counties, cities and villages, towns, and sewer or sanitary districts may cooperate to provide sewerage services through intergovernmental contract.

(2) A joint sewerage district may be established by resolution of several municipalities, subject to DNR approval. These districts are not given a strong legislative base.

(3) DNR, upon petition by one or more municipalities, may establish a metropolitan sewerage district. Districts must encompass one entire municipality plus all...
5A. Changes suggested by Clarenbach.

5B. Changes suggested by The Wahner Report.

*Inferred:* No specific changes are suggested. The RPC would retain its consistency power in relation to metropolitan sewerage districts in any county that remains in the RPC. Presumably, the county power over sewer extensions (see county column) would replace the RPC power whenever a county withdraws.

The report states, "County boards would be permitted to condition sewer extensions on adopted county plans."

*Inferred:* (1) County board powers of approval over sewer extensions would cover not only metropolitan sewerage districts (as in RPC's) but any city, village, or town sewer systems and town sanitary districts.

(2) Sewer extension approval powers would be at the option of the county board. There is no requirement that county plans be followed.

*Questions:* There is currently considerable activity at the state level in developing stronger sewer extension regulations. Would stronger
5A. Changes suggested by Clarenbach.

5B. Changes suggested by The Wahter Report.

Inferred: No specific changes are suggested. The RPC would retain its consistency power in relation to metropolitan sewerage districts in any county that remains in the RPC. Presumably, the county power over sewer extensions (see county column) would replace the RPC power whenever a county withdraws.

The report states, "County boards would be permitted to condition sewer extensions or adopted county plans."

Inferred: (1) County board powers of approval over sewer extensions would cover not only metropolitan sewerage districts (as in RPC's) but any city, village, or town sewer systems and town sanitary districts. (2) Sewer extension approval powers would be at the option of the county board. There is no requirement that county plans be followed.

Questions: There is current considerable activity at the state level in developing stronger sewer extension regulations. Would stronger
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY &amp; VILLAGE</th>
<th>TOWN</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.) Village boards may exercise the same sewerage powers as cities.</td>
<td>subsequently annexed territory may remain in the district. Town sanitary districts may construct, maintain, and operate a total sewerage system or may serve as an auxiliary to a metropolitan sewerage district. (b) Town sanitary districts may own and operate facilities and extend sewers outside their corporate limits subject to state regulations.</td>
<td>or part of at least one other. Concurrence of a city or village having a sewerage system is required before it can be included. Districts may encompass town sanitary districts. Powers are very broad and include construction and operation of sewerage systems, condemnation of property, and control of services to particular lands. (4) All of the above districts may extend sewers outside their corporate limits subject to state regulation. Metropolitan sewerage districts must also insure that sewer extension plans are consistent with RPC plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Any sewer extensions by cities could be subject to county board approval. Any sewer extensions by towns could be subject to county board approval. See RPC column.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5C. Changes suggested by Wallace</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Special Functions — Shorelands and Floodplains.

RPC's have no specific shoreland and floodplain powers or duties, but they have often provided planning aid to counties in the development of ordinances to satisfy state requirements.

(1) Shorelands: For all lands in unincorporated areas within 1000 feet of navigable lakes, ponds, and flowages, and 300 feet of a navigable stream, or to the leeward side of a floodplain, counties are required to enact zoning, sanitary regulations, and subdivision controls which meet or exceed state standards. Town approvals not required. **If the county does not enact a sufficient zoning ordinance, DNR may adopt such ordinance.**

(2) Floodplains: Counties shall also prepare a zoning ordinance for unincorporated areas with greater than 1% chance of flood in a given year. **If not sufficient, DNR may adopt an ordinance.**

6A,B, and C. Changes suggested by the three reports.

**Inferred:** No specific changes are suggested by any of the reports. However, any county choosing to do its own planning without RPC assistance must have the capacity to develop ordinances that will satisfy state requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5C. Changes suggested by Wallace</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>state regulations make any county powers superfluous? Would counties be allowed to provide any input into state regulations for sewer extensions in their territory?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Special Functions — Shorelands and Floodplains.</td>
<td>RPC's have no specific shore-land and floodplain powers or duties, but they have often provided planning aid to counties in the development of ordinances to satisfy state requirements.</td>
<td>(1) Shorelands: For all lands in unincorporated areas within 1000 feet of navigable lakes, ponds, and flowages, and 300 feet of a navigable stream, or to the leeward side of a floodplain, counties are required to enact zoning, sanitary regulations, and subdivision controls which meet or exceed state standards. Town approvals not required. If the county does not enact a sufficient zoning ordinance, DNR may adopt such ordinance. (2) Floodplains: Counties shall also prepare a zoning ordinance for unincorporated areas with greater than 1% chance of flood in a given year. If not sufficient, DNR may adopt an ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A, B, and C. Changes suggested by the three reports.</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Inferred: No specific change are suggested by any of the reports. However, any county choosing to do its own planning without RPC assistance must have the capacity to develop ordinances that will satisfy state requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) City and village ordinances governing shorelands remain in effect if they meet certain standards.
(2) Cities and villages shall prepare a zoning ordinance for their incorporated areas with greater than 1% chance of flood in a given year. If not sufficient, DNR may adopt an ordinance.

(1) -----
(2) If an existing town floodplain zoning ordinance is stricter than a county ordinance, it shall remain in effect.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Special Functions -- Soil and Water Conservation Districts</td>
<td>Plans and programs of Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD's) must be consistent with adopted plans of an RPC.</td>
<td>SWCD's are district units organized at the county level by resolution of the county board. Every Wisconsin county is also an SWCD. SWCD's have regulatory powers to deal with such land use problems as erosion, sediment, and agricultural runoff. The SWCD prepares an ordinance which must be approved by referendum in affected areas and then approved by majority vote of the county board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A, B, and C. Changes suggested by the three reports.</td>
<td>See county column.</td>
<td>Inferred: No specific changes are suggested. If a county withdraws from an RPC, the consistency power would be lost. However, since the boundaries of the county are identical with the SWCD (and since they often have the same members), SWCD actions might tend to be even more consistent with county planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Special Functions -- Soil and Water Conservation Districts</td>
<td>Plans and programs of Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCD's) must be consistent with adopted plans of an RPC.</td>
<td>SWCD's are district units organized at the county level by resolution of the county board. Every Wisconsin county is also an SWCD. SWCD's have regulatory powers to deal with such land use problems as erosion, sediment, and agricultural runoff. The SWCD prepares an ordinance which must be approved by referendum in affected areas and then approved by majority vote of the county board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A,B, and C. Changes suggested by the three reports.</td>
<td>See county column.</td>
<td>Inferred: No specific changes are suggested. If a county withdraws from an RPC, the consistency power would be lost. However, since the boundaries of the county are identical with the SWCD (and since they often have the same members), SWCD actions might tend to be even more consistent with county planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The A-95 review power is used to review the consistency of federally-funded projects with local and state plans. The review function is originally designated to the state, and may in turn be designated to sub-state units of government. Designation is made by the Governor for areas which do not contain an SMSA, and by the federal government with the Governor's concurrence for areas which do contain an SMSA. In Wisconsin, every RPC except one has been designated as a clearinghouse for these reviews. The RPC's comments are advisory to the federal government.

(2) The federal government has interpreted that an RPC should continue to serve as the A-95 clearinghouse for a county that withdraws from the commission. Presumably, the review function could revert back to the state, but no withdrawn county in Wisconsin has yet requested that any change be made.

8A. Changes suggested by the Clarenbach Report.

Improve the quality of A-95 review by assigning at least one full-time RPC staff member to social planning and coordination and to the related A-95 clearinghouse review work.

8B. Changes suggested by the Wahner Report.

No final conclusion is offered on the A-95 review function, but the body of the report supports resumption of the state A-95 clearing house role upon the request of either a local unit or an RPC.

A county government may serve as an A-95 clearinghouse if so designated. In Wisconsin, only Brown County, which contains an SMSA, has been designated by the federal government to perform the review function. It is unclear whether a county without an SMSA would be likely to be designated as an A-95 clearinghouse.
Inferred: This would permit an RPC to suspend its A-95 review responsibility to any withdrawn county that the commission no longer wishes to serve.

most counties would be allowed to serve as A-95 clearinghouses. The distinction between A-95 treatment of counties with and without SMSA's is also avoided. Lastly, it is not clear whether support for the state A-95 role is based on an expectation that county review would not be allowed or that county review capability would not be satisfactory.

8C. Changes suggested by The Wallace Report

9. Other Powers
   Levy Power and Other Sources of Funding.
   (1) At the local level, RPC's are allowed to charge each county not more than .003 % of the county's equalized real property value per year. If less than half of the land in a county is within a region, charges are to be made to individual municipal units. A county board or local governing body may approve a rate higher than .003 %.
   (2) Funding from state and federal levels is provided through a variety of basic appropriations and direct grants from specific agencies. Much of the federal funding is subject to A-95 review, but there is still considerable lack of coordination in funding arrangements.

9A. Changes suggested by The Clarenbach Report
   (1) Maintain the existing levy power.
   (2) (a) Increase arrangements for funding and other assistance to RPC's by state functional agencies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inferred: This would permit an RPC to suspend its A-95 review responsibility to any withdrawn county that the commission no longer wishes to serve.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most counties would be allowed to serve as A-95 clearinghouses. The distinction between A-95 treatment of counties with and without SMSA's is also avoided. Lastly, it is not clear whether support for the state A-95 role is based on an expectation that county review would not be allowed or that county review capability would not be satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8C. Changes suggested by The Wallace Report

9. Other Powers
Levy Power and Other Sources of Funding.

(1) At the local level, RPC's are allowed to charge each county not more than .003% of the county's equalized real property value per year. If less than half of the land in a county is within a region, charges are to be made to individual municipal units. A county board or local governing body may approve a rate higher than .003%.
(2) Funding from state and federal levels is provided through a variety of basic appropriations and direct grants from specific agencies. Much of the federal funding is subject to A-95 review, but there is still considerable lack of coordination in funding arrangements.

(1) Local funds for county planning are derived entirely from general county funds.
(2) Some state and federal funds are available to county planning through special programs and grants.

9A. Changes suggested by The Clarenbach Report.

(1) Maintain the existing levy power.
(2) (a) Increase arrangements for funding and other assistance to RPC's by state functional agencies.
9B. Changes suggested by The Wahner Report. (1) Inferred: The report criticizes the power of "advisory" RPC's to levy a charge to local governments. However, it stops short of recommending the removal of RPC levy powers and seems to support the idea of calling the process a budget "request". The conclusion is not clear, though. (2) See changes described under county.

The state should participate in funding for all areawide planning agencies, including RPC's, counties, and agencies established under intergovernmental contracts. State funds would match local contributions up to a legislatively determined limit. The funds would be apportioned on a sliding scale with the greater amounts going to the less populous, poorer, counties.

Questions: Considering the likely expansion of the total number of planning agencies, especially in poorer counties, how much additional state funding would be required to support satisfactory planning capabilities? Would total state matching funds equal total locally-provided funds throughout the state, or would a higher state matching proportion be permitted?

9C. Changes suggested by The Wallace Report. (1) Various suggestions are offered for changing and improving county revenue sources. Presumably county
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>planning functions would also benefit from these increased county revenues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The state should provide financial aid for local planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions: The report outlines a detailed process for the preparation and coordination of county plans. How much additional state funding would be required to support this method of planning? How would the cost compare to the Wahner approach? Would any requirement be made for a specified amount of local funding (as in Wahner's matching fund arrangement)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10. Other Powers - Referral Requirements. | Local governmental units shall refer to the RPC any matters concerning the location or acquisition of land for any of the items included in the adopted regional master plan. RPC's have 20 days in which to make advisory comments and recommendations to the local government. This provision is currently thought to be fairly weak. |

| 10A. Changes suggested by the Clarenbach Report. | The report considers strengthening the referral provision by granting to the RPC a suspensory veto power to delay any local action for a 60 or 90 day study period. However, no conclusion is offered in this regard. |

<p>| 10B. Changes suggested by Wahner. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>planning functions would also benefit from these increased county revenues.</td>
<td>(2) The state should provide financial aid for local planning.</td>
<td>Questions: The report outlines a detailed process for the preparation and coordination of county plans. How much additional state funding would be required to support this method of planning? How would the cost compare to the Wahner approach? Would any requirement be made for a specified amount of local funding (as in Wahner's matching fund arrangement)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Other Powers - Referral Requirements. Local governmental units shall refer to the RPC any matters concerning the location or acquisition of land for any of the items included in the adopted regional master plan. RPC's have 20 days in which to make advisory comments and recommendations to the local government. This provision is currently thought to be fairly weak.

10A. Changes suggested by the Clarenbach Report. The report considers strengthening the referral provision by granting to the RPC a suspensory veto power to delay any local action for a 60 or 90 day study period. However, no conclusion is offered in this regard.

10B. Changes suggested by Wahner.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10C. Changes suggested by The Wallace Report.</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Proposed city or village zoning changes that are inconsistent with an adopted county plan shall be referred to the county for review and comment before those changes take effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

