

Section 12

State Planning: Its Function and Organization
Report of the Committee
American Institute of Planners
(November, 1959)

State Planning: Its Function and Organization

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON STATE PLANNING, AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS

Foreword

A movement to revitalize state government is gaining strength at the present time. This effort is based on the traditionally important place occupied by the states in the federal system, their legal authority, the belief that state financial problems can be solved, and the already important responsibilities of state government for highways, education, public health, welfare, recreation, agriculture, forestry, water supply and use, waste disposal, stream sanitation, and wildlife conservation. The whole field of resource utilization and the solution of problems relating to the growth and shifts of population are the concern of the states. A re-evaluation of our concepts of the role and contribution of the states becomes a major consideration in shaping public programs.

Professor Coleman Ransone in his study "The Office of the Governor in the United States" summarizes the current situation as follows:

The American state has not been displaced as a unit of government. Its role has been somewhat altered by increasing federal participation in fields formerly thought to be reserved for states, but the status of the states has actually grown rather than been diminished by the programs of co-operative federalism as they are carried out in practice. While it is undeniable that the federal government has assumed new powers and functions, this is also true of the states. . . .

Committee on State Planning

Drafting Committee Members: A. J. Gray, *Chairman*, Edward L. Hopkins, L. L. Durisch, E. David Stoloff.

Corresponding Committee Members: William W. Anderson, Ralph W. Barnes, Lachlan F. Blair, B. Budd Chavooshian, Victor Fischer, Noland R. Heiden, Peter Henderson, Thomas F. Hubbard, Walter K. Johnson, Jerry H. Manning, Harold V. Miller, Francis A. Pitkin, Walter Shouse, Justus K. Smith, Miriam Strong, Carroll M. Tabaka, Julian W. Tarrant, Robert L. Williams.

October 10, 1958.

[207]

Although progress has been slow, states are seeking to improve organization and administration in order to meet new responsibilities and to discharge existing ones effectively. An unusual amount of study by legislative councils, special commissions, and other groups is observable. More generally, the Commonwealth Series, dealing with administration and governmental organization within the individual states has provided comparative material and analyses of great value.

A part of the growing concern for state government and administration is expressed in attention to the function and organization of state planning as a means of meeting problems of change and growth. Several groups have addressed themselves to this problem. Since 1953 AIP has had committees on state planning. The 1955 and 1957 annual meetings included workshops on the subject. The National Municipal League in 1955 prepared and released its report "Model State and Regional Planning Law." This was followed in 1956 by the Council of State Governments' study of "Planning Services for State Government." In the same year the Maryland Commission on State Programs, Organizations, and Finance issued its report entitled "Improving State Planning in Maryland."

Several states have taken action apparently aimed at making state planning more effective. Pennsylvania removed the state planning commission from the Department of Commerce and placed it in the office of the governor. In 1957 the states of Colorado and North Carolina established a new administrative framework for state planning. In Colorado the Division of Planning was established in the office of the governor, and in North Carolina a new Division of Administration, which includes budgeting and long-range planning as two of its major divisions, was established in the office of the governor.

The renewed concern with state planning points to the need for AIP to clarify its position in regard to this important state function and to the organizational approaches appropriate to its discharge.

This report is the result of the work of the Committee on State Planning appointed by President Wetmore in November 1957 and directed to prepare a statement on state planning for AIP consideration. In carrying out its assignment the committee drew extensively from the reports and studies listed in the report bibliography and sought to evaluate the more than twenty years of experience of state planning agencies.

Summary

State planning must meet both the functional and organizational needs of state government. The heart of the state planning function is its concern with a unified policy framework under which state development goals are defined, priorities established, and programs kept in balance.

In accord with the general concept that the chief executive has the responsibility for formulating such a policy framework and for directing programs to carry out these policies, the following organizational principles for state planning are suggested: (1) state planning must be an integral part of the administrative structure of state government; (2) the state planning staff should be advisory to the chief executive and act at his direction in its relationship to the legislature and the individual state departments; (3) the director of planning must be acceptable to the chief executive and should be qualified by training and experience in state and regional planning; the technical staff should be within the career service; (4) if a commission is considered desirable, it should be advisory to the director of planning, who takes full administrative responsibility for recommendations. The application of these principles should be adjusted to meet the situation in individual states.

A state planning staff should be equipped to perform at least the following activities: (1) fact-gathering and analysis; (2) policy formulation, which includes assisting the governor to define goals, set priorities, and relate the individual programs concerned; (3) programming, including establishment of specific goals, courses of action, and programs for the many facets of activity of concern on the statewide level; (4) capital improvement programming; (5) assisting operating agencies in adjusting programs to a unified state program.

AIP can assist in establishing the planning function in state government by (1) helping to increase the understanding of the need for planning in state govern-

ment, (2) defining skills necessary for state planning, and (3) establishing an educational theory and programs to develop personnel capable of dealing with planning problems at any level of government.

I

The Planning Function

Planning has come to have a variety of special interpretations according to the level of government involved, but an element common to all levels envisions planning as the process of determining the objectives to be achieved and the means for achieving them. In its simplest terms planning is preparation for rational action. The process involves:

- 1) The formulation and identification of short- and long-range objectives.
- 2) The assembly of essential information to secure an adequate understanding and definition of the problem.
- 3) The determination of priorities and programs within a flexible schedule.
- 4) The integration of activities for the most effective and economical accomplishment of the aims.

Governmental planning should be (1) appropriate to the level of government at which it takes place and to the responsibilities of the agency doing the planning, (2) related to the specific functions of the agency with the degree of generalization called for by the position of the agency, and (3) carried out so that decisions can be made shaping activities and assigning priorities.

State Planning

As the scope and complexity of state services and functions increase, the need to bring these services and functions together into a single unified program becomes more pressing. For example, it is now clear that individual state programs, such as those relating to highways, can achieve only limited goals if not properly related to such larger planning issues as sound economic development and metropolitan growth or to a forecast of the future over-all state needs. This, in part, explains why, during the past half century, the functions performed by the chief executive of the state¹ became more and more important as the focal point for over-all state management and development. It also explains why state planning must be closely associated with the office of the chief executive, for it is there that broad policies and objectives are set and the role of particular departments and agencies is appraised in relation to a total state program.

¹The functions of the chief executive may be the responsibility of one individual, the governor, or that of an executive group or council as is true in Florida.

The chief executive must accept responsibility for the development of state-wide development policies, for the choice of the means of carrying out these policies, and for the direction of effort of operating departments and agencies toward an integrated program for the solution of state-wide problems. It is the chief executive to whom the department heads must look for leadership when questions of general state policy arise. If the chief executive can meet these responsibilities in the light of a coherent set of policies, then, and only then, can *state planning* be said to be operative.

Departmental Planning

Not all planning in state government, however, is state-wide in character or confined to the office of the chief executive. Planning activity at the departmental and subdepartmental levels is equally essential and a necessary part of the planning process.

Plans prepared in the office of the chief executive establish the general objectives to be sought, and these must be further refined and applied to specific programs. This is the task of departmental planning and involves the preparation of short- and long-range programs of operation consistent with the over-all objectives and priorities of the state plan.

Use of the experience and on-the-ground knowledge of the operating departments is a vital part of the state planning process. Close cooperation must exist between the planning staff associated with the office of the chief executive and those responsible for planning within the individual operating departments.

II

The Need for State Planning

The need for more and better services from state government has increased rapidly in recent years. The problem of providing these services is not only more complex but also the relationship of state and local responsibilities for them is more evident.

With the increase and change in distribution of population, the advances in technology, and the advent of faster means of transportation and communication, significant changes have occurred and are occurring in our society. Many development problems which formerly could be handled on a local basis or were of no serious concern now far outstrip the capabilities of local jurisdictions and require state action.

These state service and development problems and relationships are extensive and complex, and there is a need to relate the individual programs concerned. Every state is involved with programs dealing with highway construction, traffic regulation, education, water and

mineral resources, conservation and recreation, industrial development, agriculture, and any number of other interests of state-wide concern. All these programs have a definite bearing on each other and may no longer be treated as separate entities. Unless these programs are coordinated and geared in the same direction at the executive level, there is a wasteful duplication of effort and the real possibility of failure to meet the needs and problems of the state.

Because of these basic interrelationships and the demand for competent action, state government today requires more than ever before the ability and capacity to plan on a comprehensive and long-range basis.

Stated in general terms, the following are among the most crucial current problems facing state government. They illustrate the need for state planning.

Development of All Sections of the State

The rapid increase and major shifts in population are resulting in new problems of state development. As a result of technological advances and other factors, the migration of people to new areas and to new occupational pursuits has created serious problems of physical and economic adjustment. The depopulation of some regions and the tremendous build-up of others necessitate a reappraisal of state facilities and services as they will affect the development problems of each major region of the state.

Resource Appraisal

The mechanization of most types of economic activity calls for new appraisals of basic state resources. State programs and policies regarding the use of resources need to be revised to strengthen the economy of individual states and the nation. A clear understanding of modern industries' needs for such resources as water, land, and transportation is essential. Further, some effort needs to be directed toward making the resources of the state not only compatible to but accessible for industrial development. Recognition of the state's limitations in regard to its resources should point to the type of economic and physical development that may realistically be sought.

Metropolitan Problems

As the movement of the people toward the city and particularly toward the metropolitan areas continues, a larger and larger proportion of population of individual states is being concentrated in a relatively few areas. In fact, recent studies show that of the national population increase of nineteen million from 1940 to 1950, 80 per cent occurred in the 168 standard metropolitan areas and 46 per cent was in the 25 largest

metropolitan areas. Many state services and activities directly affect how these areas develop. Conversely, how these areas develop directly affects many state problems.

Urban areas are absorbing open space at a rate of a million acres a year—an area about the size of Rhode Island. In many areas, land for essential services and facilities, recreation, and industry is becoming scarce. Because these problems sprawl across the many local jurisdictions, only the state is capable of meeting them.

One example is the need for park and recreation land and for open space in our metropolitan areas. State leadership in devising a cooperative program with the many jurisdictions involved could produce a positive attack on this serious problem.

Similarly such metropolitan regional problems as stream sanitation, flood-damage prevention, local tax structure, and provision for essential utilities services need special recognition within state programs and a sound legislative basis to permit solution.

Relating Fiscal and Physical Planning

There are, as has been stated, constantly growing demands upon state services. For instance, the highway program involves expenditures of about one hundred billion dollars in the next ten years, of which half or more is to come from the states. However, highways are only one basic capital facility needed. Stepping up this program may create unbalance unless some over-all determination of priorities is established. Few states have the organizational tools needed to define objectives, measure alternatives, determine priorities, and appraise results. A planning staff working with the budget staff can help to provide these essential tools.

III

Organizational Approaches

Efforts to develop over-all planning as a recognized function in state government were the natural outgrowth of what we now know as the "conservation movement," which began shortly after the turn of the century. It was during this period that the nation for the first time became concerned with the use and development of its natural resources.

The 1908 report of the National Conservation Commission to the governors of the several states was a milestone in this movement. The report was not only one of the most comprehensive inventories of resources of its time, but more important it stressed the interdependence of these resources. Subsequently several of the states undertook surveys of resources within their jurisdictions. An outstanding example was the Michigan land surveys of the 1920's.

History of Organization for State Planning

During the 1930's there was the first widespread effort to organize official state planning agencies. This was a result of the depression efforts to create jobs through public works. It was realized that if these projects were to have lasting value they should be planned to meet basic needs and fit into a generally desirable scheme of development in each state.

Encouraged by the National Planning Board and its successor agencies, 46 states created state planning commissions to help guide the public works program. At first these commissions were primarily concerned with inventories of state resources, physical problems, and development needs. The 1942 report of the National Resources Planning Board on state planning noted "Because of problems of 'physical' planning, like the conservation of land and water resources and development of public works, were more within the grasp of the planning personnel and techniques then available, they concerned themselves largely with such problems." Gradually the commissions began to study social and economic aspects of state development. Some of them attempted to become staff arms of the governors. Others began to put greater emphasis on service to all branches of state government. Experience seems to suggest that operating as commissions separate from the regular administrative organizations they were unable to perform these functions effectively. The problem of finances became more acute, and the commissions began looking for operating programs which justified their budget requests.

Most commissions reoriented their programs toward "industrial development" or local planning assistance. The formation of the national organization known as the Association of State Planning and Development Agencies recognized the effort to merge planning with economic development. Perhaps the most straightforward statement which from the record seems best to characterize the prevailing attitude in the many discussions of the period was made at the 1947 annual meeting of the American Society of Planning Officials: "Unless we can get ourselves hitched up to an operating agency to see our plans carried out, our planning organization is on its way out." It was inevitable that once a state planning agency became a part of an operating agency with a limited area of activity its ability to function in an over-all planning capacity would be weakened or even destroyed.

In some states the state planning agency retained as its principal function technical planning assistance to localities. Local planning assistance is a service which differs little from the programs of assistance to localities

carried on by the states in many fields. While assistance programs are important, they are no substitute for broad over-all planning so urgently needed in the states.

In the 15-year period between 1935 and 1950 there was an almost complete transition of the state planning agencies to operating agencies. Today over-all state planning as an organized and recognized function of state government is virtually nonexistent. This experience points to the need for a redirection in the organization and activities of staffs concerned with state planning if it is to be an effective force in state government.

Principles of Organization for State Planning

To be effective state planning must meet the organizational as well as functional needs of present-day state government. This report does not lay down hard and fast rules as to how state planning should be organized. It does suggest principles of organization for state planning based on the general concept that the chief executive has the responsibility for formulating long-range policies and for directing programs to carry them out. Moreover, in many states the chief executive is becoming more and more the focal point for legislative leadership. The planning staff should be in a position to help him in preparing policy and program recommendations for administrative and legislative consideration.

Within these general concepts, the following principles of organization for state planning are suggested:

- 1) State planning must be an integral part of the administrative structure of state government.
- 2) The staff concerned with over-all state planning should be advisory to the chief executive. The staff should act at his direction in its relationships with the legislature and with individual state departments.
- 3) The director of planning must be acceptable to the chief executive and should be qualified by training and experience in state and regional planning. The trained technical staff should be within the career service.
- 4) An advisory commission may or may not be needed. If such a commission is created it should be advisory to the director of planning who takes full administrative responsibility for recommendations.

Any organization for state planning should be based on the concept that the continuity of the planning function can be assured only by the technical competence of the staff. An independent board is no assurance of the continuity or even performance of the planning function.

Application of Principles to Individual States

Governmental organization is not the same in all the states, and the principles for organizing state planning

outlined above should be adjusted to the situation in each state. Obviously these principles will be most directly applicable to those states in which the governor has clear-cut powers as chief administrator of state activities. The state of New York is perhaps the best illustration. Here the governor has been given broad management powers so that he is in fact chief administrator of the total state program. In contrast, in the state of Florida the cabinet is really a plural executive and considerable ingenuity would be required to apply the principles given above.

Between these two extremes there is a great variation in the degree to which a governor may exercise his executive authority over state administration. In Michigan, for example, the governor shares his executive authority with such elected officials as the treasurer, the highway commissioner, the superintendent of public instruction, and the boards of agriculture and education. Even in those states with a strong chief executive the governor may not have sufficient strength to equip himself directly with a strong staff planning arm. In this situation if a commission is created the commission itself should seek to establish a relationship, such as outlined in this report, between the chief executive and its planning staff even though the relationship may be informal.

The arrangements made in Pennsylvania illustrate an alternative when it is not feasible immediately to establish the planning staff within the office of the chief executive. There the State Planning Commission is within the office of the governor. The commission appoints the director of planning with the approval of the governor.

Position of the Director of Planning

The head of a state planning staff will find it necessary and desirable to work closely with the chief executive, for planning must be focused at the point where decisions are made within the administration. In this respect the position of the director of planning is essentially the same as that of the heads of budgeting and personnel, both of which provide services which enter into central decision making. Planning thus takes its place in state government among the staff agencies essential to executive direction and leadership in a large organization. The heads of these staff agencies have an increasing amount of professional status but are subject to removal by the governor in accordance with the concept of executive responsibility.

States seeking to fill the position of director of state planning should recruit nationally in order to secure a person qualified by training and experience in state or regional planning.

The director of planning must maintain professional status for himself and for his organization. In this respect his position is admittedly difficult, but not impossible. State planning is a cumulative and continuous process and must be long-range in its outlook. The professionalization of planning personnel is a means of securing this point of view, and professional status and standards are a safeguard to the director and his staff. It is necessary for the staff to achieve both active participation and objectivity in state affairs if planning for state government is to be effective. This is not a problem peculiar to planning, but arises as well in connection with the contributions of other fields both at the staff and operating levels. Its solution is basic to the improvement of government generally and state government in particular.

IV

Activities of a State Planning Staff

The heart of the state planning function is the unified policy framework which is established at the highest level of state government. To operate effectively in creating and putting into action this unified policy framework, the planning staff should be equipped to perform at least the following activities:

Fact-Gathering and Analysis

Before a rational high level policy framework can be established, the conditions in the state must be explored in depth. This type of fact-gathering or research is one of the vital activities of a state planning organization. A wide variety of information must be collected and correlated to obtain a comprehensive picture of state-wide conditions and problems. A state planning organization must keep informed on such matters as the economic situation, population trends, industrial and agricultural development, resource availability and utilization, technological trends, transportation facilities, and education, health, and other social conditions, in order to understand adequately what is happening throughout the state. Agencies, departments, or institutions outside the planning staff can contribute greatly to the necessary store of knowledge from studies and data which they have developed independently.

After the necessary information is collected it will be the responsibility of the state planning staff to analyze and correlate the facts gathered so as to be able to recommend and to exert influence upon the shape which the over-all unified policy framework is to take.

It is well to remember at this point that, although planning depends upon knowledge, research and anal-

ysis alone are not planning. Research contributes to planning, of course, but the collecting of information and the accumulating of knowledge is not the same thing as preparing a course of action designed to achieve specific goals.

Policy Formulation

It is in policy formulation that the real function of state planning is executed. With the facts well in hand, the over-all development concept for the state may be formulated with goals defined, priorities set, and programs placed in balance. As stated, such a policy framework is ultimately set by the chief executive. It is the role of the director of planning and his planning personnel to assist the chief executive through the medium of good staff work in presenting the facts, preparing alternatives, giving professional advice, and making recommendations.

Programming

When the base of state policy has been formulated and established the activity of the state planning agency does not cease. Some of its most valuable contributions are still to be made. At this point definite goals and courses of action to accomplish the purposes of the broad unified policy framework may be charted.

This translation from policy to action may be expressed through the program statements. These recommend specific goals, courses of action, and programs for the many facets of activity which are of state-wide concern, such as industrial development and location, land use, urbanization, economic development, employment-security services, local governmental patterns, and facilities for leisure time. Specific programs stem from the unified concept derived from the policy framework and are parceled out to the operating agencies with established priority and timing.

Capital Improvement Programming

One of the most significant ways in which development policy may be implemented is through capital improvement programming. Only in this way can the fiscal resources of the state be correlated with its goals for physical and economic development.

This should be done in close conjunction with the budget office and on the basis of well-established working relationships with that office. The capital improvement and public works programs of all departments and agencies should be reviewed so that a unified and coordinated annual or biennial capital budget and a long-range capital improvement program may be prepared.

Assisting Operating Departments and Agencies

The state planning staff should not become involved in carrying out any phase of the unified policy. However, it must stand ready when called upon to assist and coordinate, by furnishing professional advice and basic information, the activities of planning and programming carried on in the various operating or line departments. The state planning function thus has the opportunity of exerting its influence in the other levels of state governmental services.

V

AIP's Contribution to State Planning

State administration is becoming more and more professional. As public management has developed into a skill requiring more than a glad hand or service to the political party in power, more has come to be expected of administration at all levels of government. However, while the spoils system left the national scene very early in the century and the city manager movement gained strength shortly thereafter, state governments have been slower to respond to the demand for professional personnel. Now we are witnessing the recognition in a large number of state governments that political adroitness does not solve managerial problems. Planning in cities is recognized as the basis for survival. Planning in the federal government is pervasive—if not always identifiable. Planning in state governments is coming of age.

But as states attempt to solve their problems through rational action, many other problems will arise. An inadequate administrative structure may prove a real deterrent to effective planning; established operating departments are apt to be jealous of their existing prestige and prerogatives; the coordination of the budgeting and the planning processes presents special problems; and the recruitment of qualified personnel

with the backgrounds and orientations requisite to such an all-encompassing endeavor may for a time prove difficult. The solutions to these and other problems that may arise will be found at the state level as they have been found at other levels of government. The solutions may be more complex, however, as the problems are sophisticated ones. In some states administrative restructuring of existing relationships may accomplish the end; in others vast legislative changes may be needed. In still other states, the reorientation of the elected officials is the chief solution. More frequently all these elements of solution will enter into the achievement of effective state planning.

The AIP can do much to promote and aid the establishment of the planning function in state government. First, it can aid in increasing recognition of the need for planning at that level of government. Much will be gained by identifying the process and by clarifying the role of the planner in state government. Second, an obvious need is the definition of the skills requisite to state planning. Third, it can help develop an educational theory and practice which will train people capable of dealing with planning problems at any level of government. Particular attention should be given to the concept and process of staff work and its implications for education of city, regional, and state planners. The lack of personnel with broad enough orientations to undertake work of interdepartmental and state-wide scope might well prove the greatest bottleneck to the growth of effective state planning.

Certainly these problems address themselves with special force to AIP. AIP can perform its greatest service through its ability to identify for itself and others the skills, techniques, and orientations needed to make state planning a vital and effective force in state government. The need for planning in state government is unquestioned. The challenge to AIP to contribute to this end is one of the greatest that the organization faces.

Bibliography

- AMERICAN SOCIETY OF PLANNING OFFICIALS. *Planning 1945*. Part II, Proceedings of a Discussion Conference on State Planning Problems, July 11-12, 1945. Chicago: A.S.P.O., 1945, 88 pp.
- . *Planning 1947*. Proceedings of Annual Meeting, May 5-9, 1947. Chicago: A.S.P.O., 1947, 192 pp.
- BANE, FRANK. "The Job of Being Governor," *State Government*, 31:184-190, Summer 1958.
- BARNARD, CHESTER I. *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938, 334 pp.
- BUCK, A. E. "A New Look at the States," *National Municipal Review*, 44:72-75, February 1955.
- CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE (Assembly). *A State Office of Planning for California*. Report of the Subcommittee on County and Community Planning, a Subcommittee of the Assembly Interim Committee on Conservation, Planning and Public Works. Sacramento, California, 1955. (Interim Committee Report V. 13, No. 1.)
- CLARK, J. W. "State Planning and Industrial Development Agencies," *State Government*, 29:173-176, September 1956.
- COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS. *Planning Services for State Government*. Chicago: Council of State Governments, 1956, 63 pp.
- . "Planning Services for State Government," *State Government*, 29:199-201, October 1956.
- DIMOCK, MARSHALL E. "The Objectives of Governmental Reorganization," *Public Administration Review*, 11:233-241, Autumn 1951.
- DOLAND, ROBERT T. AND WICKHAM, RAYMOND. "States Seek Efficiency," *National Municipal Review*, 47:166-170, April 1958.
- ELLIOTT, JOHN E. "Economic Planning Reconsidered," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 72:55-77, February 1958.
- FRANKS, OLIVER. *Central Planning and Control in War and Peace*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947, 61 pp.
- GAUS, JOHN M. "Planning Process in Government," in *Problems of the Postwar World* (Thomas C. T. McCormick, editor). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1945, pp. 163-178.
- GRAVES, W. BROOKE. *Public Administration in a Democratic Society*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1950, 759 pp.
- HAAR, CHARLES M. "Regionalism and Realism in Land Use Planning," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 105:515-537, February 1957.
- HAMMAN, CHARLES L. "The Concept of Regional Development," *Appraisal Journal*, 25:499-504, October 1957.
- HOBBS, EDWARD H. *Behind the President; a Study of Executive Office Agencies*. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1954, 248 pp.
- KAMMERER, GLADYS M. "The Governor as Chief Administrator in Kentucky," *Journal of Politics*, 16:236-256, May 1954.
- KENNEDY, JOHN P. "The Shame of the States," *New York Times Magazine*, May 18, 1958.
- LANE, DWINDELL. "The States and the American Federal System," *State Government*, 31:66-69, April 1958.
- LANGLIE, ARTHUR B. "Stronger States in the Federal Union: Why and How," *State Government*, 28:267-271, December 1955.
- LEPAWSKY, ALBERT. *State Planning and Economic Development in the South*. Kingsport, Tennessee: Kingsport Press, 1949, 193 pp. (National Planning Association. Committee of the South, Report No. 4.)
- MARYLAND. COMMISSION ON STATE PROGRAMS, ORGANIZATION AND FINANCE. *Improving State Planning in Maryland*. November 1956. Baltimore, Maryland, 1956, 90 pp.
- MASON, TILDEN B. "Miracle in Michigan," *National Municipal Review*, 47:318-323, July 1958.
- MERRIAM, CHARLES E. "The Place of Planning," in *Saving American Capitalism* (Seymour E. Harris, editor). New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948, pp. 159-167.
- MILLER, HAROLD V. "Liaison with the Chief Executive for State Planning." Address before Association of State Planning and Development Agencies, Des Moines, Iowa, May 14, 1958. Nashville, Tennessee: Tennessee State Planning Commission, 1958. 7 pp. mimeo.
- MILLETT, JOHN D. *The Process and Organization of Government Planning*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1947, 187 pp.
- . *Management in the Public Service*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1954, 417 pp.
- NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE. *Model State and Regional Planning Act*. New York: National Municipal League, 1955, 66 pp.
- . "Group Studies Illinois Government," *National Municipal Review*, 47:171-172, April 1958.
- NORTON, PERRY L. *Planning and the AIP, a Report to the Board of Governors*, August 1957. Washington: American Institute of Planners, 1957, 145 pp.
- PERLOFF, HARVEY S. *Education for Planning: City, State, and Regional*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1957, 189 pp.
- PINCHOT, GIFFORD. *Breaking New Ground*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1947, 522 pp.
- RANSONE, COLEMAN B., JR. *The Office of the Governor in the South*. University, Alabama: Bureau of Public Administration, University of Alabama, 1951, 256 pp.
- . *The Office of Governor in the United States*. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1956, 417 pp.
- RODWIN, LLOYD. *The British New Towns Policy: Problems and Implications*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956, 252 pp.
- SAMPSON, ROBERT C. *The Staff Role in Management; Its Creative Uses*. New York: Harper Brothers, 1955, 226 pp.
- SIMON, HERBERT A., SMITHBURG, DONALD W., AND THOMPSON, VICTOR A. *Public Administration*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950, 582 pp.
- U. S. NATIONAL RESOURCES BOARD. *State Planning*. A Review of Activities and Progress. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1935, 310 pp.
- U. S. NATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE. *The Future of State Planning*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1938, 117 pp.
- U. S. NATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE. *State Planning*. Programs and Accomplishments, December 1936. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1937, 128 pp.
- U. S. NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD. *State Planning—June 1942*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1942, 134 pp.
- YOUNG, WILLIAM H. "Development of the Governorship," *State Government*, 31:178-184, Summer 1958.

Comment on the AIP State Planning Committee's Report

THE INSTITUTE COMMITTEE report on State Planning may be criticised for what it does not say rather than for what is set forth. The need for planning at the state level of government is well stated. The section on organizational approaches recognizes that planning, at any level of government, is essentially a staff function and must, therefore, have a close and effective relationship with the chief executive's office.¹ Whether there is a need for an advisory committee is a point that may be debated, as the report suggests. We agree, however, that where it exists, such a committee should be advisory to the director of planning to assure the proper relationships among the chief executive, the staff agency, and the advisory committee. The report is wise, however, in recognizing that "governmental organization is not the same in all states, and the principles for organizing state planning outlined [in the report] should be adjusted to the situation in each state." Some critics of the staff approach proclaim that the continuity of purpose and long-range objectives and policies of the planning agency will not be achieved if the responsibility for decisions is placed with the elected chief executive, and they plead for an administrative commission composed of citizens serving terms that overlap governors' terms. They are really saying that "planning should be kept out of politics." This approach fails to recognize that government is a political activity and that planning is a function of government. The planning agency that is part of the "team" will be effective; the agency that is "nonpolitical" will be ignored.

It is in the sections on the planning function and the activities of a state planning staff that the report fails to state the case and describe completely and specifically the function of a state planning agency, or for that matter any planning agency. The report's summary asserts that a state planning agency should be equipped to perform certain functions; but throughout the report, the word "plan" is carefully avoided. Many other terms are used which might be interpreted to mean "the state plan," but nowhere do we find the explicit statement that the function of a state planning agency is to prepare a state plan.

The planning agency is to commence its efforts with "fact-gathering and analysis," which is appropriate;

and the report does well to emphasize that "research and analysis alone are not planning." We then move to "policy formulation" which is, as the report states, the point at which "the real function of state planning is executed." But here we define goals, set priorities, and place programs in balance. From this language it would appear that the function of the state planning agency is to prepare a "state policies plan." If this is the meaning, it should be so stated and the components of the policies plan spelled out; i.e., physical, social, economic, etc. There are those that would deny the appropriateness of combining in one "super planning agency" the responsibility for all aspects of developmental policy. As a practical matter, the difficulties of establishing effective physical planning agencies in state government have been great enough. We should not try to achieve the pinnacle of governmental policy guidance until we have demonstrated that we can provide effective policy guidance for physical development at the state level.

If the language of the report intends to restrict the function of the planning agency to the formulation of policies for physical development, why does it not so state? Why is the word "plan" so steadfastly avoided? Should not the spatial aspects of the development policies and programs of the state be set forth in graphic form, on a map, as explicitly as possible? We are reminded of the recent article published in the *JOURNAL* by Eldridge Lovelace, in which he states "We have become so happily absorbed in techniques and surveys—in origin and destination, in economic backgrounds, in decibels, street capacities, trade areas, space hours and APHA scores—that we are neglecting our major task—the preparation, public acceptance, adoption and carrying out of comprehensive city plans."² Mr. Lovelace is talking about city plans, but is there any reason to believe that state planning should not produce and be responsible for the maintenance of a graphic statement of the physical development objectives, programs, and policies of the state?

¹ See *Planning Services for State Government*, Chicago: Council of State Government, 1956.

² Eldridge Lovelace, "You Can't Have Planning Without a Plan," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, Vol. XXIV (1958), No. 1, p. 7.

The State of California has recently adopted legislation establishing the State Office of Planning.³ The first function of this new agency is to

Prepare, maintain, regularly review and revise a comprehensive, long-range, general plan for the physical growth and development of the State, in co-operation with, and utilizing the physical development plans as prepared by state, local, regional and federal agencies, which plan shall be known as the State Development Plan.⁴ . . . [The plan] shall be based on studies of physical, social, economic and governmental factors, conditions and trends⁵ [and] shall embody state policy regarding the State's physical growth and development⁶ [and] shall further include, and consist of, a document, or documents, containing concise statements in written and *graphic form* [emphasis supplied] concerning and including, but not limited to, the following:

a) A statement including principal findings of fact and delineating physical growth and development problems and potentialities of the state.

b) A statement of the major objectives and principles and a summary of the proposals expressed in the plan.

c) Recommendations for the most desirable general pattern of land use and circulation within the state, and for the most desirable use and development of land resources of the state, all considered in respect to: present and future growth and trends and forecasts thereof; climate, water resources and other relevant natural or environmental factors; the need to conserve and develop special types of land and water resources of statewide significance including, but not limited to, areas especially suited for agriculture, forestry, mining, recreation and fish and wildlife; all other factors and conditions deemed to be relevant by the [State] Office [of Planning].

d) Recommendations concerning the need for, and the proposed general location of, major public and private

³ Chapter 1641, *Statutes of 1959* (Section 65011.1—65020.9, chapter 1.5, Title 7, Government Code, State of California.)

⁴ *Ibid.*, Section 65013.2 (a).

⁵ *Ibid.*, Section 65015.1.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Section 65015.3.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Section 65015.4.

works and facilities, which works or facilities, or reservations of land or water therefor, by reason of their function, size, extent, legal status, or for any other cause, are of state concern; or the authorization, location or construction of which are legally within the province or jurisdiction or state agencies or officials, or which for any other cause are appropriate subjects for inclusion in the State Development Plan.⁷

We feel that the report of the AIP Committee should have set forth the basic elements of a state plan in a manner and in detail similar to the language of the California legislation.

The Committee Report further suggests that the capital improvement programming function should be a primary responsibility of the planning agency. Of course the planning agency must be concerned with this function; but without a long-range physical plan, there can be no valid long-range capital improvement program. It would seem that long-range fiscal planning should be as much the province of the budget agency as physical planning is the province of the planning agency. Together, the two functions provide the long-range program. The capital improvements priority list must be balanced against financial capability before there is a program, and the immediate result is the capital budget. Should not, therefore, the capital improvement program be the primary responsibility of the budget agency with essential assistance from the planning office?

We hope that the Committee's report and these comments will stimulate debate among the members of the Institute and others, and that through discussion many of the differences of opinion and approach may be resolved. In this way the Institute will make a maximum contribution to state planning by helping to establish firmly the planning function in state government.

ELTON R. ANDREWS

*Planning Officer, Local Planning Office
California Department of Finance*