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The implementation of planning goals and objectives, including the goal of regional sustainability, requires cooperation and a degree of social unity, or cohesion, within society. In large, complex societies, a system of legally established planning mechanisms is also required to make and implement the public policies that express societal goals and objectives. In many regions, such as the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor, planners have another obstacle to implementing their communities' visions: jurisdictional boundaries that segment otherwise contiguous populations. In order to effectively implement the common goals and values of such a divided region, a planning system is needed that will transcend political boundaries. Many multijurisdictional regions have developed mechanisms in order to make and implement policies, and to provide advice to governing authorities. These mechanisms are considered as possible models for the components of a transborder planning system for sustainable development in the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor. A theoretical planning system is constructed and presented to a set of targeted individuals for evaluation. Many conflicts emerge between the theoretical planning system and the political realities of the study region. The goal of sustainability requires the resolution of such conflicts in the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor and in other planning regions.
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Chapter 1
THE VANCOUVER-SEATTLE CORRIDOR: DEVELOPING A TRANSBORDER PLANNING SYSTEM FOR SUSTAINABILITY

1.0 Introduction

Community and regional planners are members of a profession which serves the public interest. One of the most important responsibilities of planners is that of allocating scarce resources among competing groups. By managing change, planners attempt to promote a course of action that will lead to a better future. Planners recommend policies to the communities which they serve that are compatible with their constituents' vision of a better world, and with the long-term greater good of society. In doing so, they utilize their own expertise, creativity, and independent thinking abilities.

Governmental structures which were designed to address the planning needs of the past may not be adequate to address the planning challenges of the present and future. In the study region to be initially defined as the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor, the major challenge at this time is that of sustainable development.

Given the dramatic growth pressures on the bioregion, special cooperative efforts are needed to preserve the quality of life of the area, including opportunities for employment, housing, and recreation. The fact is that livable places do not just happen, they are created by the people who live there....

This dissertation will develop and propose a planning system for the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor. The structure of that system will be specifically designed to implement a regional vision for sustainable development. As suggested by Artibise, planning will be viewed as a means for those who live in the region to create a livable place for themselves and for future generations.

The planning system must, above all, facilitate the process of creating a livable and sustainable region based upon the values of the region's citizens. The system should also operate across political boundaries, including the international border between the United States and Canada. While it is appropriate for the planning function to be exercised at the local level, standards should be set to ensure that the goals of the larger region are not compromised. Enforcement mechanisms are needed to ensure that the governments which carry out planning functions within the region adhere to the standards.

1.1 A Sustainable Urban Region

It is the concern of this dissertation to develop a system of mechanisms for planning for "sustainability" in the "Vancouver-Seattle Corridor." The term "sustainability" has become fashionable in recent years, and has been used (and abused) to mean many different things. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, "sustainable" is an adjective meaning:

1. Capable of being borne or endured; supportable, bearable.
2. Capable of being upheld or defended; maintainable.
3. Capable of being maintained at a certain rate or level.
   ... Hence sustainability.²

For the purposes of this dissertation, the above definition of "sustainable" will be used as a starting point. "Sustainable" development is that which may be supported by available resources and maintained over time. Regional "sustainability" thus implies a development pattern that will allow each generation to benefit from the region's stock of resources without depleting the usability of those assets by subsequent generations. The stock of resources which is to be preserved has been defined differently by different scholars. To some, it refers to a specific set of wealth-generating natural assets, while to others, it refers to a constantly changing mixture of assets having equivalent value over the course of time.

Hutton and Davis, recognizing that non-renewable sources of wealth cannot be replaced, wrote of preserving the value of a variable stock of manufactured and natural assets. In an urban context, the "renewable capital stock" consists of "physical assets" (mainly infrastructure), "natural capital" (including environmental and natural resources), and "social or human capital" (skills, education, culture, etc.).³

---

Major planning documents define sustainability in a similar manner. The Brundtland Commission Report, *Our Common Future*, defines sustainable development as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." A report by Canada's National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy had a similar definition: "development which ensures that the utilization of resources and the environment today does not damage prospects for their use by future generations."

According to Rees and Roseland, the definitions of sustainability by Brundtland and the National Round Table are deficient, because they "advance economic growth as the principal vehicle for sustainability...." Rees and Roseland, citing Daly and Cobb, would instead distinguish "sustainable development" from "growth" as the "qualitative change in a physically nongrowing economic system in dynamic equilibrium with the environment." This implies that the sizes of, and the resource input and output ("through-put") requirements for, the sustainable communities would never change, resulting in a utopian, conflict-free steady state.

The arguments of Rees, Roseland, Daly, and Cobb are based upon

---

4 WCED, *Our Common Future*, 43.
5 Rees and Roseland, "Sustainable Communities," 15.
6 Rees and Roseland, "Sustainable Communities," 16; and Daly and Cobb, *For the Common Good*, 71.
the assertion that a growing economy is "unsustainable" since the carrying capacity of the environment is a function of its natural capital, which in turn is being depleted by growth. They argue that the substitution of human ingenuity and technology for natural capital is also unsustainable.\(^7\) Worldwide movement of goods is also said to be unsustainable, as expressed in Wismer's "Principles of Sustainable Development," one of which is "Local self-reliance." According to Rees, an unequal distribution of wealth, "between and within nations," is also unsustainable.\(^8\)

Some of the above arguments are very powerful, but are not proven scientific facts. They are based upon assumptions about future technologies and class economics which are beyond the scope of this thesis. Some of the social and economic constants which are implicit in steady-state sustainability theory may indeed be variable. Predictions of resource depletion are largely based on the projection of trends from the past into the future, and may not be accurate. For these reasons, the working definition of "sustainability" for purposes of this dissertation will be that of the Oxford English Dictionary, as reflected in the Brundtland Report and the Report of National Round Table.

While it is not the concern of this dissertation to develop

\(^7\) Rees and Roseland, "Sustainable Communities," 17; and Daly and Cobb, For the Common Good, 22.

\(^8\) Rees, "Defining Sustainable Development," 5-7.
specific standards and plans, there are certain parameters which must be considered as part of any attempt to create a sustainable region. In an urban region such as the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor, planning for regional sustainability will involve the following parameters:

**Basic needs and quality of life:** Citizens should have the opportunity to secure adequate food, clothing, and shelter for themselves and their families within their communities. A minimum standard of living, somewhat above the minimum required for survival, should be realistically possible for all citizens. Opportunities for public outdoor recreation should be preserved as well.

**Environmental quality and resources:** Acceptable levels of environmental quality and adequate stocks of natural resources must be maintained continuously. This implies the following:

**Consumption:** Present lifestyles cannot be maintained at the expense of future generations. If consumption of "natural capital" erodes nature's capacity to generate wealth (a "natural capital deficit"), future inhabitants may be forced to erode that capital stock even further for their own

---

9 While the parameters of sustainability listed below are those of the author, they reflect the concerns of Roseland, Rees, Daly and Cobb, and others.
survival.

Land use patterns and transportation: The demand for land for human activities must be managed so that it does not excessively deplete the resources which sustain human and other life. The demand for transportation can also deplete the resources (such as land and energy) which sustain human and other life, and it, too, must be managed. The demands for transportation and land resources are interlinked, and public policy should not treat them as if they were separate issues. Physical separation between activities such as housing, shopping, and employment should not be encouraged, except as necessary to promote public health and safety.

Community and regional citizenship: The people who live in a sustainable region are responsible citizens of that region and of smaller communities within the region. These people and their governments, businesses, and other organizations are part of the region’s social, economic, and environmental systems.

Impact and dependence upon rest of the world: A region which maintains its consumption levels by eroding the
sustainability of other regions is not sustainable. A region which is dependent upon unreliable, unstable, or marginally accessible places, either as markets for its products or as sources for its basic needs, is not a sustainable region. This is not meant to preclude all trade relationships with other regions; only those which are unsustainable. For example, if a region's resources are extracted by the world economy at a faster rate than new resources can be generated, an unsustainable trade relationship is taking place. The economics of trade in a sustainable region will be discussed in section 2.2.

1.2 A Planning System for Sustainability

The goal of this dissertation is to propose a possible planning system for sustainable development in the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor. This goal is summarized below in a formal problem statement:

Effective regional planning in the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor will require that intergovernmental and government–citizen relationships be redefined as part of a new "social contract."

A planning system is needed which will empower the governments, communities, and citizens of the study region to carry out their vision of sustainable development. The system must be flexible enough so that the range of choices faced will be meaningful and
diverse. At the same time, it must be ensured that responsibilities and obligations to the larger region and to future generations will be not be avoided.

The components which make up the planning system will be derived from existing models for regional cooperation. The system as a whole will be designed specifically for the study region, the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor, and for sustainability. Four basic functions must be included: (1) bringing people together to develop visions for their communities and region and plan according to their shared values; (2) overcoming barriers to cooperation across jurisdictional boundaries; (3) setting region-wide planning standards; and (4) ensuring that those standards will be enforced and upheld.

The primary study region for the purposes of this thesis is defined as the "Vancouver-Seattle Corridor." It consists of the urbanized portions of British Columbia’s Lower Mainland plus the six Washington counties which line the eastern shore of Puget Sound/Strait of Georgia and are within its drainage basin. The Strait of Georgia-Puget Sound Basin, or simply the Georgia Basin, will be defined as an expanded or alternative study region. The selection of these boundaries will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.

Map 1.1 illustrates the boundaries of the Vancouver-Seattle
Corridor and Georgia Basin study regions. Table 1.2 lists the counties and regional districts, and portions thereof, that are within the boundaries of the regional districts. The definition of the study region will be scrutinized during the field interviews, which will be documented in the final chapter.

Unlike other transborder planning regions, the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor is defined more for its shared concerns about the future than for its past and present linkages. The international border, which was drawn in the Oregon Treaty of 1846, has not had a significant history of conflict.¹⁰ The Corridor is separated from its surroundings by water and mountains and is united by common problems and concerns. Its boundaries were drawn to follow political boundaries as well as geographic features. It is not so large as to seem vast and alien to its citizens, while it is large enough to contain many intrametropolitan externalities.

There are several names and definitions of transborder regions which include the Vancouver—Seattle corridor. One is the "Pacific

¹⁰ Although the border was drawn from east to west, the early history of the study region reflects the natural regions extending from north to south. Before the railroads were built, the logical direction of trade was in fact north-south. In Winter Brothers, Ivan Doig documented the experiences of the settlers, natives, and territorial administrators in coastal Washington during the 19th Century. Puget Sound, the Straits of Georgia and Juan de Fuca, and the Pacific coast defined their economic and cultural region, while the border meant little. The interior Kootenay and Arrow Lakes regions of B.C. and Portland, Oregon were linked with each other by the Columbia River, rather than with Vancouver and Seattle (McIlwraith, "Transport in the Borderlands, 77).
Northwest" (as in the Pacific Northwest Economic Partnership and the Pacific Northwest Economic Region), a vast region defined by state and provincial boundaries. Schell and Hamer also list "The New Pacific," the "North Pacific West," "The Northeast Pacific Rim," and "Pacifica" as labels applied to the region.11 The British Columbia Round Table on the Environment and the Economy has discussed the "Georgia Basin—Puget Sound Region," as defined by these water basins.

"Ecotopia" and "Cascadia" are terms which may imply either a coastal strip, a "bioregion," a political region, a water basin, or a highway corridor; depending upon the user of these words and the situation. When these terms are used, they often imply not only a physical or economic region but a group of people with a distinctive culture.

Garreau, in The Nine Nations of North America, asserted that political boundaries do not reveal "the way North America really works." According to Garreau, North Americans have a regional loyalty to one of nine "nations" which competes with their official citizenships. Each of the Nine Nations (five of which span the U.S.-Canada border) "has a distinct prism through which it views the world."12

---

11 Schell and Hamer, "Future of Cascadia."

Ecotopia, one of Joel Garreau's Nine Nations, is a coastal strip running from California to Alaska. It is a "nation" not only because of its geography, but because of a unifying common culture, with distinct values and attitudes. Garreau borrowed the term from Ernest Callenbach's 1975 novel, Ecotopia, and modified its borders to better reflect the true boundaries of "Ecotopian" culture. Callenbach's fictional Ecotopia, which included the entire states of Oregon and Washington, as well as Northern California (but neither British Columbia nor Alaska), seceded from the United States because of conflicts with American values. Garreau described the philosophy of life which sets his Ecotopia apart from the remainder of the continent:

Foundry-like unemployment and recession are simply not overwhelming concerns in the Pacific Northwest, which is developing the industries of the twenty-first century.... Its natural markets and its lessons about living are in Asia [rather than Europe].... The mistakes Ecotopia fears it may repeat are not those of the Foundry, but those of the boom towns of dry, sunny MexAmerica.13

There are some paths into the twenty-first century that are very different from the bigger-is-better, growth-is-inevitably-good, sons-of-the-pioneers philosophies that are especially well represented in the MexAmerican and Empty Quarter nations of the West.14

Ecotopia is also defined by Garreau for its Anglo-Saxon culture, including "its highly civilized traditions and handsome scenery." According to Garreau, Ecotopians dream "upper-middle-class Anglo dreams." Ecotopians "consider themselves to be

13 Ibid.
14 Ibid., 250.
politically liberal, independent thinkers, artistic, to value self-sufficiency, and to believe that they influence what happens in the world around them."\textsuperscript{15}

The transborder culture which is described above will be an asset in building the sense of regional citizenship which is desired in the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor study region. The fact that many of the cultural values described above are compatible with sustainable development goals will be a further asset. The task of building and transforming a transborder regional citizenship will be facilitated by utilizing sustainability as a unifying principle.

Throughout history, social theorists have proposed the use of unifying principles as a tool for moulding populations into cohesive social units. Social cohesion is an important influence on cooperation. Without social cohesion at both the individual and intergovernmental levels, planners would only be able to achieve cooperation through coercion, at the expense of freedom. When opposing interests are at stake, social cohesion holds the conflicting stakeholders within the same society and under the same governmental authority.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 257,272. The study region's people are largely of northern European and Protestant extraction. T. Hutton believes that Seattle's "Protestant work ethic" was enhanced by immigrants of German and Scandinavian extraction, which are less numerous in Vancouver.
Fortunately, democratic societies have been shown to be capable of cohesion when their citizens and local governments are convinced that their freedoms and values are truly threatened. As a unifying principle, sustainability could potentially promote an even greater measure of social cohesion within the study region. Such principles must be applied with moderation if they are to succeed in real life. If the methods used are too harsh, the potential short term losses of some individuals, businesses, and governments will discourage their voluntary cooperation, and polarize, rather than unify, the society.16

Planning issues are not contained by jurisdictional lines, as the ecological, social, and economic effects of planning decisions spill across political boundaries. Cooperative transborder planning may help to resolve conflicts across borders and reconcile differences between governments, while the people and governments work together for a sustainable region.

Multijurisdictional planning is analogous to coordinating the efforts of many individuals. Although each individual may be acting in his or her own self interest, there may exist, implicitly or potentially, interests or values which are shared among them. In a transborder region, the task of coordination is further complicated by differences in culture and in the regulatory

16 See Wilson, Politics of Moderation, for a discussion of why moderation is desirable in the use of governmental power. Wilson’s analysis is an interpretation of the dialogues of Plato’s Republic.
requirements of senior governments.

Political philosophers have used the mechanism of a "social contract" to describe the commitment of individual actors to form a social unit or to submit to authority. Although such "contracts" are seldom formally drawn and signed, they exist in theory, and are recognized at least implicitly. If people did not behave as if there were such a contract, collective action within a system of rules would be impossible.¹⁷ This applies to actions by collections of governments as well as collections of individuals.

There are several theoretical models for planning across international and jurisdictional borders, which will be explored and analyzed in Chapter 5. These models have been developed in order to redress grievances among governmental units, deal with "traditional" border issues (e.g., allocation of water, ecological spillovers, border-crossing points), and take advantage of economies of scale.

This dissertation will move beyond these traditional areas of cooperation. Planning has been envisioned not merely as a technical and political tool of governments, but as a means for transforming societies from within. This vision of planning will be extended to a transborder region or community.

The transborder planning system which is to be developed in this thesis will be designed to turn the common goals of citizens into common action, and their ideals into reality. Mechanisms already exist to deal with most of the "traditional" border issues along the Canada-U.S. and Washington-B.C. borders. While some of these functions may be incorporated into the proposed planning system, it will aim to touch the lives of citizens in additional ways.

The planning system will be designed to develop and implement a common vision for the future of the study region, based on the similarity of concerns on both sides of the border. By creating a cooperative, interactive system of planning mechanisms for sustainability, it is hoped that citizenship at all levels can be given new meaning. By utilizing models for policy making, policy implementation, and policy advising as interlinked components in a planning system, it is hoped that planning for sustainability will become more effective.

1.3 Dissertation Design and Research Questions

This dissertation is divided into six chapters. Each chapter is intended to build on the findings of previous chapters and address certain fundamental research questions.

Chapter 1 defines the concept of a sustainable urban region and raises the need for a transborder planning system in the study
region.

What are the general parameters (or dimensions) of sustainability in an urban region?

What special functions need to be addressed by a planning system which is to have as its goal the sustainability of the study region?

Chapter 2 will present the specific conditions which have created the need for transborder regional planning in the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor. Rapid growth has forced the region’s governments to consider issues of sustainable urban form. A history of economic dependence and marginalization, as well as recent economic restructuring, have raised concerns about the need to bring about sustainable patterns of economic development. Finally, the region’s system of governance, must be addressed as a potential obstacle to planning for regional sustainability.

What issues must be addressed in planning for a sustainable future in the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor?

Chapter 3 provides a general overview of the context of the problem within planning and political science theory. Chapter 3 will introduce the theoretical questions which this thesis intends to address:

How will the concepts of sovereignty and local autonomy impact the design of the planning system?

What additional challenges result from the need to adhere
to democratic ideals and the general difficulty of exercising authority in a rapidly changing world?

Chapter 4 will describe the elements of the planning model which are essential in order to address various legal and practical requirements, as well as the theoretical questions which were raised in Chapter 3.

Chapter 5 will present several models based on existing planning mechanisms for achieving cooperation. These models will be examined to determine their potential roles as components of a planning system, taking into account the findings of all previous chapters. The result, a planning system designed to address issues of sustainability in the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor, will be presented.

What types of mechanisms have been developed to deal with transborder and multijurisdictional planning issues? How can these mechanisms be utilized as components of a system that will allow for effective regional planning while respecting local values and preferences?

Chapter 6 contains the results of interviews with a variety of people who have potential roles in the proposed planning system. Conclusions will be made regarding the theoretical and practical validity of the proposed planning system.

What is the reaction to the proposed planning system of
governmental officials and other experts?

How can the planning system be put in place, given the political and economic realities which all planning efforts are up against?

What are the applications of the research findings as a model for transborder planning in regions other than the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor?
Map 1.1
Georgia Basin & the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TABLE 1.1 - GLOSSARY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cascadia, Ecotopia, New Pacific, Northeast Pacific Rim, North Pacific West, Pacifica:</strong> Transborder regions which have been defined by some authors to include the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor, and refer to the general region in which the Corridor is located.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georgia Basin-Puget Sound Region:</strong> The land and water which are part of the drainage basins of the Strait of Georgia and Puget Sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Region:</strong> A hypothetical region which is to be united by a common or linked planning system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning System:</strong> The policy structure in which planning takes place; the components of which are policy making, policy advising, and policy implementation mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Cohesion:</strong> Forces which hold a society together as a social unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Contract:</strong> (1) Commitment of individual actors to form a social unit. (2) Commitment of individual actors to submit to authority in return for governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Region:</strong> The planning region which is the case study for this thesis. It will be initially defined as the &quot;Vancouver-Seattle Corridor,&quot; as defined below in this table. The definition of the study region may be revised in later chapters to reflect the interview results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Development:</strong> Development which may be supported by available resources and maintained over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability:</strong> A condition of being sustainable; of being capable of being borne and maintained at a certain rate or level over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vancouver-Seattle Corridor:</strong> The primary study region of this dissertation. It will include the urbanized portions of the British Columbia Lower Mainland and the six counties which line the eastern shore of Puget Sound. The study region may be redefined in later chapters to reflect the interview results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 1.2 - JURISDICTIONS (AND PORTIONS THEREOF\textsuperscript{18}) IN THE VANCOUVER-SEATTLE CORRIDOR STUDY REGION AND THE GEORGIA BASIN\textsuperscript{19}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Washington State</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Area (sq.km)</th>
<th>1990 popn.</th>
<th>estimated within:</th>
<th>estimated within:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% area</td>
<td>% popn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clallam</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>56,464</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>60,195</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>4,675</td>
<td>20,146</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>5,512</td>
<td>1,507,319</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>189,731</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>6,239</td>
<td>59,358</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>38,341</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>4,338</td>
<td>586,203</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>10,035</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit</td>
<td>4,494</td>
<td>79,555</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>5,434</td>
<td>465,642</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>161,238</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>5,504</td>
<td>127,780</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>47,139</td>
<td>3,362,007</td>
<td><strong>55.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.C. Regional District</th>
<th>Area (sq.km)</th>
<th>1991 popn.</th>
<th>estimated within:</th>
<th>estimated within:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% area</td>
<td>% popn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>2,442.5</td>
<td>299,733</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cen.Fr.V.</td>
<td>402.3</td>
<td>87,360</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com.-St.</td>
<td>20,295.5</td>
<td>82,886</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow.Val.</td>
<td>3,508.3</td>
<td>60,683</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewd.Al.</td>
<td>2,860.8</td>
<td>89,968</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.Cheam</td>
<td>11,003.2</td>
<td>68,681</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr.Vcvcr.</td>
<td>2,936.6</td>
<td>1,542,744</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>2,081.6</td>
<td>101,736</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pow.Riv.</td>
<td>5,264.2</td>
<td>19,217</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq.Lil.</td>
<td>16,692.4</td>
<td>24,384</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun.Cst.</td>
<td>3,823.9</td>
<td>20,831</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>71,311.3</td>
<td>2,398,223</td>
<td><strong>8.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Washington Counties and British Columbia Regional Districts

|                        |            |            |            |            |            |            |
|                        |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| **Totals**             | 118,450    | 5,760,230  | **27.5%**  | **81.6%** | **85.3%** | **97.9%** |

\textsuperscript{18} The percentages given below indicate the portion of a county's or regional district's total area or population estimated to lie within the boundaries of the study region.

\textsuperscript{19} See note regarding sources on the following page.
TABLE 1.2 (Continued) - JURISDICTIONS (AND PORTIONS THEREOF) IN THE VANCOUVER-SEATTLE CORRIDOR STUDY REGION AND THE GEORGIA BASIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wash. portions</th>
<th>B.C. portions</th>
<th>Washington and B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total areas and populations:</td>
<td>26,350</td>
<td>6,247</td>
<td>32,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van.-Sea. Corr. area sq.km. popn.</td>
<td>2,887,428</td>
<td>1,814,283</td>
<td>4,701,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georg.-Pug. Basin area sq.km. popn.</td>
<td>34,844</td>
<td>66,237</td>
<td>101,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes on Sources for Table 1.2:

For the Central Fraser Valley, Dewdney-Alouette, Fraser-Cheam, Sunshine Coast, and Squamish-Lillooet Regional Districts, the boundaries of the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor are approximately the same as the electoral area and municipal boundaries. Areas and populations were estimated using the electoral area and municipal figures, listed in B.C. Municipal Affairs, Statistics Relating, 1993. For the Comox-Strathcona Regional District, a similar method was used in estimating its area and population within the Georgia Basin. Its Village of Gold River and Electoral Areas D and G straddle the Basin boundary. Their areas and populations were apportioned as 50%, 70%, and 10%, respectively, within the Basin boundary.

Letters of inquiry were mailed to the Comox-Strathcona Regional District, and the Counties of Thurston, Clallam, Lewis, Jefferson, and Mason to obtain more accurate data. The planning departments of Thurston, Lewis, Clallam, and Mason Counties responded to the letters of inquiry. They provided written estimates of the population and land area of the portions of their counties lying within the Georgia Basin and Vancouver-Seattle Corridor boundaries. (Thurston County: Ron Towle, letter to author, 23 February 1994. Lewis County: Mike Zengel, letter to author, 25 January 1994. Clallam County: Richard James, letter to author, 18 February 1994. Mason County: Dee Townsend, letter to author, 19 April 1994.)

For Jefferson County, the population of the county seat, Port Townsend, which lies inside the Basin, was given in the World Almanac. There were no other places with populations over 5000 within the County. The remainder of the population was assumed to be uniformly distributed over the County's land area.

The populations of the areas in question are relatively small compared to that of the Georgia Basin or the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor as a whole. Any errors made in the above approximations are therefore not of statistical significance.
Chapter 2
THE VANCOUVER-SEATTLE CORRIDOR: TRANSBORDER ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

2.0 Introduction to the Study Region: Geography and Sustainability

The need for a planning system for sustainability in the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor has multiple dimensions. The geographic features and political boundaries which define the study region have influenced the region’s development, and will continue to do so. The region’s environmental and economic health are directly related to the parameters of sustainability. Governments in the study region have implemented policies which are intended to address some of the environmental and economic parameters of sustainable development. The development of a sustainable region may ultimately require that some of the defining characteristics of government and society in the study region be modified or replaced.

The Vancouver-Seattle Corridor is defined by the Georgia Basin-Puget Sound coastline and the mountains which separate it from the remainder of North America. This physical isolation, along with the international border which generally follows the 49th Parallel, have greatly influenced the region’s development.

The Vancouver-Seattle Corridor will be defined as the Pacific Fraser Region of British Columbia’s Lower Mainland\(^1\) plus the six Washington State counties on the eastern shore of Puget

\(^1\) Seelig and Artibise, *From Desolation to Hope.*
Sound/Georgia Strait (From Whatcom to Thurston). A portion of Thurston County which lies outside the Georgia Basin will be excluded from the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor. The question of the study region's boundaries will be raised during the field interviews, which will be documented in the final chapter.

Vancouver and Seattle are the two urban hubs of the study region. The City of Vancouver is 35 kilometres north of the 49th parallel, although it is about 50 kilometres northwest of the border crossing at Blaine. Bellingham is 26.7 km south of the Blaine border crossing, while Seattle lies 154.6 km south of the 49th Parallel.

Beginning at the southwest corner of Delta, the borders of the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) follow the Georgia Strait shoreline northward past Lion's Bay (including Bowen Island), and extend eastward to include Coquitlam, southward to include Langley, and westward along the U.S. border to include Delta and White Rock. The Vancouver CMA (Census Metropolitan Area) also includes Pitt Meadows and Maple Ridge, which are in the Dewdney-Alouette Regional District. Seelig and Artibise expanded the definition of Metropolitan Vancouver from the GVRD to the

---

2 Although Victoria is a major urban centre of the Georgia Basin, it was excluded from the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor study region because of its physical isolation from the mainland.

"Pacific Fraser Region": the "functional region" extending from Desolation Sound on the Sunshine Coast to Hope in the Fraser Valley.⁴

Seelig and Artibise expanded the defined region so that it would be "large enough to encompass the major demographic, social, economic and ecological issues we must face if we are to maintain the quality of life we so cherish."⁵ This chapter will argue that the defined study region must be expanded into Washington State for the very same reasons cited by Seelig and Artibise in From Desolation to Hope.

Map 1.1, which follows Chapter 1, shows the boundaries of the Georgia Basin and the Vancouver–Seattle Corridor (the primary study region) and the regional district and county boundaries. Table 1.2 lists, for each regional district and county, its total area and population, and the estimated percent of that area and population which lie within the Corridor and Basin boundaries.

The natural valley of the Fraser River forms a "well-defined bowl" which includes Seelig and Artibise's Pacific Fraser Region and much of Whatcom County, Washington. The "bowl" is bounded by

---

⁴ Seelig and Artibise, From Desolation to Hope.
⁵ Ibid., 5–8.
mountains to the north and east, and by salt water to the west.\textsuperscript{6} To the south, the natural region follows the coastline to Olympia, and includes the Washington counties of Skagit, Snohomish, King, Pierce, and Thurston. Vancouver Island and the western shore of Puget Sound are isolated from the Corridor by water, and the eastern and southern portions of Washington State are isolated from the Corridor by mountains.

Unified by common air and water basins, the study region is fragmented by political boundaries, local and international. Its physical isolation from the larger population centres of North America has helped to delay its population growth and has preserved its natural amenities relative to the continent's other major metropolitan regions.

Its location on the distant frontiers of two westwardly-expanding nation-states has also contributed to the development of a peripheral resource-based economy and mentality throughout the region. Rather than fostering indigenous economic activity, the region's governments have historically competed with one another to attract investment and activity from the economic core: railroads; gold prospectors; and multinational corporations. With such a mentality, there is little incentive to cooperate and plan for the future.

As the region has become increasingly urbanized and technology has advanced, cooperation has become inevitable. Issues are no longer contained by political boundaries. More coordinated planning would help to maximize the benefits of environmental stewardship and insure that the region will survive and prosper as a whole.

The division of the planning region by the international border has affected its human settlement patterns. For reasons of geography and (especially) climate, the population of the British Columbia Mainland is clustered along the American border. Canada's border strip is its heartland. In fact, approximately three out of four Canadians live within 150 miles (241.9 km) of the U.S. border.7

In Washington State, it is the Everett-Seattle-Tacoma corridor along Interstate 5 which is the most urbanized and is continuing to experience the pressures of population growth. Northwest Washington experiences some growth pressures from Vancouver, but not of the same magnitude. Without the international border, however, the northern end of the I-5 corridor would experience similar pressures, as the "bowl" of the Fraser River drainage basin would tend to be filled in a uniform manner.8 If that border

---

7 Alper, "U.S.-Canada Regional Diplomacy," 121-22.

were ever to be effectively dismantled as a barrier, growth pressures on Whatcom County would become overwhelming.

When Vancouverites seek open spaces and a destination for family trips, the border is the weakest of the barriers, compared to the mountains and sea. Gerard Rutan wrote in 1977, "Thus, like toothpaste squeezed out of a tube under increasing pressure, Canadians from the Lower Mainland of British Columbia have come south to Whatcom County."  

Canadian influence on Whatcom County follows four "paths": (1) shopping and tourism; (2) real estate purchases; (3) closeness of metropolitan Vancouver compared to Seattle (especially rapidly growing municipalities south of the Fraser); and (4) movement across the border as developable land on the Canadian side is used up.  

Thus, the economic activities, resource consumption patterns, and land use and transportation patterns which are part of the lifestyles of Vancouverites (and are parameters of sustainability) are not completely contained by the international border.

The lack of transborder policy coordination reduces the


effectiveness of any governmental efforts to deal with issues of environmental sustainability. For example, the potential effectiveness of Canada's higher gasoline prices in achieving transportation planning objectives in border communities is reduced by the availability of cheap and abundant gasoline in the automobile-addicted United States.

2.1 Environmental Sustainability Issues

Seattle's development pattern in the post-World War II era had a negative impact on the environmental parameters of sustainability. An extensive freeway network opened up large tracts of suburban land in the Seattle area, and contributed to the decline of mass transit there. The sprawling pattern of development which has been characteristic of post-World War II growth in the Everett-Seattle-Tacoma corridor led to the Washington State Growth Management Act of 1990. Just between 1982 and 1987, "over 80,000 acres [32,376 hectares] of farmland in the Puget Sound region were converted to other uses."11

Meanwhile, the Vancouver region's development pattern showed a greater consideration of the environmental parameters of sustainability. The Vancouver region supported public transportation and preserved large amounts of farmland within its urbanized districts; land which could be threatened if the

development patterns of the 1980s are allowed to continue.

Less than four per cent of British Columbia's land base is classified as being capable of producing a variety of crops, yet from 1981 to 1986, 20 per cent of the land converted to urban use was prime farmland. In the lower Fraser Valley alone, some 4,354 hectares of rural land were urbanized between 1980-87, of which 1,127 hectares or 26 per cent was farmland.¹²

According to Oberlander and Smith, there was an era in Vancouver (roughly, from 1952 through 1967) during which public transportation declined and the automobile achieved dominance. Proposals brought forth in 1966 to build a freeway system mobilized opposition from the public. According to Oberlander and Smith, this resulted in the end of the "era of the private automobile" and the "re-emergence of public transit" as a priority.¹³ The facts cited below raise doubts as to whether automobile dominance has in fact ended in Vancouver.

The period which Oberlander and Smith refer to as the auto-dominant period was one of "heavy road and bridge construction." The transportation system proposed in the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board's "Choice and Challenge" (1963) strategic plan would have covered the entire region with an extensive freeway grid of 10-mile spacing. It was never fully implemented.¹⁴

¹² B.C. Round Table, Towards a Strategy for Sustainability, 84.
The automobile, nonetheless, remains the dominant mode of transportation in both the Vancouver and Seattle regions. Given recent trends, the regions are on a path to even greater automobile dominance.

Between 1961 and 1987 single occupancy vehicle trips increased from 58% to 69% of all trips in the four-county Central Puget Sound region of King, Snohomish, Kitsap, and Pierce Counties. In the same period, public transit's share of all trips decreased from 5.2% to 3.3% according to the Puget Sound Regional Council's latest study.\textsuperscript{15}

In the period 1985 to 1992...[in the GVRD] transit's region-wide share of the travel declined... from 11.2% to 9.9% of the total number of peak period trips... the share of all trips represented by automobile drivers increased... from 54.3% to 56.6%....\textsuperscript{16}

Population growth in the study region has compounded the problems of land-intensive and energy-intensive lifestyles, and made the need to work towards sustainability even more urgent. The magnitude of population growth in the study region is higher than in most other North American urban regions.

Metropolitan Vancouver and Seattle were tied in fourth place in a comparison of the growth rates of the major (population over 1 million) urban areas of the U.S. and Canada. During that five year period (1986 through 1990) only Orlando, Sacramento, and San Diego grew faster.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15} Agnew, Cross-Border Issues, 3.
\textsuperscript{16} Transport 2021, Long Range Transportation Plan, 11.
\textsuperscript{17} Agnew, Cross-Border Issues, 3.
Table 2.1, which follows this chapter, shows the growth in the populations of the counties and regional districts of the Georgia Basin over a ten year period: 1980-1990 for Washington; and 1981-1991 for British Columbia. Densities are computed using the 1990 and 1991 populations and the data from Table 1.2.

Predictions of future population in the Pacific Fraser Region, the Canadian portion of the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor, vary from 2.325 million by 2011 (by Statistics Canada), to 3.5 million by 2011 (by B.C. Business). Seelig and Artibise's prediction of 2.7 million by 2010 reflects an average annual growth rate of 2.3%; similar to the 1981-91 period shown in Table 2.1. The places on the Canadian side that are predicted to have highest population growth are Surrey and Abbotsford-Matsqui, both of which are adjacent to the international border.18

On the American side as well, border communities are projected to have some of the highest rates of growth. In accordance with Washington's Growth Management Act, Whatcom County has prepared population projections for 2010, with "low" and "high" forecasts. Whatcom's "low" and "high" forecasts represent an estimated population increase of between 33% and 60% over twenty years. Blaine's population is expected to increase between 70% and 100%

18 Seelig and Artibise, From Desolation to Hope, 9-10,15,21.
during the same (1990-2010) period.\textsuperscript{19}

Local, regional, and state/provincial governments in the planning region have responded to the problems of growth with policy documents, and less often, with action. These responses will be reviewed below and will be briefly discussed and compared.

The City of Vancouver’s Task Force on Atmospheric Change published its "Clouds of Change" Report in June 1990. Its thirty-five recommendations would lead to a drastic reduction in automobile usage and neighbourhood design based upon principles of sustainability and community self-reliance.\textsuperscript{20} While accepted by the City as "advice," few of its recommendations have been implemented.\textsuperscript{21}

Arguably, the social transformation which is envisioned in "Clouds of Change" cannot take place at the municipal level. It could also be argued that the fatal flaw of the "Clouds of Change" report was that it lacked a specific, implementable, "hard" policy component.

\textsuperscript{19} Property Counselors Real Estate, Population, Economic, and Housing Projections 1990-2000-2010, 8.

\textsuperscript{20} Vancouver, "Clouds of Change."

\textsuperscript{21} Munro, "Clouds of Change Plans Disappear." According to Munro, there was resistance within the City government to proposals which would require changes in personal behaviour.
Residents of the Greater Vancouver region feel that their quality of life is threatened by downtown congestion and long commutes, exacerbated by a growing population. Official GVRD planning policy has been to

restructure the population distribution away from the central city toward designated suburban municipalities. Encouragement of offices to locate in these satellite centres is held to be the key to the success of the development of these centres.22

This strategy has evolved since the 1960s, when an unprecedented 2.5% annual population growth rate took place in metro Vancouver. During the mid-1970s, the GVRD developed a document, The Livable Region 1976-1986, which set forth a strategy for managing growth in region. It included targets for residential growth, jobs-housing balance, an efficient transportation system, and multinucleation through the establishment of designated Regional Town Centres (RTC5). Each RTC was envisioned to contain 1 million square feet of office space, and serve a population of 100,000 to 150,000. The plan stated that its success was dependent upon the "locational propensity of future office development."23

The success of the plan was mixed. During 1977-82, there were higher growth rates in office and commercial floor space in Downtown Vancouver and in non-RTC suburban areas than in the RTCs. Federal government and regional authorities are "attempting to

22 Hutton and Davis, "Role of Office Location," 19.
23 Ibid., 20-21.
support the RTC program by establishing large office operations in the RTCs," but they have not been trendsetters for private development. Four RTCs were attempted simultaneously and without prioritization, which was perhaps too ambitious on the part of GVRD. GVRD was unable to prioritize among them because its decision-making is based on the consensus of 16 municipalities. The lack of CBD-RTC linkages allegedly constrains RTC development, although non-RTC suburban development appeared to be unconstrained.24

At the Provincial level, British Columbia has implemented a model of direct intervention since 1973. The Agricultural Land Commission will be discussed in greater detail in Chapters 4 and 5. Its purpose is to protect agricultural land from nonagricultural uses. It has prevented a uniform sprawl of development across the Lower Mainland's municipalities.

The City of Seattle's draft Comprehensive Plan 1994-2014: Toward a Sustainable Seattle, summarized in a condensed booklet, contains an "Urban Village Strategy." It recognizes that a refusal by the City to accept more growth (and at higher densities) will

24 Ibid., 22-30. In fact, two "new" RTCs, the Vancouver CBD, and numerous smaller "Centres" have been added to the GVRD's map since the concept was originated. See GVRD, Creating Our Future, 1990, 18. Creating our Future also modifies the RTC concept, viewing the RTCs as complementing one another rather than competing. It recognizes the value and uniqueness of the Vancouver CBD to the region and the province, and visualizes the RTCs as complete, balanced communities rather than as alternative office centres.
only lead to more sprawl in suburban King County and a loss of green space on the outskirts of the city. Like Vancouver's "Clouds of Change" report, it aims to reduce the usage of single occupant automobiles. As required by the Growth Management Act (described below and in later chapters), it addressed the place of the City's plan within those of the County and the Puget Sound region.²⁵

In 1979, the Puget Sound Council of Governments adopted its Regional Development Plan, which had much in common with the GVRD plan of 1975. Its goals included "Activity centers" (analogous to the GVRD's Regional Town Centres) and to "develop and implement policies to sustain agriculture."²⁶ The loss of farmland in the Puget Sound Region (32,376 hectares between 1982 and 1987) was much greater than that of the Lower Fraser Valley of B.C. (1,127 hectares between 1980 and 1987).²⁷

Vision 2020, the current Strategy and Transportation Plan for the Central Puget Sound Region, recognizes the continued loss of green space. It emphasizes strict urban growth boundaries, linkages between transportation and land use planning, a "Hierarchy of Central Places," and higher densities.²⁸

²⁵ Seattle, Citizens Guide.
²⁶ PSCOG, Regional Development Plan, 14.
²⁷ U.S. Bureau of the Census, cited by Agnew, Cross-Border Issues, 3; and B.C. Round Table, Towards a Strategy for Sustainability, 84.
²⁸ PSCOG, Region at a Crossroads.
Under Washington State's Growth Management Act (GMA), comprehensive planning is required if a county has a population over 50,000 and its growth rate exceeded 10 percent over the previous 10 years. All cities within the borders of such counties must also plan comprehensively under GMA. A plan's land use element must designate the "proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of land...." Many of the stated goals of GMA, listed below, are similar to the goals of planning in the Vancouver region:

...encouraging development in areas where public facilities exist or can be provided efficiently; reducing sprawl; encouraging multimodal transportation; provision of a wide range of housing options; encouraging economic development; preservation of open space; protecting the environment; citizen participation and coordination; ensuring the provision of adequate public services and facilities.

GMA also seeks to redirect growth to centres outside the Puget Sound region, which has "enjoyed" most of the previous growth in the State while other regions struggled economically. Just as the GVRD has had difficulty redirecting growth to its Regional Town Centres, any attempts to redirect growth from the Puget Sound region to Washington's interior will probably be limited in their success.

It has been argued that the configuration of regional development is just as much of an economic issue as it is an

---

29 Washington, Growth Management Planning.
30 Ibid.
environmental issue. Market forces of a global nature may be driving metropolitan decentralization regardless of urban public policy responses.

It therefore seems likely that settlement patterns of major metropolitan regions of advanced economies will become more similar as they continue to decentralize in a multinucleated fashion.\textsuperscript{31}

2.2 Economic Sustainability Issues

In order to successfully implement any regional strategy for sustainable development, the citizens and governments of the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor must envision and plan for their economic futures. According to one school of thought, they must not depend entirely on outside investment and world markets if they desire regional economic security. They should be able to refuse the demands of outside economic interests when they are not compatible with their own aspirations for a high quality of life and a healthy environment. At the other extreme are those who believe that open markets, government noninterference, and free trade are the only reasonable economic path.

The globalization of the economy has undermined the ability of governments to deal with economic problems at the regional level. As capital has become more mobile, ownership of a region’s economic assets by a business community with strong ties to a region is becoming increasingly rare. This is an obstacle to a region

\textsuperscript{31} Rothblatt, "Summary and Conclusions," 459.
seeking to take control of its own economic destiny.\textsuperscript{32} Below, the views of some economists on the causes of economic marginalization and their views on how regions may rise from the economic periphery will be discussed.

Even before Pacific Rim trade became dominant, Vancouver and Seattle had economies which were heavily dependent on exports and imports to and from distant markets; Europe and the urban centres of the North American industrial heartland. Joel Garreau pointed out one of the drawbacks of the current Pacific Rim trade: by exporting raw logs to Japan, British Columbia and Washington are exporting jobs.

\textsuperscript{T}here is some concern that Ecotopia is being reduced economically to nothing but a resource colony of the Asian industrial powers - surrendering its vital natural products in exchange for much more costly manufactured products.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{T}here is a real prospect of British Columbia exchanging its traditional hinterland status within the Canadian federation for an equally peripheral status in the Pacific sphere.\textsuperscript{34}

If the situations which Garreau and Hutton describe above are

\textsuperscript{32} In many regions which have rebounded from severe economic losses, the presence of a strong regional business elite has contributed to the apparent resilience. (Pittsburgh is a prime example.) If the major investors are "in" but not "of" the region (or often neither "in" nor "of" the region), they may not have the same level of commitment to reinvest there.

\textsuperscript{33} Garreau, \textit{The Nine Nations}, 280-281. While Garreau wrote that the Japanese did not want Ecotopia's lumber, Japan does in fact buy lumber as well as raw logs from "Ecotopian" forests.

\textsuperscript{34} Hutton, "Visions of a 'Post-Staples' Economy," 31.
in fact true of the study region, its existing form of economic development may be undesirable, according to Jane Jacobs' economic theories. Vancouver and Seattle have not yet generated "city regions" in which their economies are driven to produce goods locally as replacements for "imports" from other regions. Instead of replacing imports, both cities continue to use the export earnings of their hinterlands' production to buy imports and maintain (or increase) their standards of living.35

British Columbia "relies on foreign markets, exporting over 50 percent of its total goods production" to foreign countries.36 Including exports to other regions of Canada would make this percentage even higher. Although 75% of British Columbia's exports consist of forestry and mining products, 70% of its labour force, and 80% of (metro) Vancouver's labour force, are in the service sector.37

According to Jacobs, economic stagnation will be inevitable in such an economy: a "supply region."38 Overdependence on staple exports also results in a "highly cyclical economy, marked by pronounced 'boom and bust' phases. B.C.'s manufacturing and

36 Cohn, Merrifield, and Smith, "Cities in an Interdependent World," 83.
37 Hutton and Ley, "Location, Linkages, and Labour," 129.
services sectors, including "producer" services, are also dependent on the resource sector, with which their development has been closely linked. Although staple exports have been responsible for increased standards of living, such income growth is not sustainable. In the case of B.C., staple exports have purchased affluence by forcing certain costs upon future generations, in the forms of environmental degradation, social problems, and government debt. The average 4.8 percent per annum of "real" (constant dollar) growth in B.C.'s Gross Domestic Product between 1961 and 1989 does not account for these costs. Such growth is therefore unsustainable.39

According to Jane Jacobs, when imports are replaced with locally produced goods, money becomes available to purchase other imports. If local producers replace these new imports, there is potential for a continuous cycle of import replacement and import diversification. The result would be a dynamic, complex, interlinked city economy and the generation of a "city region" (as defined by Jacobs) which could conceivably encompass both of the study region's metropolitan areas. City region formation is also stimulated when the city trades with a partner which is nearby and

39 Hutton, "Visions of a 'Post-Staples' Economy," 1-9, 18-23. According to Hutton, however, there are now "structural shifts" underway in the British Columbia economy. Hutton cites several studies showing that the province's dependence on the resource sector is lessening. While Vancouver and Seattle are orienting their economies toward the Pacific Rim, secondary business centres are increasingly serving the needs of the interior resource regions.
in a similar stage of development, as are Vancouver and Seattle.\textsuperscript{40}

When a region supplies the world economy without the internal forward and backward economic linkages present in a "city region," the result is a "supply region." In both of Jacobs' models, earnings from exports are used to buy imports. In the "supply region" model, however, there is no cycle of import replacement and import diversification. The mentality of the "supply region" is to supply world markets with resources from the hinterland and to import needed goods and services. Urban residents are effectively living off the production of their hinterland and are not using their own ingenuity to produce wealth. When services are provided locally rather than imported, economic niches are likely to be filled by emerging enterprises.\textsuperscript{41}

With the recent expansion of producer services in Vancouver and the influx of Asian capital into the region, the necessary conditions for developing an import-replacing city region (as defined by Jacobs) may now be in place. Immigrants have brought an entrepreneurial spirit and a supply of capital with them to Canada. Services and products which were once imported are being produced in Vancouver by locally based companies. As a result, Vancouver (and similarly, Seattle) might be emerging from the periphery of the world economy.

\textsuperscript{40} Jacobs, \textit{Cities and the Wealth of Nations}, 135-145.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.
Corporate economists such as Kenichi Ohmae belong to a school of thought which represents the opposite of Jacobs' views. They would disagree with Jacob's thesis, insisting that serving the needs of the global economy is more important to regional development than is import replacement. City region formation goes against Ohmae's notion of an Interlinked World Economy in which the trend is regional specialization.\footnote{Ohmae, The Borderless World.}

In Ohmae's view, the benefits of membership in the society of global consumers far outweigh the disadvantages of dependency and marginalization. Below, an intermediate position between Jacobs' and Ohmae's extremes will be discussed: a position which neither totally rejects nor completely accepts the region's role in the global economy.

Hutton and Davis make a careful distinction between two paths for participation in the global economy. If a city or region actively pursues international opportunities (in the Pacific Rim, in this case), while linking environmental and economic goals and policies, it is taking steps towards sustainable development. For Vancouver and Seattle, the steps taken in pursuit of such activities may involve investments in the region's physical and social infrastructures. If, however, the city or region is merely "hosting" multinational corporations and their activities, the result is a less sustainable form of development; less resilient,
less dependable, and more vulnerable to booms and busts.\textsuperscript{43}

Hutton and Ley found dense inter-firm linkages within the metropolitan core of Vancouver, including strong backward linkages. Forward linkages were not as dense, and were found across a more extensive territory: the B.C. hinterland; the rest of Canada; the U.S.; and overseas.\textsuperscript{44} In Seattle, Boeing was found to have very few forward or backward linkages to the local economy, other than its labour market.\textsuperscript{45} Regional dependence on "boom and bust" industries creates a highly cyclical economy. If local enterprises had arisen to fill economic niches created by Boeing, those enterprises may have exploited alternative markets for their services and goods during Boeing's "down cycle." If, however, such enterprises were entirely dependent on Boeing (rather than merely "linked"), they would rise and fall with Boeing's cycles.

According to Hutton, the fortunes of "advanced staple-producing regions" continue to depend on their resource endowments, combined with economic factors such as external demand and terms of trade. Both British Columbia and Washington could have a bright economic future, if they are innovative and effective in making a transition to "sustainable" patterns of development. To try to

\textsuperscript{43} Hutton and Davis, "Prospects for Vancouver's Sustainable Development," 83-84.

\textsuperscript{44} Hutton and Ley, "Location, Linkages, and Labour," 133-38.

\textsuperscript{45} Beyers, lecture, 5 March 1993; and Beyers, "From Seattle to the World."
maintain the income growth rates of the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s by imposing costs on future generations will only make the transition to sustainability more painful.\textsuperscript{46} Below, the efforts of the study region’s governments to bring their economies into the next century will be reviewed.

At the local level, Seattle and its suburbs have made economic development (including its international aspects) a more explicit concern than has Vancouver.\textsuperscript{47} One possible explanation may be the influence of Seattle’s comparatively larger corporate headquarters complex. Another explanation is the fierce competition between jurisdictions in all regions of the U.S. to attract all types of economic activity, in contrast to the Canadian pattern of regional specialization.\textsuperscript{48}

Both central cities have used their "sister cities" programmes to develop strategic economic development linkages, especially in the Pacific Rim. Seattle has an Office of International Affairs,

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{46} Hutton, "Visions of a 'Post-Staples' Economy," 34-37.

\textsuperscript{47} See Cohn, Merrifield, and Smith, "Cities in an Interdependent World," 73-117. At the state/provincial level, however, the opposite is true, with provinces outspending states on economic promotion activities. See Fysh, "Go with the Flow;" Bluechel, "Pacific NorthWest Economic Region;" and Yang, "Magic Mountains."

\textsuperscript{48} Canada’s history of nation-building included efforts to build an economic identity distinct from that of the United States (Keating, \textit{Comparative Urban Politics}, 13-14). Arguably, the outcome of Canada’s "Economic Nationalism" was a network of specialized hinterland regions which functioned to serve the needs of the Windsor-Quebec industrial corridor.
\end{footnotesize}
(established in 1986) which in 1989 had a budget of approximately $230,000 (U.S.). Seattle also has a permanent trade information office in Kobe, Japan. While Seattle has gone to its state and federal governments to help defray the costs of its international activities, assistance is nonetheless limited by the desire of senior governments not to favour Seattle over its competitors.49

Vancouver’s international activities have been coordinated "on a more ad hoc basis" and have been largely dependent on the personal involvement of mayors and other community leaders. The activities take place largely through the City’s Strategic/Sister City Commission and its Economic Development Office. Vancouver’s annual budget for its international activities was about $100,000 during the late 1980s, far less than Seattle’s. Nonetheless, Vancouver enjoys certain advantages of which Seattle can only dream.50

In 1986, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed between Canada and B.C. to "jointly develop programs that would stimulate and enhance Pacific Canada as a centre of trade, commerce, and travel." Between 1987 and 1990, these governments committed $6 million (CDN) to the Asia Pacific Advisory Committee to "identify programs and projects that will move the city, and B.C. toward the

49 Cohn, Merrifield, and Smith, "Cities in an Interdependent World," 88-104.

50 Ibid., 88-99,107.
goal of becoming Canada’s Asia-Pacific centre." Vancouver and its region were the prime beneficiaries of this money.51

Vancouver is in a unique position to expect favourable treatment from its senior governments. Vancouver dominates Canada’s Pacific coast, and is therefore the focus of most federal and provincial efforts to lure Pacific Rim economic activity to Canada and British Columbia. Meanwhile, Seattle must compete with many American rivals (as well as with Vancouver) for its Pacific Rim economic activity, and must spend more of its own money doing so.

Vancouver businesses are able to benefit from the services of the British Columbia Trade Development Corporation, which describes its mission as:

To help British Columbians utilize their human, natural and economic resources in the global trading environment to create jobs and wealth for the Province.52

B.C. Trade administers the provincially funded British Columbia Export Loan Guarantee Program, and conducts market research through its Information Services Branch. Its Trade Operations Division "launches" strategic market alliances of B.C. companies with three-to-five year business plans in order to help

51 Ibid., 90.
them compete internationally.\textsuperscript{53}

The City of Vancouver is treated differently from other B.C. cities both by its provincial government (which allows only Vancouver a charter) and federal government (which designated it an International Banking Centre). The City of Vancouver "is not curtailed [in its international activities] in any way at all by the province or the feds" according to former Mayor Gordon Campbell. This is the case despite Canada's history of "intergovernmental jealousy." It is largely due to "city innovations being coincident with federal and provincial government agendas."\textsuperscript{54}

\section*{2.3 Governmental and Societal Sustainability Issues}

"Community and regional citizenship" was one of the parameters of sustainability listed in Chapter 1, and will be an important factor in developing regional cooperation. Cooperation requires a degree of social bonding (cohesion) across the barriers which separate people from one another. Between Washington and British Columbia, these barriers include differences in constitutional and

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., 8, 10, 17. B.C. Trade Development Corporation's mission and activities are a provincial expression of "Economic Nationalism," as described in Keating, \textit{Comparative Urban Politics}, 13-14. American governments, especially at the local level, have also been known to use public funds and expertise for the benefit of private companies. U.S. political culture, however, is centred around the mythical separation of the private sector from government.

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 88-99, 107.
political cultures. Even on the same side of the border, the fragmentation of local governmental authority creates barriers between cities and suburbs, and among suburbs. Because the boundaries of sustainability-related issues do not usually match those of local political units, the challenges of sustainability may go unanswered.

The involvement of the study region's many local governments in addressing the parameters of sustainability is limited by the "place of the city in the larger socioeconomic and political context." Cities are often viewed as the mere providers of local services, rather than as the makers of political decisions. U.S. planners tend view themselves as nonpolitical, technical, rational, and regulatory, rather than as advocates for the city. In both American and Canadian cities, local elections are often portrayed as nonpartisan contests based on the ability to efficiently administer the provision of local services.

Land use decisions in the United States are primarily made through a competitive bargaining process. In the U.S., property values are the "greatest cause for participation in the local political process."

---

55 Peterson, City Limits, 4.
57 Ibid., 83.
Washington and British Columbia have very different traditions regarding local self-rule, and regarding authority in general. To Washingtonians, self-rule is not a privilege which is granted from above, but rather, a right which is initiated from below.\(^5\) It reflects the U.S. Constitution, which was written with the assumption that all power rests with the people, who then grant or deny certain rights to their governments. Article 11 of Washington's State Constitution (part of the original 1889 document) embodies the basic right of communities to, if they so desire, incorporate as self-governing municipalities.

Cities and towns... may become organized under such general laws whenever a majority of the electors... shall so determine.... Any city containing a population of twenty thousand inhabitants, or more, shall be permitted to frame a charter for its own government, consistent with and subject to the Constitution and laws of this state....\(^5\)

Statutes in Washington State law (such as the Growth Management Act) elaborate on the powers and duties of "Home Rule" municipalities, which otherwise enjoy considerable autonomy. Local autonomy can be further eroded if special-purpose bodies are empowered to take over important functions.

\(^5\) In U.S. states which do not have such a strong history of local rule (referred to as "Dillon Rule" states), cities are treated more as "creatures" of the state. Virginia's legislature enacts separate lists of functions which each of the state's six types of municipalities are empowered to perform (Canadian Urban Institute, *Disentangling Local Government Responsibilities*, 146). In Maryland, county governments have been strengthened and incorporation of new cities has been made difficult.

\(^5\) Article 11, Section 10, Washington State Constitution, 1889. Amendment 40, approved in 1964, changed the population threshold to ten thousand.
Canadian tradition begins with the opposite assumption that all power originates in the Crown, from which it is distributed to various levels of government in a manner which protects certain democratic rights. The procedure for incorporation in British Columbia rests on the Government's willingness:

(1) The minister may, and shall before recommending incorporation, direct that a poll be taken, within the area he designates, to ascertain whether those persons who would be entitled to vote if the municipality were incorporated favour the proposed incorporation.60

Cities in British Columbia are not even chartered like their American counterparts, with the exception of the City of Vancouver. B.C. municipalities (except for Vancouver City) are governed according to the Municipal Act rather than according to individual charters. Municipalities are issued "letters patent" by the Lieutenant Governor in Council when they incorporate.61

The fact that Washingtonians can initiate the formation of municipalities (from the grass roots) while British Columbians leave this decision to a minister is just one example of a larger pattern of national histories and cultures. Americans demanded, fought for, and won their independence from Britain, while Canadians received their independence in an incremental fashion. American settlers established their own "frontier justice" while

---

60 British Columbia, Municipal Act, Part I, Section 6. The fact that a poll is required emphasizes grass roots involvement, and is also evidence of a populist element in B.C.'s political culture.

61 Ibid., Sections 13 and 15.
the North West Mounted Police (today's RCMP) provided law and order for Canadian settlers and natives. Canadians are therefore said to trust one another (and their governments) to a greater degree than Americans, and to shy away from asserting themselves in an aggressive manner.  

This difference in political cultures is reflected in the two nations' governmental systems. In the U.S., the branches of government were designed to work as "checks and balances" on one another, to prevent governments from holding unchecked power. In Canada and in each of its provinces, there is only one "government" which holds all of the power necessary to govern. Although Canada's federal and provincial governments are able to "check and balance" one another in areas of shared jurisdiction, that was probably an unintended consequence of a system designed for "peace, order, and good government."

The "hard-line approach of U.S. environmental groups" is another example of contrasting political cultures. Trade Economics Prof. Peter Morici of the University of Maine at Orono said that "American environmentalists have a real cops-and-badges style. They are obsessed with compliance and control." In contrast,

62 In literature on the subject of Canadian-American comparisons, the above patterns are mentioned as recurring themes; for example: Berton, *Why We Act Like Canadians*; Keating, *Comparative Urban Politics*; and Lipset, *Continental Divide*.

Murray Smith, the Director of the Centre for Trade Policy and Law at Carleton University in Ottawa noted:

that the Canadian approach of "inducing compliance" rather than imposing fines and threatening lawsuits is also at odds with U.S.-style environmental enforcement.64

The role of litigation in U.S. environmental policy was demonstrated by the Clinton Administration's July 1993 decision to reduce timber harvests on federal land in the Pacific Northwest. One reason for that decision was that a judge had imposed an injunction in enforcement of the U.S. (federal) Endangered Species Act. Litigation had been initiated by advocates of a threatened species; the northern spotted owl.

Under terms of a court order, the U.S. administration will present the plan as a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) to a federal judge on July 16. The court will then determine whether the forest management prescriptions comply with federal environmental laws. If they do, the administration will ask the judge to lift his injunction at that time, circumventing some of normal EIS procedures.65

Canadian tradition views litigation as a last resort for dispute resolution, and civil disobedience as inappropriate. American tradition does not expect the parties to a dispute to settle for anything less than "justice." In this respect, however, Washington and British Columbia may be moving closer together rather than farther apart. While some British Columbians are beginning to use more confrontational tactics to promote their

64 Ibid.

65 Associated Press and Vancouver Sun, "Owl Ruling."
causes, the Washington State Growth Management Act is emphasizing cooperation and consensus-building. The defeat of the 1992 Charlottetown Accord is evidence that Canadians (and especially British Columbians, who voted "no" by the highest margin of any province) no longer trust their governments and elites to the extent that they did in the past.

One factor which may move British Columbia closer to the American tradition of litigation is the environmental pact that was negotiated as a side agreement to NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement. It is intended to harmonize the environmental standards of the U.S., Canada, and Mexico, and thereby prevent polluters from escaping environmental requirements by moving their operations across borders. B.C. Forests Minister Dan Miller has expressed concern that Americans will use the pact to impose their policies (through tariffs) on Canada and Mexico.66

Both political cultures present barriers to the successful transformation of the study region based on the parameters of sustainable development. Mistrust and litigation do not promote a cooperative approach to sustainability issues, an approach based on common interest. On the other hand, a political culture which relies heavily on trusting those in high positions to do what is best for the public can also be detrimental to sustainability; it acts to dampen the vigilance of an active citizenship. In both

66 Ibid.
Canada and the United States, rivalries and jealousies between governments, and overbearing senior governments, pose additional obstacles to achieving the type of governance required for sustainability.

Canadian provinces have traditionally been more involved in urban affairs compared to the states of the U.S.67 In Canada, where the provinces strongly guard their stewardship over cities, the federal role is less extensive, more limited, and more fragmented compared to the U.S.68

Canadian provincial governments (or in effect, provincial cabinets) have dominated their metropolitan regions.

The provincial cabinet, with its broad powers of providing social and infrastructure services and reviewing land use decisions, still has the greatest potential to influence the character of public services and settlement patterns within a metropolitan region. This potential far exceeds the authority exercised by American states, which have usually given considerable deference to local governments, including home rule powers.69

In British Columbia, the province is responsible for and

---

67 American states are further limited in their power to control metropolitan development by the multi-state nature of many major U.S. metropolitan areas. State boundaries were drawn along the very same river valleys (Delaware, Hudson, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio) which unite (rather than divide) many of the largest metropolitan regions in the U.S.

68 MacDonald, Distant Neighbors, 192-194.

financially committed to public transit. Vancouver's Skytrain was a unilateral decision of the Provincial government, and was funded mostly by the province. Most American states leave the matter of public transportation to local and regional authorities and largely federal funding.

The legacy of the U.S. government role in cities is a landscape of freeways, urban renewal, and public housing. MacDonald argued that federal involvement in urban affairs has made U.S. cities less livable than Canadian cities. Defence spending is another example of the overwhelming federal influence on U.S. urban areas. With over $2 billion spent on defence purchases in Washington State during 1980, federal military spending has been a major factor in its development. Even the interstate highway system was originally conceived as a defence programme.

There is reason to believe that American governments are moving closer to the Canadian approach to urban policy. Governors have assumed leadership roles in some of the states which have growth management (or other environmental) legislation, and may be prepared to challenge their cities' Home Rule privileges. The days of massive U.S. federal spending on defence, elaborate new highway

70 MacDonald, Distant Neighbors, 192-194.

71 Ibid., 192-196. Kitsap County, on the western shore of Puget Sound across from Seattle, has been described as the most defence-dependent county in the U.S. (Beyers, lecture, 5 March 1993; and Beyers, "From Seattle to the World."). It is the home of the Bremerton naval home port and the Bangor shipyard.
systems, and urban megaprojects appear to be waning.

In both the U.S. and Canada, governments at all levels are looking for more modestly priced solutions due to budgetary pressures. Higher governments have found ways to impose their wills on lower governments without having to pay the price. John Shannon refers to the evolving situation in the United States as a fiscal "layer cake" and a regulatory "marble cake." Financially, higher levels of government are disentangling themselves from financial obligations to their junior governments. At the same time, the U.S. governmental levels are becoming more entangled by mandates and regulations.\(^\text{72}\)

Meanwhile, Canadian provincial attitudes regarding metropolitan government began to converge with those of U.S. states, especially during the 1980s. Canadian provinces, like the U.S. states, are beginning to view themselves as "facilitators" rather than "mandators" of regional governance. In Montreal and Toronto, provincial governments did not extend the territorial authority of regional entities to keep pace with outward development. In Edmonton, the central city was prevented from expanding its boundaries to absorb outlying suburban growth. In Vancouver, an existing power of the GVRD, regional planning, was actually rescinded. In these cases, there may have been a jealous

\(^{72}\) Canadian Urban Institute, *Disentangling Local Government Responsibilities*, 154.
feeling on the part of the provinces that a powerful metropolitan entity would threaten provincial power.73

Intergovernmental jealousies and rivalries also inhibit transborder cooperation. Most state officials think that "cross-border interactions are essentially bureaucratic and not important enough to warrant a separate agency level office or even a high-ranking advisor." Provinces are especially reluctant to do anything that would "create the symbolic effect of being formally tied to the United States." Most provinces are larger than most states, and more influential with their central government. They own their natural resources, and are powerful in international trade. They have "cross-border interests which go beyond their immediate U.S. neighbors" to larger regions such as the West Coast, Rocky Mountains, or Great Lakes.74

State and provincial governments have an incentive to keep their transborder contacts to a minimum: it enables interest groups to look toward their national governments for protection. One example of how the B.C. and Washington governments avoided cooperation was the instance in which they tested separately for radioactivity (in milk, rain, etc.) after the Chernobyl nuclear

73 Rothblatt, "Summary and Conclusions," 454; and Oberlander and Smith, "Governing Metropolitan Vancouver," 358-359.
74 Alper, "U.S.-Canada Regional Diplomacy," 133-134.
It could be argued that the reluctance of the governments in Victoria and Olympia to cooperate in such matters is not in the best interests of the citizens of the transborder region. Although local and regional governments are capable of taking initiative (as well as pressuring their senior governments), they lack the authority to effectively coordinate policies among themselves. Only legislation from senior governments (such as the B.C. Agricultural Land Reserve or the Washington State Growth Management Act) can impose planning standards on all subordinate level governments.

The ability to impose planning standards for sustainability over a territory is derived from the authority which sovereign governments (and quasi-sovereign states and provinces) hold over their territories. The concepts of sovereignty, local autonomy, and authority, including their practical and theoretical aspects, are part of the environment for which the planning system will be designed.

---

TABLE 2.1 - POPULATION GROWTH AND DENSITY IN COUNTIES AND REGIONAL DISTRICTS OF THE VANCOUVER-SEATTLE CORRIDOR AND THE GEORGIA BASIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clallam</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>1,269.9</td>
<td>1,507.3</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>146.6</td>
<td>189.7</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>485.7</td>
<td>586.2</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>337.0</td>
<td>465.6</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>124.3</td>
<td>161.2</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>127.8</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totals</td>
<td>2,740.1</td>
<td>3,361.9</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data compiled in Table 1.2; see notes on sources for Table 1.2.

76 The Vancouver-Seattle Corridor study region and the Georgia Basin are defined in Map 1.1 and Table 1.2. See notes following Table 1.2.
TABLE 2.1 (Continued) - POPULATION GROWTH AND DENSITY IN COUNTIES AND REGIONAL DISTRICTS OF THE VANCOUVER-SEATTLE CORRIDOR AND THE GEORGIA BASIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>249.5</td>
<td>299.7</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cen.Fr.V.</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comox-St.</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow.Val.</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewd.Al.</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.Cheam</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr.Vcvr.</td>
<td>1,229.6</td>
<td>1,542.7</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pow.Riv.</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq.Lil.</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun.Cst.</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totals</td>
<td>1,905.4</td>
<td>2,398.2</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Washington Counties and British Columbia Regional Districts

totals | 4,645.5 | 5,760.1 | 24.0% | 2.2% | 144 |

Data compiled in Table 1.2; see notes on sources for Table 1.2.

77 The Vancouver-Seattle Corridor study region and the Georgia Basin are defined in Map 1.1 and Table 1.2. See notes following Table 1.2. Regional District populations and areas are those contained within their 1993 boundaries.
Chapter 3

THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

3.0 Introduction to Theory of Cooperation

The creation of a planning system for sustainable development is related to several theoretical questions which have been discussed by scholars throughout history. What factors determine whether or not people cooperate, and whether they comply with authority? How will the concepts of sovereignty and local autonomy impact the design of the planning system? What additional challenges result from the need to adhere to democratic ideals and the general difficulty of exercising authority in a rapidly changing world?

A planning region, established for the purpose of cooperation toward a sustainable form of development, must be more than a mixture of diverse interests. It should be a social unit, working toward a better future for all of its resident citizens. It should have many of the attributes of a cohesive and united society, with a citizen base consisting of individuals, governments, and non-governmental organizations. For that reason, this section will examine the forces that bind people into social units.

The first societies were formed with the implied consent of their members, who entered into a "Type 1 social contract," a contract of society. People who had previously enjoyed
unrestrained "natural rights" in a lawless "state of nature" surrendered their individual free will to the society. In exchange, the people gained the greater security of living in a community in which their life and property were respected, or at least, not under constant threat. This contract of society is the social contract of which Locke, Hobbes, and Rousseau wrote.¹

Within any society there is balance and conflict between centrifugal and centripetal forces. Centrifugal forces are those which pull a society apart, and might include regionalism, individualism, and special interest groups. Centripetal forces, such as shared concerns and customs, pull a society together.²

Centripetal forces are the building blocks of nearly every planned utopian society ever proposed, including Skinner's Walden Two and Callenbach's Ecotopia. Even Plato's Republic suggested that structure and conformity are necessary to the development of its proposed social classes, especially the philosopher-rulers. Most democratic societies have shied away from such thinking, as they are committed to the preservation of individual rights.

Nonetheless, a society which is dominated by centrifugal forces will have great difficulty in achieving social progress.

¹ Locke, "Civil Government," 4-5; and Barker, Social Contract Essays, vii-xliv.
² Etzioni, Immodest Agenda, 163.
Karl Mannheim suggested that planning for a higher level of conformity or uniformity builds a society which is not only more united, but is more free and democratic.

Once a society has become united on the plane of ritual or any other matter which creates basic conformity, it is all the easier to allow freedom and plasticity on a higher level.3

The concepts of social cohesion and civility are attempts to deal with the necessity of centripetal forces without offending democratic sensitivities. Social cohesion is a sense of shared purpose and common values which unites a population by building upon the centripetal forces. The Council of Europe defines social cohesion as:

firstly, a concept based on a political philosophy which refuses to accept the inevitability of a struggle between classes and social groups. It must also be seen as a principle of political action which makes it possible to overcome the tensions and conflicts inherent in the life of a group. It is the search for a balance between the freedom of each individual in various fields of political life and the solidarity which seeks to preserve equality of opportunity for everyone and to correct injustice.4

"Civility" is described by Etzioni as a middle ground between individualism and collectivism:

The position that government is the best custodian of shared concerns has been vastly oversold and overextended, and it has backfired. The laissez-faire notion that individualism can replace all overlooks the need for individual commitment to shared concerns. This commitment [called "civility"] has three facets: individual commitment to play by the rules...; a willingness to dedicate some of self to the public

3 Mannheim, Man and Society, 354.
arena...; and a commitment to a measure of service to one another....

When the people of a community expect to enjoy all of the privileges of membership without the reciprocal obligations of citizenship, civility is in danger of being lost. When special interest groups allow their allegiance to the larger society to be replaced by an "us versus them" mentality, civility (and more importantly, stability) are being threatened. The entire society is in danger of becoming "unglued."  

Although it is not being designed to replace the study region’s existing governments, the planning system is envisioned as part of a social contract. Its goal is to develop a means for the region's coordinated and sustainable development. In order for the region's social contract of society to have legitimacy, a commitment to shared concerns must exist or be developed within the region.

There are several possible reasons why a cohesive social bond could transcend an international border. When people depend on one another for the goods and services which they consume, they are likely to view themselves as having a common interest. Other

---

5 Etzioni, Immodest Agenda, 92.

6 Garreau, Edge City, 284-288. Garreau is referring to his interview with Mark Pisano of the Southern California Association of Governments in which Pisano expresses his fear that the lack of civility (or "civitas") in Los Angeles may have dire consequences.
contributors to transboundary social cohesion might be shared language and culture, a common history, and shared concerns about the future.

If the underpinnings of a genuine global [or transboundary] culture are to evolve, there must be a sharing of basic values pertaining to how the world [or the transborder region] is perceived and how conflicting loyalties are managed.

What role should planners have in building the social cohesion and civility which are necessary components of citizenship in a sustainable region? Each of the traditional planning ideologies has a different approach to this question. These approaches will be discussed below.

The Social Reform tradition is concerned with using planning as the state’s instrument for promoting democratic ideals, human rights, and socio-economic justice. It deals with the "broad philosophical" questions of formulating both the goals of planning and the appropriate level of intervention. A Social Reform planner might ask: Does the goal of sustainability justify behavioural modification to increase the levels of social cohesion and civility? According to Friedmann, Mannheim and Etzioni (both classified in the Social Reform tradition) regarded the process of consensus-formation as a central and continuing elite activity, Mannheim through reforming education and altering personality structures, Etzioni

---

7 Rosenau, Turbulence in World Politics, 422.

8 Friedmann, Planning in the Public Domain, 76-77.
through more frankly political activity.  

Policy Analysis is the scientific analysis of policymaking and policy impacts, as well as the analysis for the development of new policies. Herbert Simon "stressed synoptic analysis and decision-making as the means of identifying the best possible courses of action."¹⁰ This tradition of planning theory would not be concerned with the moral questions involved in building social cohesion and regional consensus.

Social Learning is a planning tradition which is concerned with changing human behaviour scientifically through experimentation. It is pragmatic, as John Dewey stressed "learning by doing." Its utilization of face-to-face transactions and dialogue would be applicable to planning efforts to build social cohesion and regional consensus."¹¹ Social Learning techniques would also be used to bring people's behaviour in line with the parameters of sustainability.

A variation of Social Learning is Transactive Planning, in which planning consists of "face-to-face contact with the people affected by decisions" and is "marked by a process of mutual learning." In contrast with Incremental Planning (discussed

---

⁹ Ibid., 136.

¹⁰ Ibid., 78-79.

¹¹ Ibid., 81-82.
below), Transactive Planning assumes that when cooperating, people learn and grow rather than merely pursue a fixed self-interest.\textsuperscript{12}

Social Mobilization is concerned with the process of transforming society through empowerment: "asserting the primacy of direct collective action 'from below.'"\textsuperscript{13} It proposes to use planning knowledge to build the type of society called for in a particular ideology, for example, sustainable development. Although collective action is most effective where there is cohesion and social consensus, planners of this tradition often make the mistake of ignoring the need to build cohesion and consensus. Their ideologies often require them to assume that people of a certain race, ethnicity, social class, or economic class are unified by definition.

Incremental and Advocacy Planning are not classifications of Friedmann's planning traditions, but are two of Barclay Hudson's five "SITAR" (synoptic, incremental, transactive, advocacy, radical) types of planning. What they have in common is that they seek to work within a bargaining environment rather than bring about social cohesion. They do not emphasize the learning and growth which Social Learning and Transactive planners associate with interaction. Hudson cited Charles Lindblom's concept of "muddling through" as the essence of incremental planning.

\textsuperscript{12} Hudson, "Current Planning Theories."

Advocacy planners represent a particular group; usually one that has traditionally had little bargaining power.\textsuperscript{14}

Although not one of Friedmann's (or Hudson's) "planning traditions," anti-planning has strong implications about the role of planners in promoting consensus and social cohesion. Anti-planning ideology asserts that behavioural modification through social engineering is not an appropriate role of the state.

The "societal goal" or "common purpose," for which society is to be organized is usually vaguely described as the "common good," the "general welfare," or the "general interest."... The welfare and happiness of millions cannot be measured on a scale of less and more.... To direct all our activities according to a single plan presupposes that every one of our needs is given its rank in an order of values which must be complete enough to make it possible to decide among all the different courses which the planner has to choose.\textsuperscript{15}

Anti-planners view people as individual decisionmakers and consumers. They view the government role as the anonymous protector of individual freedoms and the impartial enforcer of laws and regulations which protect health, safety, life, and property. It is not the individual freedom of the market system which causes environmental destruction and other problems, but imperfections in that system, which the government may correct.

The intellectual and moral basis for planning was originally some positive notion of how to shape society towards some broadly agreed social ends. Increasingly, planning has degenerated into negatives - how to stop people doing things. As a result, planning has

\textsuperscript{14} Hudson, "Current Planning Theories."

\textsuperscript{15} Hayek, \textit{Road to Serfdom}, 57.
inevitably had to interfere with people's rights, not only property rights but also individual human rights.\textsuperscript{16}

William Gairdner disagrees with all attempts at "democratic" social planning as a perversion of democratic values:

A representative parliamentary democracy is an important tool of freedom and wealth creation only if it is that; it is counterproductive to pervert it into a social engineering agency.\textsuperscript{17}

In the dialogues of Plato's Republic, the philosophers attempted to answer the question of "Who shall rule the state?" Karl Popper argued that planners should instead be asking: "How can we so organize political institutions that bad or incompetent rulers can be prevented from doing much damage?"\textsuperscript{18} Even when it begins with the best of intentions, the results of government interference can be harmful. Thus, humanity is warned about the dangers of using planning to a transform society to fit planners' own utopian dreams.

In designing the planning system, the teachings of all of the above planning traditions will be considered. Above all else, the system will be designed to bring the people and governments of the planning region together in an effective manner. The centripetal forces which provide social cohesion and civility within the region must themselves be sustainable. If the study region is to develop

\textsuperscript{16} Gordon and Richardson, "Anti-Planning?," 4.
\textsuperscript{17} Gairdner, Trouble With Canada, 63.
\textsuperscript{18} Popper, Open Society, 119-120.
as an environmentally, economically, and socially sustainable unit, its form of governance must be compatible with this objective.

3.1 Cooperation and Governmental Authority

Although governments may have a legal right to take certain actions with respect to their constituents (and senior governments with respect to their subordinate governments), they do not necessarily have the ability to take these actions. A legal right which exists on paper should be distinguished from the ability to use that right by exerting power. In attempting to exercise its legally acquired rights to bring about change, a senior government may be defeated by its own subordinates, and may even bring about its own downfall.

Under a "Type 2 social contract," a society submits itself to be governed by a ruler or a political system. Hume wrote that although the first governments were founded on such contracts, they later held power through conquest, force, habit, fear, or necessity. Just as the "Type 1 social contract" can be eroded by breakdowns in civility and social cohesion, the "Type 2 social contract" may become eroded if it loses its legitimacy.

Historians now know that the social contract is not the

---

19 Cohn, Merrifield, and Smith, "Cities in an Interdependent World, 74-75.

historical antecedent of the state. It is, however, a useful attempt to analyze its logical suppositions. People behave as if there were a contract, so the existence of a "quasi-contract" is a part of modern government. If the 1992 Charlottetown Accord had been approved in Canada's national referendum, it would have been an example of a formal social contract. Instead, it was rejected. Despite the fact that methods of consensus were used in its development, it alienated a majority of Canadians, and was not viewed as a legitimate social contract.

It is therefore necessary to consider all possible sources of (or criteria for) authority in determining the legitimacy of a social contract. As the Charlottetown debacle demonstrated, even an inclusive negotiating process does not guarantee public acceptance of such a contract.

Authority and legitimacy are "different sides of the same coin: authority attaches to the actions of leaders and legitimacy is the acceptance attached to the actions by the membership." Whatever the techniques [gentle suasion to harsh force], the greater the legitimacy that attaches to the authority seeking to exercise control, the greater the likelihood that compliance will be achieved and that the coherence and stability of the collectivity will be maintained.

22 Rosenau, Turbulence in World Politics, 190.
23 Ibid., 389.
The concept of authority is not limited to formalized legal or constitutional mechanisms. "Authority relations are... found wherever people undertake collective tasks...." The criteria for authority which are listed below have been compiled from several sources of political theory. They are: tradition or habit; charisma; fear; personal choice; economy; and competence. Each of these criteria, or sources of legitimacy, will be addressed in terms of the development of a planning framework.

Tradition is a source of legitimacy. The status quo, or a previous status quo, may be associated with stability or with past glories. Any proposal for change is going to be measured against what is already established, or what is considered traditional. When changed institutions become unstable, a return to traditions of the past is an appealing alternative.

People often comply with authority because they expect others to do the same, or because they understand that collective action will serve their needs better than will chaos. The expected compliance with traditional authorities is itself largely a matter of habit.

The longer authority has been in place, the greater is the legitimacy that attaches to it.... The compliance may be preceded by argument, bargaining, and delay, and the actions and policies may thus be moderated, but in the end the habit of compliance will normally prevail as the

24 Ibid., 187-188.
In order to derive legitimacy from this criterion, the planning system should include the leaders, bodies, authorities, and mechanisms that have long existed within the planning region. If the changes in policy required for sustainability are to occur, they will be most acceptable if the surrounding policy environment is changed as little as possible. That environment, and its governmental and nongovernmental actors, is what people feel comfortable with.

Personal magnetism and leadership abilities are aspects of charisma, another source of legitimacy. They are important factors in any break with a strong tradition. Without charisma, an authority which breaks with the past may be perceived as illegitimate. Nevertheless, charisma alone is not sufficient to command authority.

Leaders are not charismatic because their talents are somehow larger than those of other leaders, or their speeches delivered more evocatively. There can be no charismatic leaders without followers ready to be, so to speak, "charismatized," and charisma is thus fundamentally relational. History is replete with leaders whose charisma has deserted them when circumstances change and their followers cease to comply.26

In the context of the planning system, charismatic leaders might have a role in persuading governments to pass and implement

25 Ibid.
26 Ibid., 189.
legislation, and in persuading individuals and businesses to change their behaviour. As implied by Rosenau, charisma alone is not sufficient to legitimize change. For example, economic hardships can cause individuals to reorder their priorities in favour of their short term needs.

According to Rosenau, one reason to "accord legitimacy to the acts of authorities and comply with their directives" is the "fear of the consequences of noncompliance." Authority based on fear of the use of force, while sometimes necessary, is not to be thought of as the legitimate basis of a social contract.

Fear may, however, play a legitimate role in encouraging the voluntary cooperation of citizens who are concerned about their shared future. Fear is also necessary to make the enforcement of sustainability standards effective. The knowledge that all violators of planning measures will be punished will assure the compliant majority that others are not taking advantage of them.

If a decision conforms to one's personal choice, one is likely to accept it. If, however, each person were only to accept those decisions conforming to personal choice, the implications would be absurd, since all persons cannot possibly agree all of the time. Thus, any policy which involves decisionmaking by consensus will be

---

27 Ibid., 187-188.
problematic. The next logical step would be to say that one will accept all decisions which include one's participation.

According to the "Principle of Affected Interests," all people affected by a decision have a right to participate in the making of that decision. In the world of the 1990s, decisions made in one place can easily have repercussions around the world. A strict application of the "Principle of Affected Interests" would involve each individual in an absurd number of decisions. The next logical step would then be indirect involvement through representative democracy. While some argue that only direct democracy will suffice, Dahl felt that the type of democracy should be appropriate for the size of the unit.29

Within the planning system for sustainability, opportunities for personal participation and representative participation should be provided. Planning measures should be flexible, so that there is room for choices to be made in their local implementation. In making policies, the public should be asked for its advice, so that people feel they are part of the decision making process.

Economy is one of Dahl's three criteria for authority. Because of the increasing levels of interdependency and complexity in modern societies, personal choice is not a realistic alternative

for most decisions which affect an individual. People are limited in the amount of time and effort which they can devote to participation in decisions. Especially when it comes to group decisions, participation has opportunity costs; hence the criterion of Economy. Because of Economy, most people allow most decisions to be made for them by elected representatives or by competent professionals and bureaucrats.30

Every time additional layers of government are created, Economy (of one's time and effort) will become more important. The importance of Economy varies from one individual to another and from one issue to another. Citizen participation in planning is difficult to attract because of Economy. For many people, "voting with their feet or their wallets ("consumer sovereignty") is an "economical" alternative to involvement in public processes.31

Economy increases the difficulty of attracting the participation of a representative cross-section of the public. It is therefore best to prevent the planning system and the participation process from becoming overly complicated and alienating the public even further. Those who do choose to participate should be allowed to do so in an efficient manner.

30 Ibid., 40-58.
31 See Gordon and Richardson, "Anti-Planning?" for a discussion of private (individual) v. public solutions.
Because of Economy, people consent to allow others to make most of the decisions which affect their lives. Where decisions are entrusted to an authority based on his or her expertise, rather than on personal appeal, the criterion of competence is being applied. If taken to an extreme, the result would be a "tyranny of the meritocrats."

In his 1948 novel Walden Two, Skinner created a utopian community in which authority was legitimized mainly through competence. "Personal choice" was limited to the privilege of expressing one's personal preferences while leaving the power of decision to the competent expert. (It also entailed the freedom to leave the community.) Economy was expressed through the policy of limiting each person's role in government to his or her own area of expertise. All remaining power, though not based on democratic mechanisms, was held within the community. It was held with the consent of the community, in the form of an implicit social contract.32

The proper role for competence in the transborder planning system is to implement the public's vision for sustainability in an effective manner. Responsibility and the power to act should be clearly distributed among the areas of competence of each of the different arms of government so that each may be held accountable. Planners should listen to the public, but they should also utilize

32 Skinner, Walden Two.
the knowledge and expertise which they possess.

3.2 Sovereign Authority: A Barrier to Cooperation?

The ultimate authority to which people owe their loyalty and allegiance is the sovereign nation-state; the basic unit of the world political system. This authority may be derived from any (or more than one) of the criteria which were described above. The impact of sovereignty upon the planning region may not be ignored. It must be viewed as a fact of life rather than as a detail of minor importance. Yet sovereignty is increasingly being viewed not as a fixed concept, but as one which is flexible and constantly evolving.

Boundaries consolidate a nation-state's jurisdictional authority within strictly defined physical limits. They are a relatively modern concept which evolved as Europe emerged from feudalism. By consolidating its authority within secure boundaries, a government can make its policies more effective, and protect its territory from the ambitions and influence of outside governments.

Sovereignty is not a physical shell, however, but a constitutional one. It cuts off the nation-state from constitutional subordination to others. Sovereignty is a legal, absolute, and unitary condition. It is based on a state's own law rather than on realities having physical substance. Although
sovereignty places "ultimate responsibility for external policy ... into the hands of the state concerned," the state may arrange for all sorts of cooperation and still remain sovereign.33

A sovereign state may have all sorts of links with other such states and with international bodies, but the one sort of link which, by definition, it cannot have is a constitutional one.34

Internally, the sovereign state "jealously guards its gateway so as to preserve its jurisdictional purity." The sovereign state claims the "exclusive right to conduct itself within its borders exactly as it wishes." This does not rule out listening to and cooperating with other states on internal matters, and it may in fact be wise to do so. But if any externally based legislature, executive, or judiciary has a claim to authority on any of its territory, regardless of consent, the nation-state has lost its sovereignty.35

A sovereign state may accept limitations on its own freedom of action without losing its sovereignty. These limitations may be part of a multi-state agreement, such as 1949 European Convention on Human Rights, or completely internal, such as the U.S. Bill of Rights. States are not, however, captive to the bodies to which they have chosen to belong. If a state wishes to be released from

33 James, Sovereign Statehood, 39-40, 54. Canada's constitutional link with Great Britain has become largely symbolic as Canada has achieved its independence incrementally.

34 Ibid., 24.

its obligations, it may leave, thereby forfeiting its benefits of membership. Likewise, if a state wishes to be released from self-imposed limitations, it may amend its constitution.

The consolidation of authority under a sovereign government has several advantages. Larger political units can be more economically self-sufficient than small ones, because economies of scale facilitate the production of a greater variety of goods. It is also a form of mutual protection, reducing the vulnerability of a region to outside aggression. The consolidated state can also offer political, social, and economic stability by absorbing and redistributing the impact of regional threats to stability.

Nearly all of the above advantages can be replicated through transborder cooperation and alliances. Recent history has, in fact, shown some of the largest states to be highly vulnerable to instability and calamity, while many smaller states have been able to enjoy the advantages of sovereignty without its burdens.

As mentioned above, boundaries have evolved into constitutional shells rather than physical ones. Physically, boundaries have been shown to be porous and penetrable by modern weapons, telecommunications, and environmental spillovers. More recently, that permeability has increased as a result of economic globalization (including market integration and the increasing

---

36 Ibid., 55,187.
mobility of capital and labour) and further innovations in telecommunications.

The increasing permeability of national borders is just one factor that is reducing the competence of national governments to implement effective policies in their border regions. There are several other reasons why "nationalistic" solutions to planning problems should not be imposed on the citizens of border regions. These reasons will be summarized below.

Local, national, and international decisions are connected. According to Seelig and Artibise, "we live in a global community where seemingly isolated actions have global consequences." All local decisions are interconnected with the rest of the world.37

Global interdependence has eroded the distinction between problems and issues of a local nature and those which are within the scope of the nation-state's central government. On one hand, subnational governments and regions are affected by central government decisions relating to foreign policy and defence. They have also assumed a role as actors in the global economy.38

On the other hand, local issues of an economic, technological, humanitarian, or ecological nature may affect national security,

37 Seelig and Artibise, From Desolation to Hope, 8.
international diplomacy, and national defence, which "remain within the monopolistic embrace of the central government." National governments, especially in the U.S., have reacted by asserting control over formerly local and subnational areas of decision.

Thus, paradoxically, provincialism has been internationalized and localism globalized.

Nationalistic border policies reflect national needs. If an issue becomes one of national importance or pride, or gets entangled in national politics, border regions may suffer. On the other hand, if the issue's importance is not recognized nationally, the border region may also suffer.

Compared to most international diplomacy, transborder regional issues have less glamour, impact, and importance to the rest of the world. They usually involve day-to-day, mundane issues, such as "police activities, natural resources protection, or transborder regional economy;" issues which are not usually national priorities.

The citizens of border regions may resent the fact that

39 Ibid.
40 Herzog, "Cross-national Urban Structure," 530; and Peterson, City Limits, 13.
41 Duchacek, "International Competence," 12-13. This sentence was underlined in the original text.
42 Alper, "U.S.-Canada Regional Diplomacy," 128-129.
border policies were formulated far away by people who are unfamiliar with the border region and its problems. Federal officials might not consult with or listen to local officials.

Nationalistic solutions reflect asymmetrical relations between nation-states. If nationalistic policies are forced upon border regions, asymmetries in the relationship between the nation-states will influence these policies. Carlos Rico uses "three levels of analysis of interdependence" for analyzing national policies for border regions. These are:

I) Sensitivity between societies and/or economies: how what happens in one country affects the other.

II) Vulnerability between societies and/or economies: Asymmetries due to (a) alternatives available to each of the participants and (b) costs to each participant of a rupture in relations with the other.

III) Power of relations between governments: Asymmetries plus governmental control over nongovernmental channels and actors.

According to Stoddard, "border influences do not always reflect nation-to-nation influences." The importance of adjacent border cities, relative to each other and to their respective

---

44 Duchacek, "International Competence," 22.

45 One advantage of border regions in a state with more centralized authority is that local officials can more easily take their concerns to the national government. This is especially true of a dominant-party state such as Mexico. See Hansen, "Border Region Development and Cooperation," 37-41.

46 Author's translation, Rico, "La frontera mexicano-noreamericana," 146.

47 Stoddard, "Problems Along the U.S.-Mexico Border," 64.
nation-states, is another influential factor. Canada and Mexico both have large and important cities at their borders with the U.S.; cities which often are as large or larger than their American counterparts.

At the federal level, transborder relations across the U.S.-Canadian border are characterized by asymmetry. If the Canadian government cooperates too closely with the U.S., it risks subordination, or the appearance of subordination, to the neighbouring American colossus.

This asymmetry is magnified by Canada's dependence on U.S. trade to maintain its high standard of living. The United States is capable of producing for itself almost everything it imports, while Canada (and Mexico) are not. Therefore, for Canada, as well as "...for Mexico relations with the U.S. are much more important than are relations with Mexico [and Canada] for the U.S...."48 Although Canada and the U.S. are each other's largest trading partners, Canada depends on the U.S. for a greater (70%) share of its export market than does the U.S. on Canada (25%). 49

Nationalistic policies often ignore the special needs of border regions. The unique problems faced by border communities

48 Author's translation, Ojeda, "México y los Ee.Uu.," 130-132.

49 Alper, "U.S.-Canada Regional Diplomacy," 119-120.
point often to a need for a cross-border urban policy, as Herzog argued in his study of the San Diego-Tijuana region.  

National governments often fail to perceive the need for transborder cooperation and bilateral solutions. One common response is to misconceptualize the problem as not being any different from purely domestic regional development problems. A second common response is for one national government to use its asymmetrical power to apply pressure on the other nation-state.

Nation-states have different socioeconomic and environmental standards. National governments set and enforce their socioeconomic and environmental standards, often without considering the necessity for transborder cooperation.  

... the ecosystem spills across a man-made political boundary, the international border. Therefore, at each level of the ecosystem transboundary spillover effects, or 'externalities,' must be accounted for as outputs of the ecosystem requiring management.

Even in two similar societies such as the United States and Canada, the cross-border differences in regulations and in the cost of doing business may be significant.

50 Herzog, Where North Meets South, 206.
52 Stoddard, "Problems Along the U.S.-Mexico Border," 70.
53 Herzog, "Transboundary Ecosystem Management," 98. The "levels" of the ecosystem to which Herzog refers are the natural, built, and human environments.
National governments have inadequate institutional structures. In North America, formalized federal institutions dealing with border issues are limited to the settlement of water-related disputes. The International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC) was formed in 1846 by the Treaty of Guadalupe after the Mexican War. At the turn of the century, the IBWC was given the tasks of overseeing water distribution and maintaining common river channels. Headed by engineers, its solutions were "redirected toward national rather than local priorities."54 For the U.S.-Canada border, a similar institution, the International Joint Commission (IJC), was created under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909.

An equal number of IJC commissioners are appointed by each federal government. IJC's purpose is "to investigate, examine, and recommend with regard to changes in rivers, lakes, and waterways which cross the border." Lacking enforcement powers, IJC findings and recommendations are not binding on their national governments. Historically, the IJC has played the role of "independent fact-finder and arbiter of crossborder differences before they escalate into major conflicts."55

The IJC actually has the power to approve or disapprove "all cases involving the use or obstruction or diversion" of "boundary

55 Alper, "U.S.-Canada Regional Diplomacy," 130.
waters" - a term which is defined not to include any rivers or streams which flow across the boundary. For all other matters, the IJC role is to investigate and to make recommendations to the national governments. Some matters may be submitted by the U.S. and Canadian governments to the IJC for binding arbitration, but only if both sides volunteer to do so.56

The IJC became increasingly politicized during the Reagan administration, with its appointees closely tied to President Reagan, politically and ideologically. The IJC's political and ideological ties to the White House also gave it greater influence on policy.57 It is conceivable that a more politicized IJC would be even less sensitive to the special needs of border regions.

The IJC was not created with the capability to address the underlying issues of sustainability, and has not shown a willingness to step into this role. It is, however, the only existing U.S.-Canada institution with any potential to fulfill a role in any future transborder planning system.

Some proposals to reform the IJC have dealt with the perceived need to increase the levels of public involvement, access, and information. There is also a perceived need for a mechanism to "institutionalize" the contacts between the IJC and other

56 Canada and the U.S., Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909.
57 Alper, "U.S.-Canada Regional Diplomacy," 132-133.
governmental bodies, such as legislatures. A "mechanism to deal efficiently and promptly with IJC recommendations" would follow through the recommendations, assuring that they are given the attention that they deserve. There have also been proposals to broaden the mandate and authority of the IJC, to turn it into a "supranational regulatory agency," and to allow it to take more initiative independently of the national governments. Don Munton argued that most of these proposals would be politically unfeasible, and would create as many new difficulties as they would alleviate.  

Is there a possible role for the IJC in the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor? In its present form, the IJC is not a body which is suited for managing an ongoing, participatory planning process. If, after a formal agreement is reached, a need arises for a third party to which the other two could submit disputes as they arise, the IJC may able to step into this role.

For all of the above reasons, the interests of border regions are best served by not forcing nationalistic solutions upon them. Cooperation between state, provincial, and local governments, facilitated by the federal governments, should be the preferred method for solving problems in border regions.

---

3.3 Semi-Sovereign or Quasi-Sovereign Authority

In a federal nation-state, sovereignty is effectively shared by the federal government and members (states, provinces, cantons, etc.) of the federation. Sovereignty within the international system is exercised through the national government, while the states or provinces exercise a form of (semi-) sovereign control over their own territories.

According to Alan James, the external policies of a federated state are not diluted by the federative arrangement. "On matters which are deemed to be of federal concern... the federal view prevails," as far as the outside world is concerned. The federation would therefore be considered an internal arrangement, rather than an alternative form of sovereignty.\(^{59}\) Canada differs from most federal states in this respect. Section 92 of its Constitution Act restricts the scope of provincial legislation to a specific list of "classes of Subjects." It does not, however, allow an international treaty or agreement to override provincial legislation.

Some of the weaknesses of nationalistic solutions which were listed in the previous section also apply to dealings between provinces and states. State and provincial capitals, like federal capitals, may be distant from the border region, unfamiliar with its problems, and closed to its influence.

\(^{59}\) James, Sovereign Statehood, 63.
There are, nonetheless, advantages to conducting transborder planning cooperation at the state/provincial level rather than the federal level. States and provinces, as "semisovereign units," may be able to reduce the implications of asymmetry by dealing with each other directly rather than through their respective federal governments. A greater equality may be possible if the state and province are of similar magnitude in population and economic wealth. It is also hoped that state and provincial governments would be somewhat more sensitive to local concerns than are federal governments.

According to Dahl, U.S. states are not viable as units of true democracy. Because their boundaries do not coincide with problems of interest or personal loyalties, their citizens are easily alienated. The states are therefore doomed to a future as quasi-democratic administrative units, lacking in social cohesion. The same cannot be said of Canada's provincial governments, which, as will be discussed in Chapter 4, have become "quasi-nations." Yet both states and provinces (and even their cities to some degree) theoretically have great potential to respond to outside forces through their powers in the federal system.

States have considerable control over economic matters through control of corporate taxation, regulation, and infrastructure development, and provinces have added the power over intraprovincial trade, natural resources, and

60 Lubin, "Routinization of Cross-Border Interactions," 162.
61 Dahl, "City in the Future."
As higher levels of government are under increasing financial constraints, they are "downloading" their responsibilities. Federal governments "download" onto states and provinces, which in turn, "download" onto cities. The lower governments are more likely to complain about their new financial obligations than to relish their new responsibilities. If the authority to innovate is included in the "downloading," the new obligations may act to empower and revitalize the lower governments rather than merely burden them.

3.4 Local Authority

During the 19th century, the Roman Catholic Church had a policy which it called "subsidiarity." Decisions were to be made at the lowest possible level of the governing hierarchy compatible with efficiency criteria. This concept has been revived in the European Community's policies for separating local, national, and community functions. Discussions of sustainable development and bioregionalism often contain similar ideologies in order to allow for the self-determination of local communities.

In 1967, Robert Dahl wrote of a dilemma in the choice between

---


63 Canadian Urban Institute, Disentangling Local Government Responsibilities, 76. The European Community has since become the European Union.
large and small governmental units. While a larger unit is more inclusive and better able to regulate its environment, "people vote but do not rule." In a smaller unit, people "rule - but have nothing to rule over." 64

In 1970, Kennneth Boulding wrote that cities were no longer viable as political decisionmaking units because they no longer had bargaining power in the face of national and corporate ambitions. The city represented neither the force of individualism nor the collective identity of its citizens, but got the "worst of both" individualism and collectivism. 65 When Jane Jacobs (in Cities and the Wealth of Nations) wrote that "cities" are (and have always been) the meaningful economic units of the world, she was not writing about North American municipal units. Municipal boundaries are rather irrelevant in Jacobs' economic theories.

Local governments should address the need for a government which does not seem distant and impersonal, offers opportunities for individual participation and community control, and is relevant to daily life. A more practical reason for the existing local governments is that certain government functions are exercised in a more efficient and responsive manner at the local level. The reasons for having local government are far from obsolete:

The global trends... imply that governments in the 21st

64 Dahl, "City in the Future."

65 Boulding, "City as an Element."
century will increasingly be seen as part of a spectrum from international to local, through national, provincial, and regional levels. Just as in the private sector, the international and national levels will be establishing the broad frameworks and standards within which society functions. The provincial and regional levels will be concerned with strategic planning and with the assurance of minimum levels of economic and social standards, while the local and community levels will be the primary deliverers of service and the primary interface among the various sectors of society in securing the development of individual communities. The most effective local governments in this context will be those that can provide one-stop service for the range of government services and that can integrate programs of all types across those services.66

Local governments have been granted many of the tools available to guide community development by their states and provinces. Although land is the only one of the three factors of production effectively contained by city boundaries, public policy instruments can be used to influence the flows of capital and labour. By using tools such as zoning and financial incentives, and planning the type and mixture of public services (parks, schools), local governments can attract or discourage labour migration, or entice capital into an area.67

In the modern nation-state, all governmental units including local units are defined by rigid boundaries. While boundary lines are relatively easy to draw where they did not exist previously, they are very difficult to change in response to changing

---

66 Canadian Urban Institute, *Disentangling Local Government Responsibilities*, 79.

circumstances. Ideally, the boundaries within which people benefit from a government expenditure are identical to those within which revenues are raised to pay for the service.

Arguably, the rigidity of the existing system of sovereign, state/provincial, and local governments has reduced their ability to evolve and to fulfill the above roles for their citizens. If boundaries are drawn to define common needs, problems and concerns, they must allow for flexibility in order to continue to respond to changing needs, problems, and concerns. Mechanisms such as loose, voluntary alliances of communities allow for a greater flexibility of boundaries but have no authority apart from that of their member governments.

Jones and Rothblatt, in their observations of the San Francisco Bay region, wrote that local officials have become less rigid about local autonomy since the 1970s. "This is partly due to learning from experience that many modern problems cannot be adequately managed by cities acting alone." Likewise, metropolitan regional economies are not independent of state, provincial, or national economies.\footnote{Jones and Rothblatt, "Governance of San Francisco," 397.}

Within metropolitan regions, a system of many competing jurisdictions has evolved, as expressed in the Tiebout model (1956). According to Tiebout, each jurisdiction competes with its
neighbours by offering an attractive package of services ("public goods") at a competitive price.69

The Tiebout model presents the multiplicity of jurisdictions in a fragmented metropolitan area as a positive thing, since it offers a choice of service packages. For every "bundle of services" there is an "optimum community size" for which a community's public policy subconsciously aims. This model fails to recognize that the citizens of an urban region share a common destiny, regardless of the boundaries which divide them. Even Tiebout acknowledged that his model is an ideal which cannot exist; one reason being the externalities between adjacent communities.70 When the actions of a government unwillingly impose costs on people who live outside of its boundaries, the result is an externality, or a spillover: a common outcome of the Tiebout model of fragmentation and competition.

Tiebout-style competition is an obstacle to all forms of cooperation across municipal boundaries, but especially to the difficult decisions and sacrifices that may be required for long range planning. One possible response is to change or eliminate

69 Tiebout, "Local Expenditures," 416-424. The services offered by municipalities are considered to be "public goods" if "each individual's consumption of such a good leads to no subtraction from any other individual's consumption of that good...." Also defined as a public good is "a good which should be produced, but for which there is no feasible method of charging the consumers."

70 Ibid.
municipal boundaries, which is politically difficult. More common are the formation of regional federations for purposes of cooperation and functional districts for the achievement of economies of scale.

According to Jack Lessinger, the fragmentation of local governmental authority was intended to satisfy the "get-it-now" mindset of the 20th Century. People chose to ignore the long-run costs of fragmentation (including its negative impacts on sustainability) because they:

valued the immense short-run benefits of competition among suburbs - the expanding urban land supply, accelerating new home construction, snowballing sales of consumer durables and sharply rising GNP.71

The nature of fragmentation has changed in the years since most North American metropolitan federations and governments were formed. Metropolitan areas have outgrown the boundaries of these organizations, as suburbanization has continued outward. In fragmented regions, many "inner ring" suburbs now have more in common with each other and their central cities than with the newer, "outer ring" suburbs. In a multicentred metropolis, a model of "rings" may no longer be appropriate, and could be replaced by a model of overlapping subregions.

Many of North America's suburban centres have arisen oblivious

71 Lessinger, Penturbia, 46.
The new town of Columbia, Maryland is a community in every sense of the word, even though it has no municipal government of its own. Clearly, municipal incorporation can no longer be equated with community self-determination.

Whether authority appears to be fragmenting or consolidating itself (or both), the fact that its nature is rapidly changing is indisputable. While world leaders often behave as if authority relationships between people and their leader were static, they are clearly dynamic. In the modern world, all types of authority are simultaneously consolidating and fragmenting.

3.5 The Challenge for Tomorrow

According to Rosenau, the world is experiencing centralizing tendencies (mostly economic) and decentralizing tendencies (mostly of political power) concurrently. Thus, "the competence of the states is both widening and withering."73

People relate to authority through their "loyalties, legitimacy sentiments, compliance habits, analytic skills, and cathetic capacities." The old industrial order, in which these

72 See Garreau, Edge City, 6, 26, 46. Garreau's "Edge Cities" "rarely have a mayor or a city council, and just about never match boundaries on a map." Garreau cites a typical Edge City which is "governed only by a patchwork of zoning and planning boards and county boards and township boards... swirling like gnats - not any elected ruling structure."

73 Rosenau, Turbulence in World Politics, 132.
attributes promoted centralization of loyalties, has changed. National governments are no longer automatically accorded the highest level of loyalty.74

While global power and predominance were once "derived from military capabilities, fostering hierarchical relationships," today, they are "derived from diverse human and nonhuman capabilities, fostering cross-cutting relationships." At a national level, power and predominance are now derived from numbers (of people) as well as from wealth. At a subnational level, power and predominance are no longer exclusively dependent on "arrangements at the national level." Today, they accrue to "numerous, well-organized, or wealthy groups, fostering diffuse relationships."75

Rosenau wrote of an emerging multi-centred world in which there are two types of actors which form two co-existing worlds: "sovereignty-bound" and "sovereignty-free." He rejected the use of the classifications of "state" and "nonstate" actors because:

states are limited by the very considerations that are usually regarded as the source of their strengths. To regard a state as bound by its sovereign responsibilities ... is to underscore its vulnerabilities and its inability to concentrate prerogatives and energies upon

74 Ibid., 88. "Cathectic" refers to mental and emotional capacities. Although revolution and upheaval did occur in the era of the nation-state, they merely resulted in the replacement of one sovereign authority with another. This is no longer the case.

75 Ibid., 101.
a few selective goals.... sovereignty-free collectives... can pursue limited objectives, and they can move forward without diverting their resources to a wide range of other obligations....

Semi-sovereign units such as states and provinces are also bound by their territorial responsibilities. Municipalities appear to bear the worst of both worlds, as they are politically subordinate and bound by territorial responsibilities. They have the liability of corporations, but are not full corporate "persons" because

they have only the powers given to them by [state/] provincial statutes and, unlike business corporations, cannot do everything an ordinary individual can do.

Like the nation-state, the type of community which is defined by one's residential jurisdiction is no longer accorded automatic loyalty. The need to belong to a "community" can be satisfied by a professional, religious, or institutional peer group. "Today's 'communities' are entirely voluntary and thus fragile." This trend was noticed by DeTocqueville, who in 1840, wrote that Americans were forming voluntary associations and withdrawing into their own private worlds. In the modern nation-state, this tendency has accelerated to the point where the very relevance of government is being questioned:

76 Ibid., 36.
77 Canadian Urban Institute, Greater Toronto Area, 49.
78 Garreau, Edge City, 278-279.
79 Ibid., 287-288.
New issues arising out of the world's greater interdependence have exceeded the competence of authorities to address and resolve them on their own, impelling followships to begin to look elsewhere for effective leadership and for psychological, if not physical, security.\textsuperscript{80}

Global forces now compete with established institutions to influence the minds of the world's people. Adaptation to change is replacing habitual learning. Analytical skills are becoming more developed, cognitive maps more complex, role scenarios more elaborate, and cathetic capacities more active and refined. The result is that people increasingly tend to question compliance, and their political loyalties become less focused on the nation-state. Legitimacy based on criteria of performance (competence) replaces that based on traditional criteria.\textsuperscript{81} Crisis may result:

It is in the deterioration of habit that authority crises originate: the more a membership moves away from automatic acceptance toward outright rejection, the more an authority relationship is subjected to strain.\textsuperscript{82}

Place-based allegiances, formerly a necessity for survival, are under particularly high strain. The "communities" which are based upon voluntary affiliation may have needs and wants which contradict those of the greater citizenship. The increasing importance of competence-based criteria for authority has led to the formation of "shadow governments": private enterprises which perform governmental functions without the constraints which

\textsuperscript{80} Rosenau, Turbulence in World Politics, 397.

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., 211.

\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., 190.
democratic societies place on governments. Thus, a homeowners’ association can raise revenues and enforce restrictive rules as if it were a private business rather than a government in a democratic society. When people willingly trade their democratic rights for the security of their property values, they are viewing themselves as economic entities rather than as citizens; a view echoed by economists such as Kenichi Ohmae.

In 1990, Kenichi Ohmae theorized that there is now a global Interlinked Economy (ILE) in which there is only one economic unit that is still relevant: the "borderless world" of the U.S.-Japan-Europe "Triad." In Ohmae’s view, regional development is facilitated by eliminating trade barriers, attracting foreign and multinational investment, and allowing consumers access to the best and cheapest products regardless of where they are made. Not every city can be a "winner" in the international hierarchy of cities, but by fighting rather than accepting its economic destiny in the global economy, a city will be a certain loser in the long run.

Leftist intellectuals condemn the forces of economic globalization. According to Castells and Henderson, the new global economy exerts demands which most governments are powerless to resist. These demands force governments to implement measures which compromise the well being of their own citizens by

83 Garreau, Edge City, 185-187, 287.
84 Ohmae, The Borderless World.
dismantling the protections of the welfare state. Globalization may be viewed both in terms of the world capitalist class exploiting cheap labour sources (the leftist view), or as an opportunity for workers throughout the world to improve their lot by becoming global consumers (the rightist view).

One criticism of economic restructuring is the "two-tiered" nature of the emerging job market. Many of the jobs which formerly provided upward mobility to working class persons have disappeared. Globalization weakens the sense of responsibility of central governments for the fate of urban areas, by placing economic forces beyond the capability of the nation-state. In that respect, all cities are now global cities.

By the late twentieth century it has become evident that cities cannot be understood solely as products of national culture; the city is profoundly entangled in the world system.... Scholars have long recognized this to be the case for the planet's largest metropolitan centres, the global centres of the world economy, anchored by hierarchies of corporate power and through the internationalization of capital. But now,... transnational forces have an impact on more than just the largest metropolitan centres.

As a result, throughout the world, legitimacy criteria are

__________________________


86 Friedmann, "World City Hypothesis," 69-80. "Bifurcated," "polarized," and "dichotomized" are other words that are used to describe the emerging job market. Producer and other services in Vancouver were found to support the theory of a polarized labour market (Hutton and Ley, "Location, Linkages, and Labour," 133-138).

shifting from habitual loyalty to informed choice. Authority relationships ("hierarchical and vertical") are being replaced with bargaining relationships, which:

   tend to be more equal and horizontal, in the sense that none of the parties lie in the others' sphere of authority and their interactions are shaped by offers and counteroffers, with no clear-cut beginning or end point.**

One of the implications of the rise of bargaining and informed choice and the decline of authority and habit is that conflicts remain unresolved, or only temporarily resolved. Old conflicts which were once thought to have been finished are continuously reopening. Since informed responses tend to take the form of negative reactions to decisions, leaders (and planners) may become reluctant to take action on a controversial issue.

When a bargaining process becomes a "free-for-all" "grab-what-you-can" process, it may be perceived as a fiasco and lose its legitimacy with the public. The consensus-building process which resulted in the highly complicated Charlottetown Accord of 1992 is one such example. Dissatisfaction with the Accord also represented a blow to the legitimacy of the provincial, aboriginal, and interest group "elites" who bargained on behalf of the Canadian people, as well as the three "traditional" national political parties.

---

Despite the appearance that national loyalties are withering, people are still influenced by their national cultures and the collective values of these cultures. In both Canada and the U.S., collective values have played, and continue to play, an important role in societal development. The resulting differences present challenges to the development of a transborder planning system for sustainable development in the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor.

Individual freedom is at the centre of the U.S. national culture. One of the manifestations of individual freedom in U.S. culture is economic individualism. According to Keating, the U.S. has created a "national culture" which is based largely on "an ethos of competitive individualism." Cultural assimilation is another collective value of U.S. national culture, as shown by the mythology of the "melting pot."

Conversely, Canada may have built a national identity based upon cultural diversity ("mosaic") and economic assimilation. Arguably, it is the U.S. model that has produced a more cohesive society. In both societies, however, the collective values unite all mainstream political parties and economic classes into a cohesive social unit.

The "economic assimilation" which is referred to above summarizes the three forces; Toryism, Economic Nationalism, and

89 Keating, Comparative Urban Politics, 13-14.
Social Democracy; which sustain collectivist values in Canada. Toryism is a paternalistic conservatism which is "suspicious of market liberalism" and sees "society as an organic whole."\(^9\)

Especially since the downfall of slavery, Americans have not subscribed to the view of society as a harmonious "social organism." This view, which was articulated earlier in the three-class society proposed in Plato's *Republic*, is remarkably similar in aristocratic, socialistic, and fascist thought.

Economic Nationalism "emphasizes national solidarity as a condition of survival in a competitive world." In Canada, the government played an active role in "nation-building under adverse conditions including the threat of an American takeover." Social Democracy criticizes the inequalities which arise from market capitalism, and "the way they empty the formal equality of citizenship of any real meaning."\(^{91}\)

None of the above forces has played a significant role in U.S. history. As a result, Americans view their governments as arbiters of the inevitable conflicts between free individuals pursuing happiness, and as regulators who protect the interests of the general public. The notion of transforming a society through planning based on a conscious, collective decision does not easily fit into this view. The forces of Toryism, Economic Nationalism,

\(^{90}\) Ibid.

\(^{91}\) Ibid.
and Social Democracy would tend to make Canadians more accepting of a collective decision to pursue the goal of sustainability. Canadian political culture would also be more receptive to a planning system in which the components are designed to reinforce, rather than place checks, on one another.

The transborder planning system for the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor must have a goal of uniting the region's people for the purpose of creating a sustainable urban region. In addition to the similarities and differences across the border, legal and practical requirements must also be considered. These requirements stem from the realities of sovereignty and the difficulties faced by authorities in achieving compliance. It is essential that the planning system for sustainability include elements designed to address the dimensions of the problem listed above.
4.0 Introduction

In order to address the legal, practical, and theoretical issues that were discussed in previous chapters, the planning system for sustainability should contain the following elements:

4.1 A structure to implement the common goals and shared visions of the citizens of the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor.

4.2 International components to link the portions of the region on opposite sides of the border.

4.3 Planning standards for sustainable communities, to be passed as acts of legislation by the Washington and British Columbia governments.

4.4 Mechanisms for enforcement of the planning standards and dispute resolution, and for monitoring compliance.

In the following chapter, each of the above elements will be described in terms of examples, and discussed in terms of the study region. While alternative ways to include the above elements are available, all of the "essential elements" should be addressed in some manner.

4.1 Common Goals and Shared Vision

The planning system should be a vehicle for turning the common goals and shared visions of the study region's people into
implementable and enforceable policies. Therefore, the policy development and implementation mechanisms should include opportunities for community participation and advice.

A review of the challenges facing the Region leads to the conclusion that to achieve a sustainable future, we will have to:

- link individuals, private and public organizations and governments in the creation of a common vision around a shared resource - the land, water and air of the Georgia Basin-Puget Sound Region;....

International borders are drawn with the intention of separating people. In many cases, a sense of regionalism exists between the human settlements on opposite sides of an international boundary, in spite of the division by the border. It may even be possible that the border acts as a unifying force, rather than a divisive force, uniting populations which feel alienated from, or ignored by, their nation-states. Ivo Duchacek described the ways in which noncentral governments may act on the forces of transborder regionalism:

...noncentral governments deal with their noncentral counterparts on the other side of the frontier. Often the two noncentral transfrontiers exercise coordinated pressure on their respective central governments or on centrally appointed and managed border institutions.2

[Transborder regionalism] refers to the sum of the various informal and formal networks of communications and problem-solving mechanisms which bring contiguous subnational regions into decisional dyads or triads ... in these an integrative transborder political culture may

---

1 B.C. Round Table, Sustainability in the Georgia Basin / Puget Sound Region, 1.
The goals and values of the people of the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor should theoretically be reflected in the study region's major planning documents, which are summarized below. Similarities found among these documents serve as evidence that a transborder political culture exists, or at least, that the basis for developing such a culture exists. The distinctive characteristics of "Cascadia's" people (discussed in Chapter 1) are also reflected in the planning documents.

The Greater Vancouver Regional District's 1990 report, Creating Our Future: Steps to a More Livable Region (updated in 1993), "sets the actions resulting from Choosing Our Future in the context of regional priorities." Choosing Our Future, a document produced fifteen years earlier, involved the participation of "thousands of people" and resulted in the following critical priorities:

1. Maintaining a healthy environment;
2. Conserving our land resource;
3. Serving a changing population;
4. Maintaining the region's economic health; and
5. Managing our region.  

The City of Seattle's 1989 background report for the Advisory Forum on Balanced Growth, Growth and Change: Seattle and the Region, expresses many of the same concerns. It contains chapters

---

3 Ibid., 17.
on the following "Critical Issues":

1. Regional human services
2. Housing
3. Economic development and diversification
4. Land use
5. Infrastructure
6. Governance
7. Neighborhoods

The City of Seattle held community forums for two years as part of its comprehensive planning process. Three "core values" were identified as "critical to maintaining Seattle's quality of life in the years ahead." These values are: (1) Environmental Stewardship; (2) Social Equity; and (3) Economic Opportunity and Security.

Washington State's Growth Management Acts, consisting of bills enacted in 1990 and 1991, express many of the above concerns on behalf of the entire state, and in particular, the Puget Sound region.

This thesis does not intend to resolve the ongoing debate over "continentalism." Much has been written about whether or not Americans and Canadians are effectively one "nation," or as Joel Garreau would argue, several transborder "nations." It is safe to assume that Canadians and Americans living in the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor share certain values regarding their priorities for the

5 Seattle, Growth and Change.

future. The challenge for the planning system will be to develop policies which incorporate these values, and to effectively implement these policies across all jurisdictional lines.

4.2 International Components

Although municipal, state, and provincial governments participate in the international political and economic arenas, they do not enjoy the status of sovereign governments. The planning system must take into account the international dimension of the problem, and recognize that the sovereignty of the nation-state is the basis of international society.

The ultimate control of all relations across international borders rests with the governments of sovereign nation-states. Although subnational units such as U.S. states and Canadian provinces are permitted by their respective national governments to pursue international contacts, they may not make treaties with one another. A formally ratified treaty is the only form of negotiated agreement having the force of law across international boundaries. Treaties are also used to create any binational or multinational bodies which hold any formal powers, including those of enforcement.

While units such as U.S. states and Canadian provinces (and by extension, local and regional governments) may participate in the international arena, they are not "full international persons."
Their international activities are "based on the specific grant of permission" from their respective sovereign nations, or on the constitutional terms which govern the federation.\(^7\)

The United States Constitution forbids states to "enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation." A state may not, "without the consent of Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws," nor may it "enter into any agreement with another state, or with a foreign power."\(^8\)

As a result, the United States Supreme Court has favoured national treaties over state regulations which conflicted with them. In 1963, Congress declared that not all compacts and agreements are prohibited to states by the Constitution, only those "tending to increase the political power in the States."\(^9\)

Despite federal government superiority in foreign policy, the U.S. must secure the voluntary cooperation of its states when it implements certain treaties, especially trade agreements. Although the federal government has control over international trade and

---

\(^7\) James, *Sovereign Statehood*, 26-28. In practice, non-sovereign states have even participated in the United Nations as full members, as have Ukraine, Byelorussia (now Belarus), India, and the Philippines before they achieved independence.

\(^8\) United States, *Constitution*, Article 1, Section 10.

interstate commerce, it cannot dictate to states regarding their
own purchase preferences. According to John Kline, the U.S.
government has asked states to voluntarily adhere to its
procurement code in order to bring their own codes in line with the
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.  

Canada's Constitution did not specifically forbid any powers
to the provinces. It contained separate lists of central
government powers, powers granted to the provinces, and shared
powers, with residual powers left to the central government.
Section 132 gave the central government "all powers necessary or
proper for performing" Canada's foreign policy functions under its
treaty obligations as part of the British Empire. Later court
decisions gave the provinces power over treaty implementation when
the treaties dealt with "provincial" powers. Some of the powers
which were classified as "provincial" are not purely domestic in
nature, especially in view of global economic trends.  

Thus, the Canadian Constitution effectively grants its provinces specific
opportunities for subnational diplomacy; opportunities which U.S.

---

10 Kline, "United States Federalism," 216. Kline is referring
to the provisions of the GATT "Uruguay" and "Tokyo" rounds of the
early 1990s.

11 Swanson, Intergovernmental Perspectives, 227-228. The
Constitution of Canada has not changed in recognition of these
powers. It is, rather, the world which has changed by increasing
the international dimensions of these entrenched political powers.
For example, "The Management and Sale of the Public Lands belonging
to the Province and of the Timber and Wood thereon" (B.N.A. Act,
1867, Section 92, subsection 5) is an exclusive provincial power
having international implications.
states do not have as entrenched rights.

The framers of the British North America Act, 1867, did not intentionally create powerful provinces. At the time of Confederation, the provinces were envisioned as "possessing little more prestige and authority than inflated municipalities." The provinces achieved their present status incrementally.12

Today, Canada's provinces are effectively "quasi-sovereign nations." Each pursues policies of "province building" akin to nation-building,13 complete with interprovincial trade barriers. According to Peter Meserve,

Provinces are now recognized by the Canadian government as being competent to conclude transnational agreements provided that first, the provinces possess the appropriate domestic legislative authority and second, there will be no international consequences from the agreement.14

While the U.S. Constitution fails to even mention cities, Canada's states that:

In each Province the Legislature may exclusively make Laws in relation to Matters coming within the classes of Subjects next herein—after enumerated; that is to say — ...8. Municipal Institutions in the Province.15

12 Canadian Urban Institute, Greater Toronto Area, 22-23.
15 Canada, Constitution Act (formerly the British North America Act 1867), Section 92. Incidentally, the clause for provincial power over municipal institutions is sandwiched between hospitals and asylums (subsection 7) and taverns (subsection 9).
Canadian provinces guard the "sovereignty" of their "quasi-nationhood" over their regional districts and municipalities in much the same way as the U.S. federal government "jealously guards" its sovereignty over the states.\(^{16}\) While U.S. cities deal directly with many federal agencies and programmes, Canadian cities often must go through their provincial governments for similar assistance.

During the 1960s the Supreme Court of Canada made a distinction between "treaties and compacts" (a central government power) and other, more informal arrangements "which do not involve obligation but which envisage reciprocal or concurrent legislative action."\(^{17}\) Thus, in general, state-provincial agreements are permitted by both the U.S. and Canadian federal governments.

A Vancouver-Seattle Corridor International Agreement for Sustainability would commit governments on both sides of the border to the development and implementation of policies designed to achieve a specified set of planning objectives. It would either create or enable the creation of (and participation by all levels of government in) any bodies needed for the development, implementation, and enforcement of planning policies. The international dimension is therefore most important for the


\(^{17}\) Meserve, "Boundary-Water Issues," 87-88.
preliminary (or enabling) phase of the planning system.

State and provincial governments already have formal places in some bilateral (U.S.-Canada) and international organizations.\textsuperscript{18} Local governments, as "creatures" of their states and provinces, could similarly have a formal place in the international components of the transborder planning system, and participate in policymaking, advisory, and implementation mechanisms. The Council of Europe has produced several "model" agreements which enable this participation to take place.

4.2.1 Council of Europe Models

The European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Co-operation Between Territorial Communities or Authorities (1980) is the Council of Europe's model for transborder cooperation. It contains an Appendix of Model Inter-State Agreements. There are five Model Inter-state Agreements, which are intended for:

(1.1) ...the promotion of transfrontier co-operation;  
(1.2) ...regional transfrontier consultation;  
(1.3) ...local transfrontier consultation;  
(1.4) ...contractual transfrontier co-operation between local authorities; [and]  
(1.5) ...organs of transfrontier co-

\textsuperscript{18} For example, the U.S.-Canada Agreement which created the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission stipulates that each government must appoint one of its three Commissioners through state (Maine) or provincial (New Brunswick) consultation (Swanson, \textit{Intergovernmental Perspectives}, 170-171). Quebec and New Brunswick, as well as Canada, participate in conferences of Francophone nations.
operation between local authorities.\textsuperscript{19}

The Model Agreements are intended to facilitate cooperation by making a commitment at the national level to dismantle barriers to local and regional cooperation. While the models are intended to encourage cooperation, they do not establish a commitment to the joint formulation and implementation of policies. In this way, they are analogous to U.S. State Planning Enabling legislation, which in most states, allows but does not require any local government to make or implement any plan.

Model 1.1, for "promotion of transfrontier co-operation," includes the following provisions:

Local and regional authorities engaging in transfrontier co-operation in accordance with this agreement shall be entitled to the same facilities and protection as if they were co-operating at the national level.... Each Party shall instruct such body, commission or institution as it shall designate to study current national legislation and regulations with a view to suggesting changes in any provisions liable to hinder the development of local transfrontier co-operation....\textsuperscript{20}

In Model 1.2, for "regional transfrontier consultation," the national governments agree to...

...establish a joint commission..., and if necessary one or more regional committees... to deal with matters relating to transfrontier consultation.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{19} Council of Europe, \textit{European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Cooperation Between Territorial Communities or Authorities.}

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
The Commission and Committees are intended to be small, efficient, and flexible, with memberships representative of both central government and border region interests. The committees are largely intended to deal with matters of immediate concern, and to "investigate problems arising... and to make recommendations accordingly." 22

Model 1.3, for "local transfrontier consultation," invites local authorities to "make a joint study of problems of common interest through consultation committees." Like the other models, it does not change the intergovernmental relationships as they are defined under a nation-state's domestic law.

The function of the consultation committees shall be to organise exchanges of information and consultations on both sides as well as to study matters of common interest and determine common aims. 23

Model 1.4, for "contractual transfrontier co-operation between local authorities," addresses contracts concluded by local authorities relating to:

...the provision of supplies or services, the taking of joint action, the creation of associations established on the basis of civil or commercial law of one of the States parties or the membership of such an association. 24

It addresses the questions of the circumstances under which each state's laws will be applicable in the contract's enforcement.

22 Ibid.
23 Ibid.
24 Ibid.
Model 1.5, for "organs of transfrontier co-operation between local authorities," allows "local authorities and other public law bodies," in accordance with domestic law, to:

- take part in associations or consortia of local authorities formed in the territory of another Party in accordance with the latter's domestic law.\(^{25}\)

Although the above Model Inter-state Agreements would facilitate and permit, rather than require, transborder cooperation between local authorities, they represent an important part of the planning system. Additional measures taken at the central and state/provincial governmental levels, such as mandatory planning standards, would act as incentives to encourage and promote the desired cooperation.

4.2.2 Alternatives to a Formal Bi-National Treaty

An agreement by the sovereign governments not to undermine transborder planning efforts in the study region would open up options that would not require a formal treaty between the two sovereign governments. That agreement may be written and signed, as in the Council of Europe Models, informally written or spoken, or completely tacit.

In the case of the Annual Conference of New England Governors and Eastern Canadian Premiers (NEG/ECP), the state and provincial executives notified their respective federal governments in advance.

\(^{25}\) Ibid.
of the first meeting of that policy-making body. Representatives of the U.S. State Department and the Canadian External Affairs Ministry were invited by the states and provinces to participate as observers.26

Much of the output of NEG/ECP and its subsidiaries consists of "resolutions" which recommend actions (or inactions) to be taken by the U.S. and Canadian central governments. The federal governments have often responded positively to these recommendations by acting in concert with each other and with the governors and premiers.27 Thus, cooperation without a formally binding treaty can amount to more than lip service.

While the non-treaty options would not carry the force of international law, they would allow for regional control of the procedures and a greater flexibility. These alternatives are listed and discussed below:

Swanson defines an agreement as a "jointly signed document setting forth regularized interactive procedures."28 In all forms of diplomacy, the goal is "an agreement based on conditional

26 Lubin, "Routinization of Cross-Border Interactions," 152-154. According to Lubin, the federal-state cooperation on the U.S. side of the border on this matter was much warmer than the cooperation between Canada and its eastern provinces.

27 Ibid., 163-164.

28 Swanson, Intergovernmental Perspectives, 235.
mutuality." Each side promises to behave a certain way provided that the other side keeps up its promise.29

Conditional mutuality is the basis of formal treaties as well as less formal agreements. The difference in practice is that a ratified treaty is enforced by a nation-state's own legal system. So long as a nation-state has not withdrawn from the treaty, it has an international legal obligation not to violate the treaty. Its courts have a moral obligation to give the treaty precedence over any conflicting domestic laws.

The British Columbia-Washington "Environmental Cooperation Agreement" was signed by B.C. Premier Harcourt and Washington Governor Gardner on May 7, 1992. It pledges the leaders to cooperation on a wide range of environmental issues. Not being a treaty, it is not enforceable by any third party such as a court. The two leaders have promised to cooperate on certain matters, but no legal action may be taken if future events prove otherwise.30 Harcourt and Michael Lowry (Gardner's successor who took office in 1993) affirmed the agreement in 1993.31


The European Outline Convention of 1980 contains an Appendix of Model Outline Agreements, Statutes, and Contracts Between Local Authorities. It includes models for:

(2.1) Outline agreement on the setting up of a consultation group between local authorities; (2.2) Outline agreement on co-ordination in the management of transfrontier local public affairs; (2.3) Outline agreement on the setting up of private law transfrontier associations; (2.4-2.5) Outline contract for the provision of supplies or services between local authorities in frontier areas: (2.4) private-law type and (2.5) public-law type; (2.6) Outline agreement on the setting up of organs of transfrontier co-operation between local authorities.32

The European Outline Convention notes that for each of these model agreements, statutes, and contracts, an inter-state agreement may be needed depending upon the particular conditions. The types of cooperation envisioned in the Models above mostly correspond to those of the Model Inter-State Agreements reviewed earlier in this chapter. The provisions of Model 2.2, however, allow for cooperation which goes beyond mere consultation and exchange of information:

the Parties undertake to comply with a prior consultation procedure before reaching decisions on a number of measures they have to take within the limits of their powers and of the territory administered by them; the Parties undertake, within their territory and within the limits of their powers, to take the measures necessary to the achievement of the agreement’s objectives;...

---

32 Council of Europe, European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Cooperation between Territorial Communities or Authorities.

33 Ibid.
Any agreement based on the above model would commit its signatories to cooperative solutions to common problems. Though not enforceable, the fact that the agreement bears the signatures of responsible leaders should be worth something.

In the study region, the border community of Sumas, Washington, is seeking an agreement with the sewage system of the Central Fraser Valley Regional District (Abbotsford and Matsqui, plus Mission) for sewerage service. Sumas would become a contract client rather than a full voting member of the sewage system's governing body.\(^3^4\) It is likely that a formal contract of this nature will require some cooperation from, and agreements between, the federal, state, and provincial governments.

According to Swanson, an understanding may consist of "correspondence, resolutions, communiques, or memoranda, not jointly signed, setting forth regularized interactive procedures." For example, two leaders, or even two bureaucrats, may exchange letters articulating a willingness to adopt a common or reciprocal policy on an issue. Two legislatures or councils may also pass separate resolutions regarding their future cooperation.\(^3^5\)

An "understanding" seems to be even less binding than does an "agreement." A leader who defies an agreement may be accused of

\(^3^4\) Adair, interview with author, 18 January 1994.

\(^3^5\) Swanson, *Intergovernmental Perspectives*, 235-236.
"breaking" it. An understanding, however, could easily be terminated without any perception of wrongdoing or betrayal.

An example of a Canadian intergovernmental "understanding" might include a federal-provincial memorandum on regional development priorities in the Atlantic provinces. Such a memorandum would probably not be jointly signed and would not be legally binding on the federal government.

In 1992, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was drafted between the Province of British Columbia and the states of Washington and Oregon to establish a Cascadia Corridor Commission. Legislation had been drafted at the federal and state/provincial levels to authorize participation in the proposed Commission.

The Commission's representatives were to be appointed from federal, state/provincial, and local governments, as well as aboriginal communities, port officials, and community and business organizations. The Commission was to have a mandate to develop a "strategic plan for environmentally sound urban management in the Cascadia Region," but was only authorized to act as an advisory body to the region's governments."

---

36 British Columbia, Washington, and Oregon, "Memorandum of Understanding," Draft 12 August 1992. "Cascadia" is defined in the MOU to include, in addition to the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor, Oregon's Willamette Valley to Eugene, the southern part of Vancouver Island, and the western shore of Puget Sound.
According to Swanson, an arrangement consists of "any other written or verbal articulation of a regularized interactive procedure." Periodic discussions between counterparts in state and provincial governments, with neither jointly signed documents nor reciprocal formal action, fall under this classification.37

The 1992 Memorandum of Understanding for a Cascadia Corridor Commission was withdrawn in favour of a less formal "arrangement": an "ad hoc strategic alliance" known as the Cascadia Task Force. B.C. Premier Michael Harcourt was concerned about "overstructuring" the Province's relationships with Washington and Oregon, a concern which became especially sensitive during the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) negotiations.38 There was also a feeling that the proposed Commission would have been dominated by the federal governments on both sides of the border.39

An arrangement can be valuable as a step leading to an understanding, an agreement, or a formalized treaty. It may also be useful in resolving policy conflicts which may arise periodically. A Governor and Premier may, for example, have an arrangement to consult one another about any proposed changes to their forestry policies, such as those pertaining to the export of raw logs. If the arrangement is no longer desirable to either

37 Swanson, Intergovernmental Perspectives, 236.
party, it may easily be discontinued (an even more mild term than "broken agreement" or "terminated understanding").

The High Speed Rail Committee, a Washington State steering committee, is studying the possibilities for a high speed rail corridor extending from Vancouver, B.C. to Eugene, Oregon. Its Phase I report (completed in 1992) involved a "non-voting liaison representative from British Columbia," a form of "arrangement." More formal participation by B.C. and Oregon will be secured for Phase II.\(^{40}\)

The economic development (integrationism/boosterism) branch of the Cascadia movement is another example of an "arrangement" which paved the way for "understandings" and "agreements." It formally began during the 1986 World Exposition (Expo '86). At Expo, Donald P. Lorentz, director of business and market development at the Washington State Department of Trade and Economic Development, began a series of meetings between B.C. and Washington government and industry officials. This led to the establishment of the "Pacific Northwest Economic Partnership (PNEP)."\(^{41}\)

The name "Pacific Northwest Economic Partnership" was first used in 1988 at the COMDEX computer trade show in Las Vegas. In 1988, a Memorandum of Cooperation and the Economic Cooperation

\(^{40}\) Agnew, Cross-Border Issues, 8.

\(^{41}\) Chadwick, "Hands Across the Border," 10-11.
Agreement on Trade, Investment, and Tourism were signed. The 14-member P.N.E.P. Committee began meeting in 1989.\textsuperscript{42}

PNEP has taken initiatives to support local economic development. A pilot programme to pair communities was started with Castlegar and Spokane. PNEP is looking to expand to nearby states and provinces.\textsuperscript{43}

The "arrangement" which began with Expo also paved the way for interactions involving legislators and business interests. The Pacific Northwest Economic Region (PNWER), a working group of state and provincial legislators from five states and two provinces that first met in 1991, will be discussed further in the next chapter. In 1989, a journal called \textit{The New Pacific} became the business community’s vehicle for promoting the concept of Cascadia as an economic region extending from Alaska to Montana. The Cascadia economic movement has been criticized as "a corporatist approach,"\textsuperscript{44} and as "the debasement of bioregionalism."\textsuperscript{45}

Lacking any formality, contacts are "single exchanges in which no regularized procedures are defined, nor any ongoing reciprocal procedural obligations incurred." Their main advantage is the ease

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 14-15, 17-20.

\textsuperscript{44} Laviolette, "The Nature of Regional Government."

\textsuperscript{45} Reid, "Cascadia: The Debasement."
with which they may take place.\textsuperscript{46}

Contiguous areas separated by a border are not perceived by one another as being "really abroad." Their process of conducting microdiplomatic relations primarily consists of luncheon appointments or is "telephonic with a minimum of paperwork." Such dealings are difficult to monitor, so it is difficult to determine their frequency.\textsuperscript{47}

The institutions of border communities are geared toward day-to-day survival, rather than the formal procedures observed by nation-states. "Arbitrary federal and state proclamations" tend to scorn this "system of traditional informal networks," when in reality it is arguably "the most effective means currently in operation for reducing border tensions and strains."\textsuperscript{48}

In the British Columbia-Washington border region, informal channels for transborder cooperation and communication between law enforcement agencies have developed through two social organizations: The Peace Arch Law Enforcement Association and the Footprinters. Highway planning cooperation in the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor has been mostly informal. Representatives of the

\textsuperscript{46} Swanson, \textit{Intergovernmental Perspectives}, 237.
\textsuperscript{47} Duchacek, "International Competence," 20-21.
Puget Sound Council of Governments (now the Puget Sound Regional Council) and the GVRD have met to exchange information on transportation planning and growth management. Informal cooperation in both highway planning and law enforcement is restricted because the border crossing facilities and extradition mechanisms are strictly federal functions. Although port officials have informal contacts through their common membership in the Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities, marine pollution control is a federal matter.  

Some informal cooperation in municipal planning has taken place, through personal contacts and largely over the telephone. Whatcom County has coordinated its planning for the Point Roberts Subarea with the District of Delta. The District of Langley has consulted with Whatcom County regarding groundwater contamination that would result if a gravel pit in Langley were to be developed. Whatcom County Planning Director Dan Taylor has visited British Columbia to attend conferences and informally consult with officials.  

Regional conferences are a variation of informal contacts. While they are indeed formally held, they have no formal governmental mandates. "Building Bridges to Sustainable  

---


Communities," a conference held 8-12 September 1993 at Western Washington University, was promoted as an international conference for the Georgia Basin, Puget Sound, and Willamette Valley regions. It was attended by governmental officials at all levels, technical experts, academics, native band leaders, and citizens' organizations. It was a forum for cooperation and dialogue between the different movements taking place in the transborder region, including: economic boosterism; environmentalism; bioregionalism; social advocacy; native rights; continentalism; and economic protectionism.

Without a formal bi-national treaty, the continuity of the cooperative planning process would depend entirely on the will of the participants. No legal obligation would be enforceable on the non-sovereign units to continue cooperation, nor on the sovereign units to allow it. If a common regional planning policy were to be adopted by state and provincial governments, its enforcement on local and regional bodies would be completely at the discretion of those same nonsovereign governments.

Without a formal and legally enforceable treaty, the political difficulties of reining in local government autonomy might persist. Especially in the U.S., the fragmentation of local authority enjoys considerable legitimacy based on criteria of habit and tradition. Lacking a strong, binding international component, the legitimacy of the planning cooperation would depend largely on charismatic
leadership, and the belief that the fragmented system can no longer competently address the transborder region's problems.

The fundamental changes which are required to create a sustainable region will most likely happen gradually. This will require a long range process such as the one outlined by the International Georgia Basin-Puget Sound Sustainable Development Project. The Project's Rationale and Operational Plans, prepared by Alan Artibise, envision a gradual development of innovations to promote and manage sustainability in the larger Georgia Basin-Puget Sound "bioregion." The Project, as proposed by Artibise, will develop an inventory of the region's resources and constraints, and develop policies for greater livability and sustainable development. The Project will have an organizational structure to be controlled equally by Americans and Canadians. The Organizational Secretariat offices in Vancouver and Seattle would also manage the dispersal of funding to applicants who have submitted proposals for specific cooperative projects in the region.\textsuperscript{51}

4.3 Legislative Element

The legislative element will implement the goals and policies through which the shared vision for the future of the study region will be realized. In federal systems such as Canada and the U.S., the powers of local and regional bodies are derived through state

\textsuperscript{51} Artibise, "Sustainable Urbanization Report."
and provincial legislation. Any requirements to be imposed on local and regional governments must therefore be imposed through legislative action at the state/provincial level. Legislative action might include changes to state Home Rule provisions (including Municipal Code statutes and state Constitutions) and provincial Municipal Acts.

Alberta’s 1980 Planning Act required each of the province’s Regional Planning Commissions to prepare a regional plan. This plan, upon ratification by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, would become "the primary planning document in a hierarchy of plans authorized by the act." All local plans and actions were required to conform to the regional plan.52 Particularly in the Edmonton area, the Province was attempting to balance the forces supporting suburban autonomy with those which wanted a city-dominated region. It felt that direct intervention was necessary to resolve the dispute within the region. In 1981, the cabinet directed the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission to incorporate policies in its plan to achieve a set of objectives which the cabinet had determined for the region.53

The legal framework is not intended to "tyrannize" local governments or individuals into "correct" behaviour, but rather, to provide for justice based on Rule of Law. The rules which govern

52 Thomas, "Edmonton," 265.

53 Ibid., 274-75, 279-81.
individuals, families, communities, organizations, and governments must be impartial and anonymous, rather than arbitrary. These rules should create (for lower governments as well as individuals):

conditions under which the knowledge and initiative of individuals are given the best scope so that they can plan most successfully....

Increasingly, the role of government is seen to be the establishment of the rules governing society, the broad direction of policy, and a framework to ensure that citizens are dealt with equitably and have adequate opportunities to better their lives.... There appears to be consensus that government has an important role in setting objectives, but there is also an increasing belief that creativity and flexibility should be the norm as to the means of achieving objectives.

Karl Popper described two choices for implementing policy goals, which apply to regional sustainability in the context of this thesis. The first is based on Rule of Law; the second on arbitrary enforcement:

The first is that of designing a 'legal framework' of protective institutions (laws restricting the powers of the owner of an animal or of a landowner are an example). The second is that of empowering organs of the state to act -within certain limits - as they consider necessary for achieving the ends laid down by the rulers for the time being. We may describe that first procedure as 'institutional' or 'indirect' intervention, and the second 'personal' or 'direct' intervention.

An example of arbitrary enforcement occurred when British Columbia's Social Credit government attempted to push through an

---

54 Hayek, Road to Serfdom, 35.

55 Canadian Urban Institute, Disentangling Local Government Responsibilities, 77.

56 Popper, Open Society, 321.

135
exclusion from the Agricultural Land Reserve which was requested by a landowner and Social Credit supporter. The proposed development, located in the District of Delta, conflicted with the Greater Vancouver Regional District’s (GVRD) official plan. In 1983, when the provincial cabinet and the GVRD "came to a head" [sic] over this dispute, the Province stripped regional districts of their planning and zoning authority and "cancelled" existing regional plans.\(^{57}\)

Although the action was perfectly legal, its motivation was the government’s desire to obtain a certain result that would please a political ally. Arguably, the spirit of impartiality had been violated. When rules are laid down in advance, they should not be changed as personal favours.

The third possible way of implementing policy goals is through appeals to conscience, or moral suasion, without any legislative action or direct intervention. If every local government (or individual) were left to decide independently whether to contribute to the maintenance of sustainability, each actor would make decisions based on its own cost-benefit ratio. The tendency of each to minimize its own costs (loss of tax revenue, reduced consumption patterns, restrictions in free choice) and maximize its own benefits (environmental, economic, quality of life) would

\(^{57}\) Oberlander and Smith, "Governing Metropolitan Vancouver," 363.
encourage "free riding." As Garrett Hardin wrote:

[A]ppealing to conscience only rewards those who lack it. 58

Thus, a legislative element is the only alternative which is both fair and effective. It will consist of parallel Lower Mainland and East Puget Sound Corridor Sustainability Acts for Washington and British Columbia. The planning system should provide a process for harmonizing these legislative acts.

A formal treaty or agreement might provide for the establishment of a Bi-National Council or similar body in which the state and provincial governments develop similar, parallel legislation. If a federal treaty were to actually dictate a piece of legislation to a state or province, it would undoubtedly be declared unconstitutional by federal courts. Such a treaty would be an infringement on state and provincial powers. Even if it were possible for a central government to dictate legislation to junior governments (which is the case elsewhere in the world), such legislation may not be in the best interests of the border region.

Enabling Acts, consisting of parallel federal legislation, could accomplish many of the same objectives as a treaty. Each Act would specifically give the respective Governor or Premier the authority to set up a policy making council on one side of the border with a mandate to develop contacts with its transborder

58 Hardin, "The Tragedy of the Commons."
counterpart. Formally or informally, the effect of these Acts would be equivalent to the establishment of a single bi-national council.

The international legislative coordination body would have to include members of the provincial Legislative Assembly (especially the governing Cabinet), the State Senate and State House of Representatives, and the State executive branch (the Governor or a gubernatorial appointee). U.S. bicameral legislatures already have reconciliation committees to harmonize legislation when the two houses pass two different versions of a similar bill.\(^{59}\) The proposed body would serve a similar function.

Even without formal authorization of the federal governments, it would still be possible for the state and provincial governments to adopt similar legislation and to consult one another in doing so. As described earlier, the harmonization would take place through agreements, understandings, arrangements, or contacts among state and provincial executives and legislators. A useful model is that of the European Convention.

"Conventions" are the non-treaty mechanisms through which the Council of Europe attempts to harmonize the policies (and policy implementation) of its member governments. Examples include the

\(^{59}\) U.S. bicameral legislatures include the U.S. Congress and all states except for Nebraska.

European Conventions are not actual pieces of legislation to be adopted as law by member countries. They are, rather, broad statements of policy or principle which governments are (morally) bound to embody into their laws once they sign the convention. They are (morally) binding only on those nations which sign on, and do not even require a majority of members in order to "enter into force." For example, Article 9 of the European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Cooperation states that it shall enter into force three months after four members ratify it, provided that at least two of them share a border.

The goal of European Conventions is to bring the "partner states ever closer together towards the goal of a common legislation." They "embrace the legal, cultural and social welfare sectors. They are a proven means of making slow but steady progress on the road to closer co-operation between the peoples of Europe, and have characterised the purpose of the Council." Conventions, as mechanisms for policy harmonization, are described as "slow and unremarkable" and as a "patchwork." "The big obstacle facing the Council is its almost total lack of power. It can only

---

60 Medefind, Organisation Europe, 40.
make proposals.\textsuperscript{61}

The European Community (EC), now called the European Union, has more effective methods for harmonizing its members' legislation. The High Court of the EC (European Court of Justice) gives European law precedence over state law. EC regulations have the effect of statutes in national law. EC Directives are policy orders for states to make things happen. While EC members can be said to have given up "some of their sovereignty," they can still claim to be sovereign.\textsuperscript{62} Participation in the European Union is voluntary for its member nation-states, although once accepted, it requires compliance with collective measures.

4.4 Mechanism for Enforcement and Dispute Resolution

In addition to harmonizing the legislative actions, a mechanism is needed for ensuring the negotiated level of conformity to which the parties have agreed. Regional planning is a good which can exist only as a public good, supported by mandatory contributions, because of its vulnerability to the "free rider" problem. If contributions to regional planning goals (such as sustainability) were purely voluntary and reached through separate independent decisions, the "good" would become unavailable to all.

The benefits of regional planning goods (such as

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., 40-41.

\textsuperscript{62} James, Sovereign Statehood, 248.
sustainability) are analogous to those of civil peace (order, respect for life and property), as argued by Hobbes. Like sustainability, civil peace was available to none (quoting de Jasay) "unless all laid down their arms and submitted to the threat of public coercion in the enforcement of their agreements." Submission to a "social contract" which makes contributions mandatory is the only means of making such a good available to anyone. 63

Jurisdictional finality is one of the benefits of sovereignty. It implies that a state's sovereignty demands the settlement of all legal issues in the courts of the land. There must be no possibility of appealing to an external court against the actions of the government or the decisions of the national courts. 64

There are examples of nation-states binding themselves to the decisions of courts of other lands. Britain's Privy Council is an external court to which some sovereign Commonwealth states allow their nationals to appeal. Another example is the European Court of Human Rights. In these cases, one may argue that jurisdictional finality has been forfeited. If the nation-state has willingly agreed to abide by the decisions of an external court, and may reverse that commitment within its own legislative and legal system (by dropping its membership, for example), it can still claim

63 de Jasay, Social Contract Free Ride, 3.
64 James, Sovereign Statehood, 240-242.
In the United States, states have a form of jurisdictional finality over matters on which they legislate, such as municipal affairs. Appeal to the federal courts can be made only on the basis that a federal law or the federal constitution has been violated. Canadian provinces, unlike U.S. states, enforce their laws through the federal court system. Washington State’s Growth Management Hearing Boards have some quasi-judicial powers to address grievances relating to the enforcement of the State’s Growth Management Act of 1991. These Boards are not actual courts, but make recommendations to the Governor for further action. Both Washington and British Columbia could establish "sustainability hearing boards" to which disputes could be submitted, since actual judicial powers would not be necessary.

The European Community’s European Court of Justice allows people, companies, governments, and local authorities to complain or seek redress if rules are being broken or implemented in an unfair manner. The Court may only exert moral pressure if it finds a member government to be guilty of a violation. Jurisdictional finality would similarly affect the enforceability of sustainability measures in the study region by a joint body.
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65 Ibid.

66 Washington, "Reengrossed Substitute House Bill 1025."

67 Budd and Jones, European Community, 42-44.
Across the U.S.-Canadian border, the Canada-U.S. Trade Commission and the International Joint Commission (IJC) also have some judicial powers for resolving disputes related to their respective treaties. If the planning system's Bi-National Commission were to be given the power to resolve specific disputes (as is the case in the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement and the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty), each nation's own courts would be morally obliged to uphold its decisions. In a treaty dealing with more general matters, or with internal matters, enforceability would be largely based on conditional mutuality.

Whether policy coordination is done through a legal treaty, a signed agreement, or less formal mechanisms, sovereignty is a given constant. The parties which sign the agreement do so because they view the benefits of membership to be greater than the cost of not joining. They remain in the agreement unless the cost of continued membership exceeds the benefit of quitting. Policy coordination would be mandatory only if it were enforced by a superior government (state/provincial/federal) upon a subordinate one (municipal/regional/county). Transboundary coordination, by definition, does not include such a relationship, and is therefore ultimately voluntary for the senior governments involved. Thus, moral pressure, but not legal pressure, can be applied across the border.

The European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Co-operation
Between Territorial Communities or Authorities contains an Appendix of Model Outline Agreements, Statutes, and Contracts Between Local Authorities. Its Model 2.2, the "Outline agreement on coordination in the management of transfrontier local public affairs," is a framework for coordinating public policy for specific purposes. It provides for some measures to be taken within a consultation group when a party fails to carry out its obligations because:

- either there has been [action but] no prior consultation;
- or the measures taken are not in keeping with the agreement
- or the measures necessary to the achievement of the aims of the agreement have not been taken.  

Grievances may then be raised within the group, and if no agreement is reached, "the dispute may be referred to a Conciliation Board entrusted with ensuring compliance with the undertakings entered into." The parties to the agreement may also "agree to set up a specific Controlling body to ensure compliance with the undertakings entered into...."  

NEG/ECP also has the capacity to contain and resolve conflicts among its member states and provinces. Because asymmetry is such a dominant factor in U.S.-Canada relations (more so than in New England-Eastern Canada relations), negotiations through NEG/ECP may
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68 Council of Europe, European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Cooperation between Territorial Communities or Authorities.

69 Ibid.
be preferred over those at the federal level. Neighbouring states and provinces, although they compete, are engaged in a common struggle to adjust to the "new world economic order." The potential benefits of an alliance (and the cost of quitting one) reduce the likelihood that a state or province will turn its back on its neighbours. 70

For the purposes of resolving disputes related to planning for sustainability in the study region, several possible mechanisms are listed below. They are based on the findings of this chapter. These mechanisms may be viewed as alternatives, or may be applied concurrently.

A single Commission could be formed with members representing governments on both sides of the border. It could oversee enforcement of the legislation, and resolve disputes over whether the parties are adhering to the agreement which they signed. The state and provincial governments would be obliged to follow the decisions of the Commission. That obligation would be moral, rather than legal, where internal matters are concerned. If bi-national Commission were given the task of deciding whether local actions conformed to a transborder policy, there would be legal complications.

70 Lubin, "Routinization of Cross-Border Interactions," 162-63.
With parallel commissions, the state and provincial governments would separately enforce the jointly developed policies. These bodies would similar to Washington's Growth Management Hearing Boards, but might be given more extensive powers. The separate commissions would enforce the provisions of state and provincial legislation on subordinate governments. A transborder linkage would still be necessary to harmonize the policies and ensure equal enforcement on both sides of the border.

With enforcement by a Washington executive department or British Columbia government ministry there would also be separate enforcement of common policies on each side of the border. While a quasi-judicial Commission interprets laws and regulations, a department or ministry implements them. While a quasi-judicial body might act by recommending that local actions be overturned, an executive department (or ministry) would enforce its regulations through sanctions. Washington's 1991 Growth Management Act contains provisions for sanctions, including the withholding of state funding by the Governor upon the recommendation of the Hearing Board.

Enforcement by a shared agency would combine the implementation powers of state departments and provincial ministries to implement a jointly developed state-provincial policy. It would, however, involve very close cooperation, effectively creating a single agency acting under the authority of
both the State and Provincial governments. It could be controlled or influenced by a Joint Commission.

The intention of this research is not to design a "planning police force" that will dictate to subordinate governments. What is desired is a mechanism to bring about a system of impartial enforcement rather than enforcement through arbitrary directives. The powers to enforce the standard for sustainability must not be allowed to be bent to suit personal political whims.

The need is for an international political authority which, without power to direct the different people what they must do, must be able to restrain them from action which will damage others....
The powers which must devolve on an international authority... should be strictly circumscribed by the Rule of Law.\textsuperscript{71}

The essential elements of the planning system will be included as components of the planning system. Examples of policymaking bodies, policy implementation bodies and tools, and advisory mechanisms will be reviewed and discussed to determine their possible roles in the planning system.

\textsuperscript{71} Hayek, Road to Serfdom, 232.
Chapter 5
COMPONENTS OF THE PLANNING SYSTEM FOR SUSTAINABILITY

5.0 Introduction

The planning system will be composed of policy making, policy implementing, and policy advising mechanisms. Examples of these types of mechanisms can be found in the councils, commissions, associations, boards, agencies, and other bodies, and in legislative acts which exist throughout the world. In this chapter, examples of these mechanisms will be discussed as models for developing the components of the planning system for sustainability in the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor.  

5.1 Policy-Making Body: "Council"

A "Council" is a body of representatives who establish policies with the goal of implementing the policies. Whether or not the policies are actually implemented as decided by a Council will depend upon several factors. A Council's composition, which could include representatives of local or senior governments, and legislative or executive branches, will be one such factor. Whether the Council possesses the authority to legislate, or is related to the legislatures which do possess the legal authority to

---

1 Multijurisdictional planning models were classified in a manner similar to that of this chapter by Artibise and Hill, Governance and Sustainability. Artibise and Hill discussed the models as alternatives for regional governance in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, rather than as interlinking components of a planning system.
require implementation, will be another factor. Furthermore, if a policy is to be implemented, the necessary administrative tools must be available.

5.1.1 Vancouver-Seattle Corridor Federation or Cooperative Association

The most common model for intergovernmental planning cooperation is the Regional Council, a federation or cooperative association of governments. Membership may be voluntary, or may be mandated by a senior government. While such an entity is capable of making regional policies and publishing policy documents, each member jurisdiction implements its own planning policies while considering the regional policy as advice.

When the regional district system was created in British Columbia in 1965-67, an intermediate governmental tier was not openly desired. As stated by Municipal Affairs Minister Dan Campbell in 1972,

Regional districts are not conceived as a fourth level of government, but as a functional rather than a political amalgamation.²

Section 767 of the British Columbia Municipal Act describes the process for incorporating regional districts. On the recommendation of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Lieutenant Governor in Council (Cabinet) may issue the letters patent for

² Oberlander and Smith, "Governing Metropolitan Vancouver," 334-335.
incorporation. Merger of regional districts (Section 772), or removal of part of one to another (Section 773), may be implemented by the Cabinet if it receives petitions from the existing regional boards.

Although regional district membership is mandated by the B.C. government, municipal implementation of regional district programmes and policies is largely based upon voluntary cooperation. While the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) acts as an umbrella organization for some vital services, since 1983 it has had no regional planning powers. Its members, usually the mayors or councillors of member municipalities, are appointed by the municipal governments.

A municipality can be expected to support GVRD policies when they coincide with its own interests and when the burdens of implementing a policy do not outweigh the benefits. Otherwise, there is little that the GVRD can do to prevent the self-interest of municipalities from overshadowing the needs of the larger region. If the GVRD were to push its regional objectives too hard, it would risk losing the cooperation of its member units. Policymaking cooperation in Washington State's regional bodies is also voluntary, although the State's Growth Management Act (GMA) has some requirements for regional consistency in planning.

Regional planning activities in a federation of municipalities
are analogous to the "social contract" in which individuals form societies. Even though membership in the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) is not voluntary, the participation of member municipalities in regional planning is not enforced from above. The "regional goods" which are made available by membership are analogous to public goods. Just as public goods cannot be provided without a public sector, regional goods would be unavailable without intermunicipal cooperation. Hospitals and education are examples of services which are not necessarily regional goods, because they can also exist as local goods. Regional goods might include maintenance of water supply, air quality, and transportation facilities, all of which necessitate cooperation, especially where natural boundaries and political boundaries do not coincide.

Traditionally, land use control would not have been thought of as a regional good on the grounds that one municipality's use of its land does not constrain the land base of its neighbours. As a local good, planning allows each local government to decide the land use pattern which is best for its community. As the region's land supply becomes used up, land use emerges as a regional issue, since development pressures are not contained within municipal boundaries. In the GVRD, all member municipalities realize that open space and quality of life are now regional assets, and will therefore go through the motions of voluntary cooperation to some degree.
As a cooperative federation, the Regional Council alone will not provide the necessary linkage between policy making and policy implementation. Municipalities may permit the denser development necessary for a Regional Town Centre (RTC), but they may also undermine regional policies by permitting suburban development in non-RTC locations to increase the local tax base and satisfy market preferences. Consistency between regional planning and local action is not required by the GVRD and other cooperative planning bodies.

Nevertheless, the accomplishments of the GVRD as a cooperative federation demonstrate that it is a useful model with a potential for effective action. Its potential for effective regional planning is greatest when senior governments provide meaningful planning standards and utilize effective tools for their enforcement and implementation. 3

One advantage of a Regional Council based on voluntary cooperation is the flexibility it allows. In 1988, Langley City and Township were allowed by the Province to leave the Central Fraser Valley Regional District and join the Greater Vancouver Regional District. 4 A Regional Council could also include transborder governments as full participating members. With the

3 See the discussions of the B.C. Agricultural Land Reserve and Growth Management later in this chapter.

4 O’Brien, Municipal Consolidation and Alternatives, 93.
agreement of state, provincial, and federal governments (or their equivalents elsewhere), voluntary cooperation in the Regional Council's policy making would have very few legal obstacles.

The logical role of the Regional Council within the planning system would be to coordinate the implementation of planning objectives by local governments. The enforcement of mandatory standards by senior governments would ensure their implementation even if the Council were a voluntary body. It would then be to the advantage of local governments to work cooperatively. The Council might also receive input from an advisory body with technical management expertise. Public input may be received from a region-wide advisory process, but would be more economical if it were coordinated at the local government level.

Oberlander and Smith would not label the cooperative federation as a form of regional government, but of "governance." A "government" by definition must be able to make its own decisions; to coordinate its multiple functions, establish priorities, and make trade-offs, within the established Rule of Law. To be a "government," the Regional Council would have to have all of the following attributes:

(1) representation, (2) revenue-raising capacity, (3) autonomy, (4) authority, and (5) the capacity to coordinate. 5

5 Oberlander and Smith, "Governing Metropolitan Vancouver," 367.
5.1.2 Mandatory Regional Government

In order to satisfy Oberlander and Smith's criteria for regional government, state and provincial officials would create and mandate a regional entity which would be given the legal authority to supersede the local governments on certain matters. This Regional Council would make policies which would then be implemented by the local governments, or by a regional agency. Effectively, the proposed regional entity is a new tier of government above the municipal and local authorities.

The regional entity's Councillors might represent the interests of the member municipalities (as in Metropolitan Toronto), resulting in a regional government which is effectively a confederation of municipalities. In Metro Toronto, Metro Councillors have been directly elected by all member municipalities since 1988, most often concurrently with local council elections. They represent districts which conform to municipal boundaries.6

Alternatively, the selection of Councillors might be completely external to municipal politics. In Minnesota's Twin Cities Metropolitan Council, Councillors are appointed by the Governor to represent districts which overlap with municipal boundaries. The Council was "created by, and reports to, the state legislature." While the selection process for Council members insulates them from local political pressures, it also disconnects

6 Frisk, "Greater Toronto," 165.
them from their own constituents.  

In their present forms, these and other mandatory regional governments exist primarily as providers of regional services (for which they make policies) and technical assistance, planners and builders of regional facilities, and facilitators of (mostly) voluntary policy cooperation. Additional powers for implementing sustainability measures could conceivably be given to the regional government(s) of the planning region.

In the Toronto region, most responsibilities of the six regional governments are not exclusive, but are shared with the lower tier of municipalities. Planning is one of these shared responsibilities. Local municipalities are "free to decide the specifics of land development." The regional government, in reviewing local plans, concentrates on their implications for regional services, rather than on their effect on regional land use patterns. The lower tier municipalities have a greater claim to the political loyalties of their constituents than the regional municipalities, and therefore "will generally win in the long run" when there is a conflict.  

A mandatory Regional Council would not give member


municipalities the option of leaving or of ignoring regional policies if they wanted to choose a different development path. Thus, the consistency between regional policy making and local implementation would be ensured.

If this model is selected, there should be a clear definition of the responsibilities of the upper (regional) and lower (local) tier municipalities. In Metro Toronto, the distribution of responsibilities contains much overlap and entanglement. The result, particularly with planning functions, has been a regional policy which is merely the sum of the component local policies (and no more effective than the GVRD).9 "Two-tier governments can undermine accountability," as can a multiplicity of special-purpose agencies (the preferred regional structure in U.S. urban areas).10

The mandatory Regional Council would raise legal questions regarding transborder cooperation. While a local government might voluntarily affiliate itself with a regional government across the border, any mandatory requirements would not be enforceable across the border. Can a state (or province) require a city to adhere to a policy of a provincially (or state)-created entity? Probably not, because of sovereignty and jurisdictional finality. These

9 Canadian Urban Institute, Greater Toronto Area, 5,97.

10 Canadian Urban Institute, Disentangling Local Government Responsibilities, 1.
principles also preclude a state and province from jointly creating a mandatory transborder regional government.

To make this option work, an international agreement could provide for cooperation between two parallel, legally mandated Regional Councils. State and provincial law would require that a local government participate in, and take actions consistent with, the policies of the regional government on its side of the border. Thus, the territorial integrity of federal, state, and provincial governments would not be violated. The regional governments could be required (by their own states or provinces) to consult regularly with their cross-border counterparts (as part of a joint Council), as called for in the international agreement.

The Regional Councils would constitute a new tier of government, with the power to implement (or require the implementation of) the policies they make. They would be established and empowered through state and provincial legislation. The members of the regional governments could be elected, or could be appointed by local and/or state/provincial governments. The geographical areas which they represent do not necessarily have to coincide with municipal boundaries. The advisory process might include representation for diverse segments of society, as well as technical expertise.

As with the cooperative federation's Regional Council, the
role of the mandatory Regional Government(s) within the planning system would be in developing and coordinating the implementation of sustainability measures by local governments. If these measures were made mandatory by the State and Province, however, their implementation could be assured even if cooperation in the Council were voluntary.

Without mandatory state and provincial planning standards, a mandatory regional government would not necessarily make and enforce the necessary measures any more effectively than one based on voluntary cooperation. As the Toronto and Minnesota examples demonstrate, the political realities of metropolitan regions do not always allow two-tier regional governments to be any more effective in regional land use planning than cooperative federations such as the GVRD.

5.1.3 **Council of Heads of Executive Departments and/or Legislative Leaders**

The purpose of this Council would be to coordinate the development by senior (state, provincial, and federal) governments of their policies for sustainability in the study region. The legislative leaders would develop laws, while the cabinet members and department heads would cooperate in developing policy tools. This Council would bring the policy making closer to the enforcement powers, but farther from the local communities.
Policy decisions in the European Community are made by the Council of Ministers, which consists of one minister from each national government. Past decisions by the Council almost always required the agreement of all twelve national governments, but under the new Single European Act, many future decisions will be made with a simple majority. The Council's decisions are considered to be law for all member nations, and the national governments have the duty to enforce them under treaties.  

The Council of Europe, which consists of nearly all European democracies, has peaceful cooperation, rather than integration, as its primary goal. Article 14 of the Statute of the Council of Europe creates the Committee of Ministers, which consists of each of the foreign ministers (or alternate in his or her place) of the member governments. Article 15 states that:

(b) In appropriate cases, the conclusions of the Committee may take the form of recommendations of the Governments of Members, and the Committee may request the governments of members to inform it of the action taken by them with regard to such recommendations.  

Thus, while it may not enact or enforce laws that are valid in member countries, the Committee of Ministers has a moral influence on government policies and behaviour.

---

11 Budd and Jones, European Community, 39-42.
12 Council of Europe, Statute of the Council of Europe.
13 Medefind, Organisation Europe, 19.
In the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor Senior Government Policy Development Council, the State and Province would agree on specific policy goals. They would agree to bring about legislation so that the goals may be implemented by the study region's local or regional governments, or by special agencies. Without transborder policymaking cooperation at the senior levels of government, planning standards cannot be implemented in a meaningful manner. With an equal number of Councillors from Washington and British Columbia, decisions could be made with less than unanimity (for example, 3/5 or 2/3 approval).

Because of the differences between governmental systems, difficulties may arise. A Canadian Premier's cabinet has considerable control over the Legislative Assembly as well as the executive Ministries. In U.S. states, however, the legislative and executive branches often oppose one another, are controlled by different political parties, or compete for power and prestige. U.S. state legislatures (except for Nebraska) are also bicameral. Both legislative houses must pass all laws, including budgetary provisions. Even if legislative leaders were given votes on the Council, they might not feel any loyalty which would cause them to support a jointly reached decision with which they might disagree. In many states, most state cabinet members (but not department Directors) are elected separately from the Governor, rather than
appointed, and are therefore not bound by loyalty, either.\textsuperscript{14}

Consistency as required by the EC Council of Ministers would amount to partial forfeiture of sovereignty. This is not always a politically feasible option, especially in Canada, where nationhood is defined as "not American." Article 15 of the Statute of the Council of Europe represents a more cooperative approach that does not infringe on national sovereignty.

The Council’s role within the larger planning system would be to coordinate the development of planning policies and mechanisms between the State and Provincial governments. The State and Provincial governments would send cabinet representatives and legislative leaders as necessary to a Council. Through a process of negotiation, they would agree on joint policy goals for their governments. There could be input from an advisory process which would represent diverse segments of society. The desired product of this Council model will be the coordinated implementation of similar policies.

5.1.4 Governor-Premier Association

An association of executives (governor and premier) would be similar to the Council of Ministers, Secretaries, Department Heads,

\textsuperscript{14} In Washington State, the independently elected members of the executive department are the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Treasurer, Auditor, Attorney General, Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Commissioner of Public Lands. See Washington, Constitution, Article 3.
and Legislative Leaders, but would be limited to the Governor and Premier. It might also be necessary to include representatives of the two federal governments.

Since 1973, the premiers of five Canadian provinces and the governors of six U.S. states have met in the Annual Conference of New England Governors/Eastern Canadian Premiers (NEG/ECP) to discuss and seek solutions to the common problems which they face. The Conference is served by permanent staffs on each side of the border, and by committees which meet more frequently. The agreements reached by the governors and premiers form the basis of parallel actions to be taken by (or recommended to) their respective state, provincial, and federal governments.¹⁵

While this model is a form of "policymaking," it is up to each leader to implement the joint policies in his or her own state or province. In each political system, there are different constraints on such implementation. For example, U.S. governors are directly elected and have nearly complete control over appointed directors of executive departments, but not the separately elected Cabinet members.

Provincial premiers are not directly elected and serve at the

pleasure of their legislatures. Although the Provincial Cabinet has virtual control over the Legislative Assembly (thanks to party discipline), the Premier's Cabinet Ministers usually include his or her most powerful rivals within the governing party. Thus, the translation of executive policies into legislative, ministerial, and departmental actions is likely to be inconsistent across an international border.

According to Martin Lubin, governors and premiers have distinctively different roles in their respective political systems:

Due to the separation of the legislative from the executive branches of government combined with the further dispersal of powers due to bicameralism, governors are normally prone to lead by persuasion and legislative craftsmanship. On the other hand, premiers provide leadership through control of their executive councils (cabinets) and unicameral legislatures. Since responsibility for both policy initiation and implementation tends to be concentrated in the hands of premiers, they are oriented to policy and programs. Consequently, documents such as NEG/ECP resolutions and memoranda of understanding are not as close to Canadian as they are to U.S. traditional patterns.16

The Governor-Premier Association would be a body in which the executives would personally coordinate their policies for the implementation of planning objectives in the transborder region. With federal involvement, the federal policies necessary to facilitate transborder cooperation could also be coordinated. Through a process of negotiation, they would agree on joint policy

16 Lubin "Routinization of Cross-Border Interactions," 145-146.
goals for their governments. There could be input from an advisory process which would represent diverse segments of society. Alternatively, the Council itself could be expanded to include the diverse interests. The product of this model will be the coordinated implementation of similar policies.

5.2 Policy-Implementing Body: "Vancouver-Seattle Corridor Sustainability Commission"

Bi-national or multi-national Commissions are generally formed to implement formal international agreements (treaties) among nation-states. Although the following examples are focused on the federal level of government, the same mechanisms could be adapted to give representation to the state, regional, and local governments.

The Commissioners usually represent the interests of the governments which appoint them. They make policy recommendations to the national governments, sometimes after consulting with local and regional officials. They may also have a quasi-judicial role in dispute resolution.

The Canada-U.S. Trade Commission, formed by the Canada-United States Free Trade Agreement (1987), supervises the implementation of that treaty. It resolves disputes over the Agreement, and may refer some disputes to binding arbitration.17

17 Canada-United States Free Trade Agreement, Chapter 18.
The U.S.-Canada International Joint Commission (IJC) has remained largely within its original scope of action; to implement the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. If governments agree to abide by and enforce the Commission's decision when they submit their disputes, their jurisdictional finality has technically not been forfeited.

The Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC), although not a Bi-National Commission, is a policy implementing body. Created by the Province of Ontario in 1973, it prepared a land use plan (completed in 1983) which it now implements. NEC has the authority to require local planning and zoning to conform to its plan.¹⁸ British Columbia's Agricultural Land Commission will be discussed in a later section of this chapter in terms of the implementation tool it controls, the Agricultural Land Reserve.

The Vancouver-Seattle Corridor Sustainability Commission would be responsible for implementing the policies which were agreed to by the signatories of the international agreement. Its structure would be flexible enough to allow each senior government to decide for itself the level and status of local participation.

In order to be effective, the Commission would have to be able to exercise some control or influence over the ministries, departments, or agencies which supervise the implementation of

¹⁸ Frisken, "Greater Toronto," 163.
planning policies at the local level.

One disadvantage of the Bi-National Commission model is that it emphasizes the division of region by the border, rather than the shared sense of transborder regionalism. An alternative Commission may have representation on a community, rather than a national basis. If divided into districts of equal population or land area, however, Americans would then control the majority of the Commission.

Policies which were made according to one of the policymaking models and passed into law by the appropriate governments would be implemented by the Commission. Commissioners could be state or provincial officials, local officials, or their appointees. There should be an agreement (as part of a treaty or less formal process) that the Commission's decisions will be enforced by the State and Provincial governments. The Commission could be given authority over the State, Provincial, or shared agencies that will enforce mandatory policies. There could be input from an advisory process which would represent feedback from the community level, or an expanded Commission which would include local and interest group representatives.
5.3 Policy—Implementing Tools

Once the transborder sustainability policies are made, they may be implemented by Washington and British Columbia through legislation and through administrative structures. The legislative and administrative tools should be designed to work together and to be linked with the policy implementation body, or Commission.

5.3.1 Legislative Tools: Parallel Growth Management / Sustainability Acts

Growth management legislation is a tool used for implementing policies to control land use, a policy area which, in the U.S. and Canada, is traditionally fragmented among local jurisdictions. By harmonizing this legislation and coordinating its implementation across a border, the effect of a transborder policy may be achieved. In JAPA (1992, 58:4), Dennis Gale, Judith Innes, and Scott Bollens each described the intervention models used in U.S. state growth management legislation. The intervention models are variations of three approaches to the use of state authority.

One approach is for the state or province to directly intervene in local matters by superseding the authority of local governments. In this approach, the state both makes and implements policies. Although this approach may seem draconian, a bottom-up advisory process may be used to mitigate the tyrannical aspect.

---

British Columbia’s Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) is an example of a provincial land use measure which preempts local authority. Created in 1973 by the NDP government of Premier Dave Barrett, the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) regulates, jointly with the municipalities, the use of land which is held in the ALR. The lands in the ALR were originally designated by the plans of the regional districts. The ALC reviewed and approved these plans, and could amend them with cabinet approval after holding public hearings. Under current procedures, land can be removed from the ALR through a process of appeal. Appeals can be made by municipalities, regional districts, the ALC itself, and individuals. The appeal process includes a public hearing, and the decision of the provincial cabinet is final in these matters.²⁰

Another approach to growth management is to allow local communities to implement the state’s policy goals through their own plans, with varying requirements for consistency and cooperation. In its weakest form, the state "policies" are merely advice to the local units, and regional "plans" are merely the cumulative result of local plans.

The third approach is to allow local units to plan, but require them to meet mandated goals, which are set by a process of negotiation and consensus-building. In this approach, the local

²⁰ Oberlander and Smith, "Governing Metropolitan Vancouver," 360-361.
units are implementing policies which have been made with their own consent or advice.

In any form, growth management legislation may be perceived as a potential or immediate threat to local autonomy. Therefore, strong personal leadership and moral suasion by governors, premiers and supporters of growth management are usually necessary in order to stand up to the entrenched interests. For the same reason, strong leadership is important for the Regional Council models to be effective, especially when voluntary cooperation is being sought. By appealing to common values, the power of persuasion can defeat the short-sighted opponents of growth controls.

Some local authorities might actually welcome the imposition of strict growth management controls. It would allow them to implement tough and potentially unpopular measures because they were mandated by "someone else": a higher government.

A process for establishing compatible planning standards for sustainability in Washington and British Columbia is a desired component of the planning system. State and provincial provisions (consisting of municipal acts and codes and U.S. State Constitutions) are the source of all local government powers, and are the keys to regulating these powers. Processes are needed to harmonize the legislation, and to ensure its equal enforcement on both sides of the border.
The policy development process would lead to the implementation of similar sustainability legislation in Washington and British Columbia. The legislation, enforceable by state and provincial authorities, or a shared agency, would require action by state, provincial, local, and regional governments. Although the legislation itself would not be bi-national, transborder policymaking and advisory processes, and continuous consultation, would provide for coordination.

5.3.2 Administrative Tools for Implementation

One option for administering the standards for sustainability is to create a single agency which operates in the territories of Washington and British Columbia. Any authority which the agency possesses must be transferred to it by these governments.

The European Community (EC) operates as if it were a government apart from its twelve member states. The European Commission is the EC's policy implementation tool. It administers EC programmes and policies such as the Common Market and Common Agricultural Policy. Its Commissioners are sworn to serve the Community (now called the European Union) rather than their own governments.\(^21\)

The General Secretariat of the Council of Europe is also a shared civil service. Unlike the European Commission, it is not

\(^21\) Budd and Jones, *European Community*, 32-36.
independent of the Council's two main bodies (the Committee of Ministers and the Consultative Assembly). Each member of the Secretariat takes an oath to serve the Council and not to be influenced by national considerations in doing so.\textsuperscript{22}

A Transborder Regional Secretariat based on the model of the European Commission or the General Secretariat may, independently of its member governments, administer the programmes and policies which are governed by the treaty or agreement. It may, alternatively, supervise the implementation of these programmes and policies by existing governments. Some legal powers would be useful in order to supervise, inspect, or administer the sustainability measures.

Who would control the Secretariat? Since it would supervise local governments and implement regulations locally, its powers must be derived from the governments of Washington and British Columbia. Its Board of Directors could be modeled on the International Commission described above, or a single Director could be jointly appointed by both governments, possibly alternating between jurisdictions or nationalities. Secretariat employees would then be serving both governments, carrying out their duties under the authority of the state and provincial governments in accordance with the laws of each land.

\textsuperscript{22} Medefind, \textit{Organisation Europe}, 35.
The Washington and B.C. governments would jointly appoint a Secretariat which would act under their joint authority. The Secretariat would be responsible for implementing the similar policies which were arrived at through the policy development process. Secretariat employees in both countries would be working towards equivalent results in their implementation. There should also be a process for citizen feedback at the local level, and the flexibility necessary to make this feedback meaningful.

Many of the benefits of the Secretariat might also be achieved through close, voluntary cooperation between State and Provincial agencies and corresponding Ministers and Secretaries. Such cooperation could be achieved through a bi-national council. Several models for state and provincial agencies already exist, and are discussed below.

In 1988, the Ontario government established the Office of the Greater Toronto Area (OGTA). OGTA lacks a legislative mandate, and is largely an instrument of coordination and a channel for communication between governments. OGTA "provides advice and research only" and lacks any formal legal status. It is therefore more of an "Advisory and Technical Management" body, which is to be described in a later section of this chapter. If a similar but more potent agency were in place in the study

---

23 Frisken, "Greater Toronto," 161.

24 Canadian Urban Institute, Greater Toronto Area, 14.
region, it could have a potential implementation role with the proper legislative authority and mandate.

California's South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is another example of an agency created by a senior government. It is "authorized by state law to develop, implement, and enforce the Air Quality Management Plan." Unlike the OGTA, the SCAQMD was given a specific mandate by the State of California (and recognized by the U.S. federal Environmental Protection Agency): to clean up the air of the Los Angeles Basin. The SCAQMD has the capacity to require local governments to implement its plans and measures for improving air quality; provided that the State government does not bow to forces opposing these measures. The SCAQMD also has the power to review and approve the trip reduction plans of major employers in that region. Powers analogous to those described above may be desirable for the study region's "sustainability agency," or agencies.

5.4 Advisory and Educational Bodies

A technical management board is an advisory body for encouraging and assisting individuals, communities, and governments to adopt policies and programmes which are compatible with regional priorities. It is a potential arena for establishing informal working groups of neighbouring municipalities to work on any

25 Giulliano and Wachs, "Transportation Demand Management," 177.
problems that may arise. Local policymakers would be assisted by
the Board and encouraged to harmonize their policies across
jurisdictional borders.

Advisory bodies may also take the form of legislative
coalitions which advise governments and share their policy
expertise with other legislators. Advisory boards and bodies can
also function from the "bottom-up," providing local or citizen
feedback to those who make and implement policies for large
governments.

5.4.1 Transborder Planning Management Board

Transborder planning entities have been created in several of
Europe's border regions, and involve national, subnational, and
local governments. The transborder entities are effectively
coooperative working groups which lack any real political power.
They are, however, useful in reaching policy agreements through
negotiation, persuasion, and advice to governments.26

The German-French-Swiss Government Commission acts as an
umbrella for the transborder issue working groups in the Basel
region. The land and population of the "Regio Basiliensis" are
divided roughly in thirds among the three nation-states. The Swiss

26 Briner, "Regional Planning and Transfrontier Cooperation." The model accommodates both federal and unitary systems: along the France-Switzerland border, for example, Swiss cantons would play a stronger role than French departments.
portion includes two entire cantons and seven districts of four others. Swiss cantons enjoy a high level of autonomy from their central government. Also included are one French Territory and one French Department (divided into arrondissements), which function mainly as administrative districts of the central government. The region’s German territory, which lies entirely within one considerably autonomous German state, consists of one urban district, two rural districts, and portions of two other districts. Over one thousand local governments are included in the region.²⁷

Each of the three foreign ministries appoints eight members of the Commission, which was established in 1975. The Commission develops recommendations and may prepare draft agreements. There are two regional committees: one for the southern part of the region which includes all three countries, and another for the northern part dealing only with French-German issues. Periodic International Coordination Meetings are attended by representatives of the local planning regions within the three countries.²⁸

Lacking any real political power, the Commission achieves cooperation largely through persuasion. Its mechanisms include joint studies on specific issues, working groups dealing with culture, transport, the economy, and the environment, and the informal Conference of the Upper Rhine Regional Planners. Its job

²⁷ Ibid., 46-47.
²⁸ Ibid., 50.
is made difficult by the growing complexity of the region's problems and the abilities of governmental units to deal with them. 29

Within the planning system for sustainability, the Technical Management Board will assist the local and regional governments of the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor in planning for sustainability. It will serve as an umbrella for local issue working groups, facilitating intermunicipal cooperation, and cooperation and discussion between different levels of government. It is hoped that such cooperation will eventually become a matter of habit.

A Technical Management Board model would be flexible enough to create new working groups as new situations arise. Without any formal authority, it could probably be established with only a minimum of legal difficulty.

In conjunction with Growth Management legislation, the Board would offer its help and expertise, and enable local and regional governments to share help and expertise with one another. Without any legislative authority, however, the Board would effectively be an instrument of moral suasion, as was the case with the cooperative regional federation.

A Technical Management Board would require a staff to assist

29 Ibid., 51–53.
local and regional governments in implementing planning measures for regional sustainability. This would include measures of an advisory nature as well as efforts to comply with mandatory state and provincial requirements. Members of the Board could be appointed, elected (as are legislators), or simply volunteer for service.

The International Georgia Basin–Puget Sound Sustainable Urbanization Project, as proposed by Alan Artibise in 1992, will have aspects of technical management and will also assist in the development of new, innovative institutional frameworks. The "Secretariats" it proposes to establish are to administer the funding of smaller projects which pertain to the technical issues of managing sustainability in the region. In this manner, the technical management aspects may begin to be addressed in the short term, while the transborder institutional structure is envisioned as evolving slowly.30

Another important role of a technical management board is to gather an inventory of the planning region's environmental assets. With this knowledge, the Board would be more capable of providing advice to governments at all levels.

30 Artibise, "Sustainable Urbanization Report; Rationale and Operational Plans."
5.4.2 Legislative Coalition

The Pacific Northwest Economic Region (PNWER) is a coalition of state and provincial legislators from British Columbia, Alberta, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Alaska. It first met in the fall of 1991. PNWER has identified and set goals in six areas of cooperation: promoting the region's environmental products to the world; promoting the region as a tourist destination; coordinating policies related to the timber industry; recycling; training and education of the workforce; and establishing telecommunications links between university libraries. PNWER legislators can help to bring about cooperation among their governments by gaining expertise and providing advice, and by proposing compatible legislation in their states and provinces.

PNWER's areas of cooperation seek to take advantage of the regional economy of scale. For example, it is more cost effective to promote a single region's products and attractions than for each jurisdiction to promote itself separately. One of PNWER's problems seems to be the understandable tendency of state or provincial governments to view their neighbours as competitors rather than as partners. Governments are therefore reluctant to fund activities that may benefit another jurisdiction. Another problem is that state governments spend modestly on these sorts of promotion.

---

31 Fysh, "Go with the Flow;" Bluechel, "Pacific NorthWest Economic Region;" and Yang, "Magic Mountains."
activities compared to the provinces.\textsuperscript{32}

The European Community's European Parliament is a legislative body which is largely advisory as it (like PNWER or NEG/ECP) cannot pass laws. It only recommends policies for the Council of Ministers, and ultimately national governments, to implement. It does, however, have the powers to influence the EC budget and to dismiss the Commission (the EC's policy implementation tool). Since 1979, the European Parliament has been elected separately from national governments.\textsuperscript{33}

The Council of Europe's Consultative Assembly contains representatives from each member's national parliament, with representation roughly in proportion to population and reflecting party composition. It discusses and debates matters within the scope of the Council's work, and makes recommendations to the Committee of Ministers.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{32} Fysh, "Go with the Flow;" Bluechel, "The Pacific NorthWest Economic Region;" and Yang, "Magic Mountains." As discussed in Chapter 2, U.S. cities make economic development a higher priority than their Canadian counterparts. Even a relatively small city such as Spokane, Washington has its own international liaison office. U.S. cities compete with each other for a wide range of economic activities, even within the same state. Regional, state, and federal governments do their best to remain neutral in this competition.

\textsuperscript{33} Budd and Jones, European Community, 36-37.

\textsuperscript{34} Council of Europe, Statute of the Council of Europe, Articles 22-25.
An advisory legislative body would be most applicable to the planning system in its policy development phase. It would be a diverse body, representative of local communities. It would advise the policymaking Council, which would consist of state and provincial executives, department heads, and/or senior lawmakers.

5.4.3 Advisory Bodies for Citizen Feedback

A citizens' advisory body makes recommendations to policymakers, but lacks the power to implement its recommendations. In Canada, Royal Commissions are advisory bodies, appointed to advise a federal or provincial government on a particular problem or issue. The formation of a policy advising body might imply that the policymakers want to act on the advice of a body which represents a wide cross-section of society. It is an opportunity for citizens who represent divergent points of view to devise a solution to which they can all agree. The formation of an advisory body may also indicate that the policy makers are in a political stalemate or lack the courage to make a decision based on their own best judgment.

When a single policy is to be recommended for a large and diverse region, it should reflect the concerns of citizens from across the region as well as of technical experts and interest groups. The policy will then enjoy greater legitimacy based on more of the criteria described in Chapter 3. A higher level of cooperation and compliance will then be facilitated.
In 1992, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was drafted between the Province of British Columbia and the states of Washington and Oregon to establish an advisory body to be called the Cascadia Corridor Commission. Legislation was drafted at the federal and state/provincial levels to authorize participation in the Commission.35

The proposed Commission’s representatives were to be appointed from federal, state/provincial, and local governments, as well as aboriginal communities, port officials, and community and business organizations. The proposed Commission was to have a (2 year) mandate to develop a "strategic plan for environmentally sound urban management in the Cascadia Region" (including Oregon’s Willamette Valley to Eugene) but would have been authorized to act only as an advisory body to the region’s governments. The plan itself would also have been an advisory document.36

The mechanism proposed for the Cascadia Corridor Commission would be most applicable to the preliminary, enabling phase of the

35 B.C., Washington, and Oregon, "Memorandum of Understanding," Draft 12 August 1992. The Commission never materialized, but the Cascadia Transition Project (or Task Force), an "ad hoc strategic alliance" was formed between the regional governments of Vancouver, Seattle, and Portland. According to Bruce Agnew, the Project’s Director, the Task Force "brings together governments and agencies to agree on an agenda and develop lines of communication and foster a spirit of cooperation" (Agnew, interview with author, Seattle, 26 January 1994).

planning system. It would make recommendations to the senior (state, provincial, federal) governments regarding the framework which is to be set up: enabling legislation; policymaking and implementation bodies and tools to be created; and transborder activities to be permitted to their local governments. As an advisory planning body, however, the proposed Commission would have little promise. With only a weak link between the Commission and policy making and policy implementing bodies, local governments would have no obligation and little incentive to follow the plan.

A Transborder Regional Advisory Body would make policy recommendations to the governments of states, provinces, and federal nation-states. Its members would be appointed by these governments (with possible requirements for including local and community leaders) with a mandate to study the region’s problems and recommend solutions. These recommendations might consist of variations of any of the other options. Each government would authorize its own participation in the body through its own legislation.

"Bottom-up" advisory bodies can be created to provide feedback to the "big government" agencies which are to implement and enforce standards for sustainability. A useful model may be found in New York City, where a set of Community Boards has been created. Although a single city under one government, New York City’s population exceeds that of many entire urban regions, including the
Vancouver-Seattle Corridor and the Georgia Basin. Unlike the previous examples, this model does not bring together representatives of smaller entities to advise on the adoption of a common policy. Conversely, it is designed to advise the larger City government on the local (neighbourhood) implications of City policies and programmes.

New York City is divided into over 50 Community Board districts, each with a population of between 100,000 and 250,000 (about that of a medium-sized city). Each Board has 50 members, appointed to represent a cross-section of the local community. The Board must be consulted on zoning and land use matters, and assesses community service needs for the City budget.37

The New York City model was brought forward because it was designed to address the impacts of the larger government policies on smaller sections of a diverse region. If state and provincial (or shared) agencies are implementing a programme or policy in local communities, they should do so in consultation with a body of local residents. Thus, communities will have a voice in suggesting to higher authorities alternative means of meeting goals for sustainability which will be compatible with the particular locality.

37 City of New York, "Know Your Community Board;" and City of New York, "Lend a Hand in Your Community Board."
The B.C. Round Table recommends the establishment of "Local Round Tables" in order to involve the public in achieving sustainability. Like the Community Boards, these are to be advisory bodies with no governmental powers of their own. They are also envisioned as representing a cross-section of the community.38

There are several reasons why a Community Board mechanism might serve this purpose more adequately than existing local and regional bodies. The size of local governments may be too large or too small to adequately advise a large policy making or policy advising body on "local" needs. There are many local governments which are so small that they may be overlooked by an organization which plans for a large region. Additionally, a Community Board which is not identical with a municipality will encourage cooperation across political boundaries rather than protection of one's political "turf."

Once the enforcement of standards for sustainability is established, it will be desirable to make it sensitive to local concerns. Throughout the study region, Community Advisory Boards would be established to provide feedback to senior policymakers and policy implementors. The boundaries of the Boards would reflect the subregions of the larger region. They would be small enough to facilitate citizen participation, but large enough to have a

---

regional point of view. They could also act as intermediaries between local policy implementors and enforcing agencies by reviewing local progress toward regional planning objectives.

5.5 Compiling the Planning System

A structure for the transborder planning system for sustainability was compiled from the findings of this chapter. The components of its "phases" are illustrated in Figures 5.1 through 5.4 on the following pages. These phases correspond to the four functions which the planning system is to accomplish: linking governments across boundaries; setting standards for sustainability; enforcing the standards; and bringing people and communities together to develop their common visions.

Although each phase depends partially upon the previous phases in order to accomplish its purpose, the phases can evolve and operate independently to a degree. Some of the components can be created more immediately than others due to legal and practical requirements. Some of the components can also evolve from existing planning mechanisms. A rough timetable was assembled in Table 5.1, and presented to interview respondents as part of their information package.

In Appendix 1 at the back of this dissertation, the tentative planning system is summarized in a mailing to interviewees. The interview results will provide feedback regarding the structure of
the planning system and its timetable for implementation. It is hoped that by "testing" the planning system on interviewees representing a wide spectrum of public life, its contents may be verified or improved upon.
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Legend:

----- Appointment

++++ Advice / Input

===== Output

Bi-National Advisory Committee

International Agreement and Enabling Legislation

Policymaking Council and other Bi-National Bodies

Federal and State/Provincial Governments
FIGURE 5.2 - SENIOR GOVERNMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT PHASE

Citizens' Advisory Body

Policymaking Council

Legislative Policies

Executive Policies

Laws and Acts Planning Legislation

Agencies and Departments (Secretariat)

Legend:

+++ Advice / Input

=== Output
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TABLE 5.1 - TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN THE VANCOUVER-SEATTLE CORRIDOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prelim.</td>
<td>Bi-National Advisory</td>
<td>Agreement and Enabling</td>
<td>Periodic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Govt. Policy</td>
<td>Existing and</td>
<td>develop tools</td>
<td>Harmonized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devel.</td>
<td>developing tools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Periodic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Enforcement Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Planning</td>
<td>Technical Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secre-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Working Groups</td>
<td>develop regional</td>
<td>tariat or Bi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boards or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 6

ANALYSIS OF THE PLANNING SYSTEM

6.0 Introduction: Purpose and Methodology

Field interviews were conducted for the purpose of "testing" the "planning system for sustainability" that was developed in the previous chapters. Other goals of the interviews were to learn about the attitudes and perceptions of the interviewees regarding regional planning, transborder regionalism, growth management, sustainability, and other related issues.

Persons having a wide range of perspectives on planning issues in the Vancouver—Seattle Corridor were asked to evaluate the planning system according to a list of criteria. These criteria were expressed in the form of multiple-choice questions, in order to provide for more effective communication, and also to facilitate the compiling of the responses.

The questions were written by compiling a list of criteria from the earlier chapters. They are intended to evaluate how the planning system derived in Chapter 5 combines the theoretical knowledge of Chapters 3 and 4 with the region-specific conditions discussed in Chapter 2.

Twenty-eight interview packages were mailed to potential interviewees in Washington and British Columbia. Each package
contained a cover letter addressed to the potential interviewee, a short paper summarizing the planning system, and a questionnaire. The short paper and the questionnaire are provided in Appendix 1. The potential interviewees were contacted by telephone during the month following the mailing, and interviews were arranged. In several cases, when making the telephone contact, the author was referred to other individuals for interviews.

The twenty-eight interviewees were selected because of the positions which they held in public life. An attempt was made to interview pairs of counterparts holding similar positions in Washington and in British Columbia. An attempt was also made to contact individuals representing a variety of different subregions throughout the larger region, and different parts of the ideological spectrum.

One respondent (Anthony) declined the interview but completed his questionnaire and returned it with additional comments. The twenty-seven remaining interviews, plus one additional interview (Senator Bluechel), were conducted within the two months following the initial mailing.

There were several requests for varying levels of confidentiality. In reporting the research findings in this dissertation, the author will respect those requests.
One of the interviews consisted of three individuals from the same department, each of whom filled out a separate questionnaire. The three-person interview at the Washington Department of Ecology will be considered as a single, composite interview when analyzing the set of interview data.

In three of the interviews, questionnaires were not completed at the time of the interviews. These interviewees did not familiarize themselves with the material in the short paper. At their interviews, they were asked to mail the questionnaires at their earliest possible convenience and agreed to do so. They were reminded to complete their questionnaires in letters of thanks which were mailed to all respondents several days following their interviews. One month following their respective interviews, each of these three people was mailed an additional package containing a cover letter, short paper, questionnaire, and a stamped, addressed envelope.

The interview sample was not randomly selected, as specific people were targeted based upon their positions in public life. Government directories and conference attendance lists were used to obtain the names of the initial contacts. For this reason, and because of the small sample size, an extensive statistical analysis of the interview data will not be conducted. The intention of the interviews was to learn about the attitudes and perceptions of persons who view the planning system from various perspectives; not
to produce statistically significant survey data.

None of the interviewees had ever experienced anything resembling the proposed transborder planning system. The interviewees’ evaluations of the planning system are based entirely on their own attitudes, perceptions, and the perspectives gained from their experiences in public life. To attempt to compile the cumulative result or average of all of the responses would not add to the value of the results. Instead, any patterns noticed in the survey data will be documented.

Table 6.1 at the end of this chapter lists the names, organizations, and titles of the initial addressees and of the persons interviewed, and the completion status of each interview.

6.1 Summary of Interview Responses

Below, the evaluations of the planning system are summarized for each of the questionnaire’s multiple choice (closed) items.

1) Is the physical definition of the planning region adequate? How would you change its boundaries?

( ) The definition of the planning region is satisfactory.

( ) The planning region should be extended across the Strait of Georgia and Puget Sound to include parts of Vancouver Island, Kitsap County, the San Juan Islands, etc.

( ) The planning region should be extended southward to include the Columbia and/or Willamette Valleys.

( ) A transborder planning region is not necessary.

The answers to question (1) were influenced by several
factors. Did the interviewees feel a sense of citizenship in a transborder region, and how far does that region extend? Did they view the problems of the region in environmental, political, or economic terms?

All but two of the British Columbia respondents felt that the planning region should be extended westward to include the entire Georgia-Puget Basin. Most of the reasons given for a westward extension were ecological. Two B.C. respondents (Doney and Karlsen) felt that it should be extended both southward and westward, for social, cultural, and economic reasons. Two respondents were satisfied with the defined planning region. Mr. Cowie felt that "there are several corridors.... This one is reasonable." Mr. Adair felt that any larger region would not be "workable."

In Washington, the responses on this question were more evenly divided. While five respondents favoured a westward extension, three others proposed extending the planning region southward into Oregon, and five felt it was largely satisfactory. The composite interview at the Department of Ecology was divided on this question. Respondents who fell in all three of the above categories had suggestions for slight modifications of the boundaries: using a more narrow highway corridor along Interstate 5; adding Kitsap County for reasons of proximity to Seattle; and adding the portion of Thurston County that lies outside the Georgia
Basin. The arguments for westward extension were largely environmental, while those for southward extension were largely economic and transportation-related. Those who argued for a more narrow highway corridor noted the differences in defining quality of life between Washington's coastal areas and inland rural areas. Several interviewees referred to recent calls for secession (and formation of new counties) by rural residents of East Puget Sound counties as confirmation of their differences from the urban majority.

2) What are the major strengths and weaknesses of the planning system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ) Level of simplicity/complexity</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Meaningful opportunities for citizen involvement</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Flexibility to permit community self-determination</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Accommodates differences between U.S. and Canada</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Reliance on voluntary cooperation</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Reliance on mandatory measures</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Potential for making progress toward sustainability</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) Other? ________________</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In designating the above criteria as strengths or weaknesses, the respondents commented on some of the "sources of legitimacy" of the planning system. From Chapter 3, these are: habit; charisma; fear; personal choice; economy; and competence. Does the planning system derive authority from these sources in a reasonable and balanced manner? Does the goal of sustainability provide legitimacy as well? How did the respondents assess the planning system's balance of sovereign, semi-sovereign, and local authority?
Does the planning system adequately satisfy the four "essential elements" of Chapter 4, and the international, human, environmental, and enforcement dimensions of the problem?

Half of the respondents on each side of the border felt that the planning system's level of complexity was a weakness. Most of these respondents felt that it was too complex, but there were respondents on both sides of the border who felt that it was too simple. Other responses included: the level of simplicity is a strength; the system is complex out of necessity; and combinations of the above opinions.

Just over half of the respondents in both Washington and B.C. felt that the planning system's citizen involvement was a strength. These people felt that the local level was the most appropriate place for citizen participation. A majority of those remaining felt that it was too "top-down," and needed more citizen involvement, particularly at the senior government policy development phase of the planning system. Respondents on both sides of this question stressed the need for public education.

Some respondents warned of the negative consequences of the citizen involvement process: increased power for special interest groups that do not represent the majority of citizens (Bluechel, Cowie); and the complications that would result if the additional involvement would supplement, rather than replace, the existing
processes (Sullivan). Citizens' groups were described by a state senator as representing political extremes (Bluechel), and by a provincial legislator as wanting power without responsibility (Cowie).

British Columbia and Washington respondents differed in their assessments of the planning system's provisions for community self-determination. In Washington, roughly half said that it was a strength. One Washington respondent, a local legislator (Sullivan), felt that community self-determination would be inherently incompatible with planning for the greater regional good. Another Washington local legislator (Brubaker) felt that the process would polarize smaller governments against larger ones.

The British Columbia respondents were proponents of greater community self-determination, and of giving communities a greater voice in senior government policy. Almost half said that it was a weakness because it did not provide enough self-determination; one said that a weakening of self-determination might promote the regional good. Only three respondents, none of whom were local government officials, felt that community self-determination was a strength of the planning system.

The respondents overwhelmingly felt that one of the strengths of the planning system was its accommodation of U.S.-Canadian differences. On each side of the border, only one respondent
cited this as a weakness of the planning system: Price, who felt that it undermined sovereignty; and Jacobsen, who felt that it would lead to conflicts over property rights.

About half of respondents on both sides of the border felt that the planning system’s provisions for voluntary cooperation were a strength. Of the four British Columbians who cited this as a weakness, two felt that the regional governments should be given land use powers over local governments (Adair, Cowie), and two felt that voluntary measures would be inherently weak (Kozak, Stott). On the Washington side, two cited the system’s level of reliance on voluntary cooperation as a weakness: Klaus, because it failed to deal with the "selfish and greedy phenomenon," and Dinndorf, because he favours a process of small, voluntary steps.

Half of the Washington respondents felt that the planning system’s mandatory provisions were a weakness, while about half of the B.C. respondents felt that they were a strength. Most who cited mandatory measures as a weakness felt that they would not work, or would lead to conflict.

A large majority of respondents on both sides of the border felt that the planning system’s potential for making progress toward sustainability was one of its strengths. According to Jacobsen, however, to make progress would take a revolution (or crisis), or "almost martial law." Heap doubts the premise that
people care about sustainability, while Cowie and Stott expressed doubts that creating additional institutions could help to bring about progress toward sustainability.

Other strengths and weaknesses of the planning system which were mentioned by respondents will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.

3) Would you describe the proposed planning system as...
   politically feasible? ( ) Yes  ( ) No
   realistic? ( ) Yes  ( ) No

This question also reflects the respondents' views of the planning system as a legitimate source of authority. Would the perceived problem be sufficient reason for people and governments "buy in" and support the planning system? Do the criteria of habit and tradition outweigh the desire for action? Would support by charismatic leaders or other possible events make a difference? This question is flawed in that one's perception of whether something is politically feasible would surely affect one's perception of whether the same thing is realistic.

A slight majority of B.C. respondents indicated that they viewed the planning system as politically feasible. Erik Karlsen, for example, felt that the planning system was not inconsistent with what the politicians are already doing. Among Washington respondents, a slight majority felt negatively about the planning system's political feasibility.
In B.C., respondents were evenly divided about whether the planning system is realistic. Elaine Kozak and Lynn Bailey both felt that it would depend on the level of commitment shown by leaders. Washington respondents were slightly negative on this question. Several respondents gave conditional answers to this question. Patricia Decker, who answered positively, said that it would "depend on the timing," while Bruce Agnew, who answered negatively, said, "not yet... but it is desirable." Agnew felt that, in particular, the system's provisions for bi-national enforcement might not be feasible.

Several respondents felt that the perceived desire for sustainability would not be sufficient reason to create the planning system. Jerry Dinndorf said that powerful arguments would need to be built, because he did not see any incentive (such as economic) to build support for the planning system. Mike Grady felt that a catalyst, such as a crisis, would be necessary to move the concept forward. Grady suggested a "spinoff" or "piggyback" off another initiative, such as NAFTA. Doug Sutherland felt that a more feasible approach would be one driven by economic rather than environmental factors. Gordon Price felt that the agenda of "sustainability" was too general, and "wouldn't get to first base." A similar view was expressed by Peter Heap.

4) Might the proposed planning system be viewed as a threat by...
The U.S. Federal Government ( ) Yes ( ) No
The Canadian Federal Govt. ( ) Yes ( ) No
As discussed in Chapter 3, the different levels of authority are no longer related in a strictly hierarchical manner, but are in a constant state of flux. Non-sovereign and voluntary attachments compete with loyalty to sovereign authority, and modern technology has given all sides a high level of sophistication. Would protection of interests and "turf" derail a planning system that is otherwise desirable for the region? This is a question which relates to the ongoing debate among the various "traditions" of planning theory: is planning a rational, synoptic process; a transactive process of social learning; an incremental process of push and pull; or a process for advocacy of interests? Several respondents felt that they could only answer the parts of the question pertaining to the stakeholders on their own side of the border.

A large majority of respondents on the Canadian side felt that the federal governments would be threatened by the planning system, while a large majority of Americans felt that they would not. Reasons why the Canadian government might feel threatened include: the appearance of giving up sovereignty (Doney); the inability of Ottawa to provide oversight (Kozak); and "what's in it for us?" (Mann). In contrast, the comments of American respondents
included: "it wouldn’t be taken seriously" as a threat (Bluechel); the federal governments "support a broader look to deal with the ecosystem" (O’Neal); "upper governments have a greater view... wider perspective... more open" (Brubaker); and that the "border will come down, or people will find a way to get around it" (Klaus).

A slight majority of British Columbia respondents felt that their provincial government would view the planning system as a threat. Roughly half of Washington respondents felt that their state government would not view the planning system as a threat. Lee Doney pointed out that the B.C. government backed away from the proposed Cascadia Corridor Commission because they felt it would be dominated by the federal governments on both sides. Bruce Agnew said that Governor Lowry also backed away from the Cascadia Corridor Commission. Art Cowie felt that the state and provincial governments would feel most threatened of all governments. Alan Artibise and Gary O’Neal both felt that the state and provincial governments would not be threatened because of their leading roles in the planning system.

The British Columbians overwhelmingly felt that local governments would be threatened, as did half of the Washingtonians. A common feeling was that the planning system would add another layer of authority on top of municipalities, and would increase the involvement of higher governments in local affairs. Cynthia
Sullivan felt that Washington's special purpose governments would be particularly threatened, and would act to protect their "turf." Ron Mann, the only British Columbian interviewee who felt that local governments would not be threatened, said that they would "buy in the quickest." He stressed the competence and professionalism of local governments. Mike Grady felt that local governments would not feel threatened if the proposal were presented as cooperative rather than top-down.

On both sides of the border, the respondents were roughly evenly divided (with no majority opinion) on whether the planning system would be threatening to citizens' groups. In the U.S., the sensitivity of tampering with property rights was noted by several respondents. According to Rundlett, Jolly, and Ragsdale, the American ideology of property rights, particularly in rural areas, runs counter to the ideals of sustainability, community values, and collective responsibility.

5) Is the proposed timetable for implementation reasonable?
( ) Yes
( ) No. It does not take the drastic action that is needed immediately
( ) No. It is overambitious. Too much is expected too fast.

The "timetable for implementation" is Table 5.1, which was also included with the short paper which is provided in the Appendix. It classifies the components of the planning system as short term (0 to 3 years), medium term (3 to 6 years), and long
term (6 to 10 years) measures.

A majority of respondents felt that the 10-year timetable was overambitious, while British Columbia respondents were evenly divided. Bailey felt that the timetable for the Preliminary Phase of the planning system was overambitious, while Kozak felt that the Preliminary Phase should move more quickly. Kozak and Sutherland both advocated an incremental approach that would give priority to issues that require more immediate attention.

6) Is the planning system a response which is in the proper proportion to the seriousness of the problem?
   ( ) Yes      ( ) No

On both sides of the border, an overwhelming majority of respondents felt that the planning system is a response which is in proper proportion to the magnitude of the problem. Those who disagreed tended to feel that it was an "overkill" rather than an underreaction. Sutherland and Sullivan disagreed with the presumption that the region and its communities are currently headed in the wrong direction. Agnew and Mann noted the need for immediate action on some issues. Bluechel, Decker, and Karlsen answered affirmatively on this question, but clarified that this should not be taken as an endorsement of the planning system itself.

7) Is the region ready to accept a transborder planning system?
   ( ) Yes      ( ) No
The above question did not ask the respondents to specifically endorse the proposed planning system, but to reveal their insights on the study region’s people and governments. Under what conditions would this acceptance be more or less likely?

A majority of British Columbia respondents felt that the region is not yet ready to accept a transborder planning system. Heap, Doney, and Bailey felt that the region might one day accept a transborder planning system, and that a dialogue would help to move the region in that direction. Price said that transborder mechanisms would be acceptable if they are perceived as in the joint interest of the region, and if they are organized "around some carefully defined specific agendas," such as high speed rail. Cowie said that while people would not object to talking about a broad regional vision, they would react against any plan. Artibise said that transborder planning could be accepted given the right "character and circumstance." According to Artibise, while present circumstances support the need for transborder planning, "character" would require more effective leadership. Mann felt that planning for sustainability would have to be initiated at the local level.

A majority of Washington respondents felt that the region is ready to accept a transborder system at least partially. Jacobsen and Dinndorf both remarked that the governments would be more accepting of transborder planning than the citizens. O’Neal
doubted that citizens would accept another regulatory body, while Brubaker felt that "small, average citizens" would be reluctant to proceed because of their "distrust of big governments." This view is in sharp contrast with that of Alan Artibise (of B.C.), who asserted that the public is more progressive than its governments in its willingness to accept change.

8) Does the structure of the planning system reflect a national bias?
   ( ) No
   ( ) Yes - biased toward American political culture
   ( ) Yes - biased toward Canadian political culture

One desirable characteristic of a transborder planning system is that it should not have a bias toward a national political culture. Even if it were to accommodate the legal and constitutional differences between the nation-states, it could still be perceived as biased in favour of one national political culture. Evidence of such a bias would include the defining characteristics of American and Canadian political cultures, as discussed in Chapters 3 and 4.

A large majority of respondents on both sides of the border did not detect a national bias in the planning system. Of those who did, nearly all detected a bias against their own nation's political culture. Reasons for perceiving a pro-Canadian or anti-U.S. bias included: the American ideology of property rights and individualism (Jacobsen, Collis); "top-down" (Brubaker); and the "willingness to plan" of Canadians (Peter Heap of B.C.). Reasons
for perceiving an anti-Canadian or pro-U.S. bias included: regulation leading to litigation (Price); and "top-down" structure (Doney).

9) Do the region's governments have the will to make and enforce standards for sustainability in a meaningful manner?

( ) Yes  ( ) No

If the planning system is to succeed in moving the study region towards sustainability, simply putting the planning system's components in place will not be sufficient. Governments must have the will to make and enforce standards for sustainability. The planning system provides the institutional structure to translate this will into effective action.

There was little optimism regarding the willingness of governments to make and enforce standards for sustainability. On both sides of the border, negative answers outnumbered positive answers by 2:1 or greater. While some of those who responded negatively meant "not now" or "not yet" (Grady, Sutherland, Decker, and Klaus in Washington; Heap, Doney, and Mann in B.C.), others cited an ongoing pattern of insufficient leadership and political will in government (Agnew, Jolly/Ragsdale/Rundlett, and Brubaker in Washington; Artibise, Cowie, and Stott in B.C.). Bluechel cited money as the primary reason for governments' reluctance to make and enforce standards for sustainability.
10) Will the planning system help to develop the required level of determination to build sustainability?

( ) Yes  ( ) No

The previous question was concerned with whether governments had the will to take meaningful action on sustainability. This question is concerned with whether the planning system's mechanisms, if they were put in place, could help to bring about the necessary mindset in the study region. The potential to change the region's mindset could be derived from planning processes of social learning or incrementalism, as well as charismatic leadership or fear.

A majority of respondents on both side of the border did feel that the planning system could potentially help to build the level of determination required in order to plan for sustainability. Among those who answered affirmatively that it would "help," some respondents implied that other conditions must also be in place to bring about the required level of determination. These conditions included education and dialogue (Decker, Karlsen), and economic prosperity (Sullivan). Collis warned that it could backfire if seen as "another layer of regulations." Bluechel and Stott warned that the planning system would lead to lots of litigation. Agnew felt that it would help because it would force governments to make decisions and develop standards.

11) In order for participants in the local planning process to make the difficult choices required for sustainability, the implementation and enforcement phase
should emphasize:
( ) punitive measures
( ) positive incentives
( ) both equally ("carrot and stick")

Punitive measures rely on fear as a means of enforcement. Positive incentives rely heavily on the ability of people and governments to change through social learning, and to voluntarily forego their immediate gratification for a future reward. In order to implement a planning system for sustainability without resorting to punitive measures, a high degree of social cohesion and civility would be desirable in the planning region. Otherwise, little progress would be achieved by appealing to collective concerns, and the positive incentives would have little hope of changing behaviour unless they involved substantial financial rewards.

A slight majority of British Columbia respondents felt that positive and punitive measures should be emphasized equally, while Washington respondents overwhelmingly favoured emphasizing the positive measures. No respondents preferred punitive measures over positive ones. Of those who preferred positive incentives, some recognized that resorting to punitive measures may be necessary (Collis, Grady, Bailey, Price), while others wanted to avoid punitive measures completely (Anderson, Brubaker, Sullivan - all Washingtonians). Klaus and Cowie stressed the need for creativity, which can be stifled by excessive regulation. Klaus called for a new economic model that would outcompete the existing model of consumption. Anderson pointed out that punitive measures would be
counterproductive since they would encourage people to find ways to "skirt the system."

12) Does the proposed planning system overestimate the degree to which the region's citizens value their quality of life over material consumption?  
   ( ) Yes  ( ) No

The purpose of this question was to find out whether the respondents detected any unrealistic assumptions about "Cascadian values" or transborder regional culture in the planning system. As discussed in earlier chapters, Cascadians are said to value their quality of life over their material consumption levels. Did they feel that such assumptions were justified or naive? In retrospect, the question was flawed; the author had to explain or reword it at many interviews, and several interviewees had explanations which contradicted their answers.

A plurality of British Columbia respondents felt that the planning system did not overestimate the degree to which the region's residents value their quality of life over material consumption. A majority of Washington respondents felt that the planning system's design was at least a little naive in this respect.

Some felt that the notion of Cascadians valuing quality of life over material consumption only applies to a small elite group of the region's citizens (Collis, Klaus, Stott). According to
Bluechel, the "taking of land" is viewed by citizens as the worst thing that a government can do. Others expressed the view that citizens are selfish and greedy and unwilling to make material sacrifices. Doney, Grady, and Dinndorf, however, felt that people might change if they were made to understand the true cost of their materialistic ways. Ron Mann, who did not think the planning system overestimated the region's idealism, still felt that people would live day-to-day unless they received direction from their leaders. Patricia Decker was convinced of the "communitarianism" of the region's citizens, and that they would prioritize quality of life once their basic needs for food, clothing, and shelter were satisfied.

13) Is the structure of the planning system...
   too rigid? ( ) Yes ( ) No
   too loose? ( ) Yes ( ) No
   too complicated? ( ) Yes ( ) No

In Chapter 5, the structure of the planning system was developed through a synoptic process. It was designed largely in order to satisfy criteria of effectiveness (or competence) in achieving sustainability, to include essential elements, and to connect its components to one another. It is possible that in attempting to satisfying these conditions, other desirable conditions were sacrificed.

Just over half of the B.C. respondents and just under half of Washington respondents felt that the structure of the planning
system was too complicated. Some admitted that a high level of complexity was a necessity (Bluechel, Decker, Doney). Karlsen said that the system was too complicated for the public, but its structure was logical.

Lynn Bailey suggested amalgamating some of the planning system’s groups, combining some functions, and reducing the number of layers. Joe Stott felt that the creation of separate, additional bodies for the planning system was not necessary. Ron Mann thought that there were too many bodies and steps, while Doug Adair was "reluctant to see the government set up more boards and commissions." Lee Doney felt that the system would not have to be so complicated if we were to reduce the number of layers of government in the region and the duplication of their functions.

There were some who felt that the planning system was too rigid, although in Washington, an equal number felt that it was too loose. Sullivan said that the system should be loose at the early stages when people are getting educated, and should become rigid at the later stages. Doney felt that if the planning system were perceived as tackling specific problems, its structure would not be an issue. Artibise said that there was not enough focus on hard data, and Jerry Dinndorf said that more detail was needed. Ann Anderson said that the structure was too loose, "knowing what we went through with the Growth Management Act."
14) Will the planning system be able to withstand changes in governments and in the region's economic health?

( ) Yes. Once it is underway, the public will not withdraw its support.
( ) No. It is too fragile and will fall apart in difficult times.

Sustainability would require a system for planning which can be sustained over time, and would not lose its legitimacy despite changes in governments and economic circumstances. The respondents were asked whether they thought that the planning system had this quality.

On both sides of the border, a majority of respondents (greater than 2:1) felt that once the planning system was underway, it would not collapse as a result of changes in governments or in economic health. Other reasons mentioned for the planning system's projected collapse (in addition to changes in government and economic health) included: entanglement in constitutional and property issues (Jacobsen); and the planning system's rigidity (Sutherland).

Of those who were more confident about the planning system's durability, many answers were given conditionally. These conditions included: its record of success (Kozak, Karlsen, Dinndorf); whether it can be sold to the public (Decker, O'Neal); and whether cooperation becomes entrenched institutionally and as a matter of habit (Collis, Adair). Cowie felt that the planning system would be secure unless an "extremist" government were to
take power. Lynn Bailey said that after reaching a certain stage with sufficient momentum, the planning system would become self-policing.

6.2 Other Suggestions by Respondents

Interviewees made a wide range of other suggestions and recommendations, including: demonstration or pilot projects (Dinndorf, Artibise, Adair, O'Neal, Grady, Jacobsen); cost/benefit concerns (Jolly/Ragsdale/Rundlett, Brubaker,); regional environmental inventory (Artibise, Anthony); and governmental restructuring or reorganization (Adair, Cowie, Doney, Kozak). Adair, a local Council Member, was in favour of reducing the number of municipalities and regional districts in the Lower Mainland, and ultimately creating a transborder planning district free from state and provincial control. Kozak saw the need to strengthen regional land use planning and to introduce a sharing of local property tax revenues. Cowie mentioned the need to directly elect a regional government and to combine the provincial Ministries of Transportation and Municipal Affairs. Doney felt that one of the strengths of the planning system's commissions was that they could cut across the various agencies in government.

There was concern about the public's ability to relate to the concept of sustainability (Collis); some suggested indicators (Artibise), while others suggested rephrasing the issue in terms of more "concrete" factors (Price, Heap). There was also concern
about overregulation, and the superimposition of another layer of
government or bureaucracy. One common stipulation to positive
responses on several questions was that the planning system would
replace or compile the existing multiplicity of regulations and
agencies, rather than add to them.

Price advocated an informal structure of consultation and
cooperation at the local government level. He envisioned local
cooperation as the "driving force" to which senior governments
would be forced to respond. Bruce Agnew disagreed; he felt that a
formal structure would be necessary and saw little significant
progress resulting from the current pattern of informal
cooperation.

The planning system's lack of a role for Canada's First
Nations and Aboriginal Americans was noted by few respondents.
Earle Anthony saw the need to involve all governments, including
First Nations, at all levels of the planning system. Lee Doney, who
is also on the B.C. Treaty Commission, said that until the final
status of Canada's First Nations is resolved, they would refuse to
participate in any planning system. In any case, the mandatory
requirements of state and provincial governments could not be
enforced on the First Nation Reserves and Indian Reservations,
leaving voluntary cooperation as the only option.
6.3 Conclusions

The underlying concepts and objectives of the planning system, as well as its logic and structure, were viewed positively by a wide range of respondents. Nearly all of their criticisms were constructive, and included suggestions for correcting the perceived defects of the planning system.

The desirable characteristics of the planning system are in a delicate balance with one another. Incorporation of many of the suggested changes would cause new defects, as the integrity of the phases and of the stated goals, functions, and objectives of the planning system would be compromised. For example, although voluntary measures and positive incentives were largely favoured (over mandatory requirements and punitive measures), their effectiveness within the planning system would be doubtful.

Each of the alternative definitions of the study region would create a different set of problems. Strong environmental arguments were made for extending the planning region westward to include the entire Georgia-Puget Basin (or at least Kitsap County). There were also strong economic and transportation-related arguments for a southward extension of the study region. While enlargement of the study region might enhance its ability to deal with certain problems, it would also dilute the bonds of social cohesion which can potentially unite the region.
Contraction of the planning region along the I-5/Route 99 highway corridor would result in a more culturally homogeneous region by excluding rural areas and pro-growth outer suburbs. It is critical, however, to prevent the "leapfrogging" of sprawling growth patterns to the urban fringe; an objective which justifies a wider corridor for planning. There is no perfect way to draw the boundaries of the study region.

Strong arguments were made for streamlining the planning system, such as cost reduction, efficiency, and understandability by the general public. It may be possible to eliminate existing bureaucracies or absorb them into the mechanisms of the planning system. It may also be possible to create the components of the planning system in a manner which does not result in a multiplicity of additional bureaucracies.

It should be noted, however, that the logic of the planning system requires that its bodies and phases remain largely independent from one another. For example, to allow the members of an advisory body to join a Policymaking Council would reduce the accountability of the Councillors for their decisions. As is the case with other desirable qualities of the planning system, the objective of simplicity is part of a delicate balance, and will have to be compromised.

The differences between the Washington and British Columbia
interview responses may reflect the different experiences of these two jurisdictions. Washington's history reflects a high degree of citizen autonomy, local self-rule, and since 1990, adjustment to the state's Growth Management Acts. This may explain the opinions that multijurisdictional planning is complicated out of necessity, that top-down enforcement and regional consistency are incompatible with bottom-up local planning, and that mandatory measures "don't work." British Columbia's lack of a history of local Home Rule may be one reason why respondents from the Province felt that "bottom-up" planning may offer them a better way to plan for their future. These respondents in both Washington and British Columbia apparently felt that "the grass is always greener on the other side of the fence."

The proposed planning system for sustainability presented in this paper is not perfect, and cannot be perfected because of the delicate balance among the objectives which it hopes to achieve. It is an attempt to balance the objectives of sustainability with the values of democracy, the political realities of the United States and Canada, and the realities of human behaviour. It is intended as a useful point of departure for designing the details of a planning system which will be needed by a sustainable society. Judging from the discussions of the field interviews, the proposed planning system has the potential to fulfill this purpose in the study region.
With appropriate changes, the planning system could serve the same purpose in other potential planning regions. It would have to be revised to reflect the political systems and existing institutions of the particular regions. Whether in the study region or elsewhere, the imposition of a structured planning system will not be sufficient to guarantee a region's sustainability. The region's people must share goals and values which are compatible with sustainable development, and must support political leaders who do the same. While the planning system can help to create and implement a vision for regional sustainability, its success ultimately depends on the people of the planning region.

People are reluctant to trust others to make critical choices on their behalf, regardless of their concerns about the future. A structure for a planning system which is derived logically, and has components which are designed to function together logically, may not be politically acceptable. The risk of an uncertain future may not be sufficient reason for most people to place their fate into the hands of a planning system which is driven by "sustainability," a concept which is difficult to grasp.

Given the choice, people will continue to strive for goals of greatness which are largely unsustainable, so long as the probable benefits of their pursuits outweigh the perceived costs. Throughout history, societies have refused to heed the warnings of impending crises which could have been avoided through effective
planning and coordinated action. Until the price of unsustainability becomes clear to the majority of citizens, there is little reason to expect an upswell of support for a planning system for sustainability.

A region's "planning system" exists within the context of its political system and political culture. In order for a region to effectively plan for sustainability, its political system and political culture would have to be directed toward that same goal. While the current "system" of planning mechanisms is largely a creature of its political system and political culture, the reverse is not true. Planning goals and processes have not yet had a major influence on North American life.

Planning for sustainability would require a flow of influence from the planning system to the larger society and its governing institutions. Ideally, there would be a two-way flow as planning and politics would gradually shape one another. While planning would (and should) offer guidance to society, "social engineering" would be neither desirable nor necessary for sustainability. While the majority of interview respondents felt that a planning system for sustainability could help to develop the required level of determination within the larger society, none of them suggested a system of social engineering.

It would be futile (as well as counterproductive) to insist on
planning for a "pure" form of sustainability in any society. Without moderation, a backlash is sure to happen, and progress already made may be lost. Just as governments reduce their budget deficits gradually rather than eliminate them immediately, it is apparent that progress toward sustainable development will be incremental. Even with a planning system for sustainability, a society may slide a few steps in the wrong direction and lose some of the progress it has already made. It is not within a society's power to outlaw such mistakes.

Planners cannot attempt to make all decisions for future generations, but they can attempt to help humanity to learn from the mistakes and triumphs of the past and present. By preserving open space, ecological assets, and nonrenewable resources, the planning system can set a pattern for future generations to follow. Future generations must be trusted to make their own decisions; the planning system which is passed on to them will be something that they can build upon and use to plan for their own priorities.

The changes that a society must implement in order to plan for sustainability are in potential conflict and competition with many of the ideals of human beings, especially in western societies. Unlike the units of an ant colony, people do not behave as if they were the components of one large organism. Especially in a society which places value on the individual, the element of unpredictability cannot be dismissed. In the society of tomorrow,
people will increasingly question authority, and compliance will be even less automatic than it is today. Individual self-interest is likely to remain a strong factor in making personal choices, but individual perceptions of the collective good will become increasingly important. The fact that in the future, these perceptions will be shaped by cognitive reasoning rather than automatic trust of ruling elites is a reason to be optimistic about humanity's chances for a sustainable future.

A common concern which was raised during the interviews was that mandatory planning requirements would oppressively intrude into the realm of personal and local choice. The steps needed to move toward sustainability might interfere with property rights and consumer sovereignty, and would cause inconveniences to many people. Because sustainability would require that humanity live within the limits of the productive capacity of its environment, it would constrain lifestyle choices. Within these constraints, however, there is little reason to believe that people will be denied the capacity to make personal choices about how they live, work, choose their leaders, and spend their money. Just as free societies constrain human behaviour in order to prevent harm to the living, they can restrict actions which would be harmful to future generations. Notions of social responsibility have always placed limits on the power of popular will.

While it might be convenient to include equity in a definition
of sustainability, it is also possible that sustainability requirements would deprive poor people of some opportunities to improve their lives. To limit the magnitude of physical growth of the human economy would likely deny opportunities to some people to pursue their dreams and ambitions. Efforts must be made to ensure that the costs of sustainability are not distributed in an unfair manner.

There are apparently many trade-offs and choices to be made along the path to sustainability, and the choices are not always clear. The attributes of a free and humane society do not always go hand-in-hand with those of a sustainable society. In designing a planning system for sustainability, planners must move beyond their dreams of a utopia. A "sustainable" society will have more in common with the society of today than with Plato’s Republic, Skinner’s Walden Two, or Marx’s worker’s paradise. It will be a society of conflict, struggle, difficult choices, and unpredictability, continuously learning to live within the limits of nature’s (and humanity’s) capacity to generate wealth.
TABLE 6.1 - PERSONS INTERVIEWED IN FIELD

A. Federal Government - Canada
   Mr. Earle Anthony, Director General, Vancouver, Environment Canada. Responded by mail, December 24, 1993.

B. Provincial Government Ministries - British Columbia
   4. British Columbia Trade Development Corporation (Crown Corporation). Original Contact: Mr. Wilson Parasiuk, Chair and Chief Executive Officer. Referred to Ms. Elaine Kozak, Vice President, Corporate Relations and Corporate Secretary. Interviewed February 8, 1994.

C. Provincial Government - British Columbia Legislative Assembly

D. Regional District Planning Staff - British Columbia
   Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) Planning. Original Contact: Mr. Hugh Kellas, Administrator, Strategic Planning. Referred to Mr. Joe Stott, Senior Planner, Regional and Economic Development, Strategic Planning Department. Interviewed January 10, 1994.

E. Local Government Elected Officials - British Columbia
   1. Mr. Bob Bose, Mayor, City of Surrey, and Director, GVRD. Interviewed January 27, 1994. Questionnaire not completed.
   2. Mr. Gordon Price, Member of City Council, City of Vancouver, and Director, GVRD. Interviewed January 13, 1994.
   3. Mr. Doug Adair, Member of Council, District of Mission, and representative to Central Fraser Valley Regional District Sewage District. Interviewed January 18, 1994.
TABLE 6.1 (Continued) - PERSONS INTERVIEWED IN FIELD

F. Local Government Planning Director - British Columbia
   Mr. Ron Mann, Planning Director, City of Richmond. Interviewed January 25, 1994.

G. Advocate for Transborder Regionalism - British Columbia

H. Facilitator of Cooperation on Environmental Issues - British Columbia
   Mr. Lee Doney, Executive Director, B.C. Round Table on the Environment and the Economy. Interviewed February 1, 1994.

I. Federal Government - United States
   U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Seattle Region. Original contact: Mr. Dana A. Rasmussen, Regional Administrator. Referred to Mr. Gary O'Neal, Director, Environmental Sustainability. Interviewed January 7, 1994.

J. State Government Executive Departments - Washington
   2. Department of Community Development. Original contact: Mr. Michael J. McCormick, Assistant Director, Growth Management Division. Referred to Mr. Michael Grady, Senior Planner. Interviewed January 14, 1994.
   3. Department of Ecology. Original contact: Ms. Mary Riveland, Director. Referred to: Ms. Carol Jolly, Special Assistant to the Director; Mr. Michael Rundlett, Regional Director, Northwest Regional Office (Bellevue); Ms. Dee Ragsdale, Environmental Planner. Interviewed January 28, 1994.

K. State Government – Washington State Legislature
### TABLE 6.1 (Continued) - PERSONS INTERVIEWED IN FIELD

**L. Regional Council Planning Staff - Washington**


**M. Local Government Elected Officials - Washington**

1. Mr. Doug Sutherland, Pierce County Executive. Interviewed January 26, 1994.
2. Mr. Bill Brubaker, Member of Council, Snohomish County, and President of the Puget Sound Regional Council. Interviewed January 21, 1994.

**N. Local Government Planning Director - Washington**


**O. Advocate for Transborder Regionalism - British Columbia**

Mr. Bruce Agnew, Director, Cascadia Transition Project, Discovery Institute. Interviewed January 26, 1994.

**P. Facilitator of Cooperation on Environmental Issues - Washington**

Mr. Arnie Klaus, Director, Puget Sounders. Interviewed January 21, 1994.
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A PLANNING SYSTEM
FOR SUSTAINABILITY
IN THE
VANCOUVER-SEATTLE
CORRIDOR

by Steve J. Patrinick,
Ph.D. Candidate
School of Community and Regional Planning
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

December, 1993
The Vancouver—Seattle Corridor has many attributes which make it a "livable region." The region is known for its natural amenities, economic health, and pleasant cities. These desirable characteristics have led to a high rate of population growth compared with other major urban regions in North America. The proposed planning system is intended to ensure that the positive attributes of this region are not lost forever.

Governments in both Washington and British Columbia have recognized that growth, if not properly managed, can potentially threaten the very same qualities which make the region attractive. "Managing" the negative effects of regional growth is not necessarily the same as planning for sustainable development. Growth can be "managed" so that its negative consequences are merely delayed. From the perspective of sustainable development, however, any future price of past and present growth patterns must be considered.

Many people now believe that the growth patterns of the past and present, if allowed to continue, would leave future generations without the quality of life which the Corridor now enjoys. When current and past consumption patterns can be maintained only at the expense of future generations, they are said to be "unsustainable."
A region's wealth can be said to consist of its stock of natural and human-made resources. If the value of that stock is conserved over time, that region's population is said to be living off the "interest" of its regional capital. Such a region is said to have a sustainable pattern of development, provided that the materials which it imports from other regions do not detract from the other regions' sustainability. If, on the other hand, the value of the regional capital is depleted with each successive generation, the pattern of development cannot be considered sustainable.

The path to sustainability will be an evolutionary and continuously changing path. The processes of developing community self-determination and working relationships across local and international borders will be a gradual one. The Corridor will continuously strive toward its goal of becoming a sustainable region, and must eventually achieve this form of development in order to sustain human life. This does not imply a steady-state utopia, but rather, a dynamic society, which, while recognizing the limits of sustainability, is constantly striving for improvement.

In order to achieve a sustainable form of development, difficult choices will have to be made. If the region's natural amenities are to be conserved while the region's population increases, per capita consumption of critical resources must be reduced. Ultimately, citizens will determine the future of their
own communities as they struggle to live within their ecological limits without further eroding their childrens’ inheritance. Alan Artibise, in his 1992 "Sustainable Urbanization Report" to Environment Canada and the Premier of British Columbia, wrote:

Given the dramatic growth pressures on the bioregion, special cooperative efforts are needed to preserve the quality of life of the area, including opportunities for employment, housing, and recreation. The fact is that livable places do not just happen, they are created by the people who live there....

The Vancouver-Seattle Corridor is to be defined as the Pacific Fraser Region (of Seelig and Artibise’s From Desolation to Hope) plus the six counties on the eastern shore of Puget Sound (from Whatcom to Thurston). A map of the defined region has been included at the end of this paper.

This transborder planning region is united by common values, such as the appreciation of the natural environment and concerns about the negative effects of growth. Geographically, the region is separated from the remainder of North America by mountains and bodies of water. Despite their separation by an international border, Americans and Canadians in the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor have much in common with one another, both culturally and historically.

The planning system will be designed to take advantage of the common values of transborder regionalism in the Corridor. The components of the planning system are modeled on transborder
mechanisms that are in place throughout the world. The four "phases" of the planning system correspond to the four functions which the planning system is designed to perform:

- connecting governments across borders
- setting standards for sustainability
- providing meaningful enforcement for standards
- bringing people together to "choose their future."

The Preliminary Phase will enable the processes envisioned in the other phases to take place. Legal and constitutional obstacles to the participation of "junior" governments will be discussed and resolved through parallel enabling legislation. Although this phase does not involve actual planning or setting the planning standards for sustainability, one of its outcomes should be a broad agreement defining the goal of a sustainable urban region. The primary goal of this phase is to connect the "senior" governments across the border; it is their participation which is essential at this point.

This phase will develop a Vancouver-Seattle Corridor International Agreement for Sustainability, as well as any necessary enabling legislation. The Agreement may be in the form of a formal treaty, or merely a jointly signed declaration. The State and Province must be assured that the federal governments will not obstruct their participation, and local and regional governments need similar assurance by the State and Province.
A cooperative body will be needed to make and implement recommendations for the preliminary agreement, and to coordinate the passage of parallel enabling legislation. A bi-national advisory commission must include, at a minimum, representation by the U.S., Canada, British Columbia, and Washington State. It will work with these governments to implement its recommendations in each of these jurisdictions.

The Senior Government Policy Development Phase will be concerned with setting region-wide standards for the planning of sustainable communities. It must bring together the governmental leaders whose cooperation is needed to translate the standards into legislation. Consultation with professional experts and with the general public is necessary, since the standards must be technically valid and based upon the common values of the people of the transborder region.

While it may not be possible for Washington and British Columbia to have identical legislation, the standards should be designed to achieve equivalent results on both sides of the border. In order to establish and harmonize the Washington and British Columbia Acts for Growth Management and Sustainability, policy making and policy advisory bodies should be established.

A policymaking council will develop parallel, equivalent sustainability legislation for Washington and British Columbia. It
must include representation from the Governor and legislative leaders of Washington, and the governing and opposition parties of British Columbia.

An advisory body or "Regional Round Table" will provide citizen and community feedback to the policymaking council in developing the legislative requirements for sustainability. It will allow for representation from diverse interests throughout the region, to ensure that the interests of all types of citizens are not overlooked.

The Implementation and Enforcement Phase is intended to provide impartial, harmonized enforcement of planning standards throughout the transborder region. After the Growth Management and Sustainability Acts have been adopted, mechanisms to ensure compliance and provide for local feedback will be necessary.

An International Corridor Secretariat may be established over a joint civil service, acting under the authority of both the Washington and British Columbia governments. Similar results may be achieved through close cooperation between State and Provincial agencies, which may be achieved through a State-Provincial Commission.

A set of community boards (or local "round-tables") will provide feedback at the local level so that implementation may be
tailored to the needs of each community. While municipal boundaries are one factor to be considered in determining the boundaries of the community boards, it is also important that they represent logical and functional communities. Larger municipalities may divided and smaller ones united under the community boards, although the municipal boundaries themselves would not necessarily change.

The Local Planning Phase will allow communities to plan for their future development with strong citizen participation. While local and regional governments will be required to adhere to planning standards for sustainability, there will be flexibility in their range of choices. The planning which is done at the local level must reflect the preferences of citizens within their communities.

At the local level, implementation of sustainability measures requires continuous and coordinated action. A management board would assist local and regional governments in planning for and implementing measures which are suited to local needs. It will provide technical expertise and coordinate working groups of neighbouring municipalities to address planning issues that may arise.

A regional government, consisting of either a voluntary federation or a mandatory second tier, would develop regional plans
and coordinate local plans. The regional government could consist of a single, voluntary, transnational unit, or alternatively, closely linked Lower Mainland (B.C.) and East Puget Sound (WA) Regional Councils.

Making the transition to sustainability in the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor will require short-term, medium-term, long-term, and continuous actions by the region's governments. It will require compromises between the ideal of a democratic and sustainable society and the reality of politics and democracy in their North American forms.

Although the four "phases" were logically developed to take place in succession, progress on several different phases could be made separately and concurrently. For example, mechanisms for technical assistance and intermunicipal cooperation could evolve before the international aspects are addressed. Sustainability or Growth Management legislation could be (and has been) implemented and refined before discussions on harmonization take place. Below, the time frame for implementing each of the components of the planning system will be discussed. This information will be summarized in Table 1.

Certain steps may be taken with relative immediacy, and will face few legal and political difficulties. The governments of Canada, the United States, Washington, and British Columbia should
establish a bi-national advisory committee to discuss general goals and possible frameworks for transborder planning. Senior (federal and state/provincial) governments in the region would also face few obstacles to beginning educational and technical assistance programmes for local governments. These could be coordinated informally across the border. An informal association of the region's local governments could begin to meet and work together. Working groups of neighbouring municipalities could be established informally. The regional association and working groups would gradually develop closer ties between their member communities.

Once the "immediate" steps are in motion, several intermediate steps may be taken. A bi-national agreement containing goals and objectives for the region, and enabling the establishment of the necessary planning bodies, could be confirmed. This would lead to the establishment of the policymaking council and public advisory body, and the formalization of transborder intermunicipal ties.

Long-range steps would be implemented by bodies which would evolve over a longer time period. The policymaking council which was created by the international agreement would work towards equivalent, harmonized growth management legislation and on mechanisms for its implementation and enforcement. This would lead to the creation of the secretariat or bi-national commission, and of local community boards (or "round-tables"). Meanwhile, the municipalities would be developing closer ties, eventually leading
to a form of regional governance (or regional government) for the Corridor.

Virtually all of the bodies created in this framework would be somewhat useful in a dynamic, sustainable region. The processes which were identified with the Preliminary Phase and the Senior Government Policy Development Phase could repeat themselves periodically. The processes which were identified with the Enforcement and Implementation Phase and the Local Planning Phase would be continuous, but might change periodically or in an evolutionary manner.

Table 1 on the following page is a timetable which summarizes the planning system and its implementation. It is not a rigid timetable, but a guideline. Its intention is to build a sustainable society and preserve the qualities of the region which their people of the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor value. The people, leaders, and governments of the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor do not need to follow this table exactly as written, but to make steady and incremental progress toward sustainability. Public awareness has been raised, but the region is still sliding in the wrong direction. The loss of environmental assets must be stopped and then reversed before a sustainable society can be developed in the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor.
### Table 1 - Timetable for Implementation of Planning System in the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Short Term (0-3 yrs.)</th>
<th>Medium Term (3-6 yrs.)</th>
<th>Long Term (6-10 yrs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prelim.</td>
<td>Bi-National Advisory Commission</td>
<td>Agreement and Enabling Legislation</td>
<td>Periodic consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Govt. Policy Devel.</td>
<td>Existing and developing tools</td>
<td>develop tools</td>
<td>Harmonized Equivalent Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation and Enforcement Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secrétariat or Bi-National Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Planning Management Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Boards or Local Round Tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Groups</td>
<td>develop regional government</td>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Interviews for Transborder Planning System - Steve Patrinick

Thank you for reading my short summary of "A Planning System for Sustainability in the Vancouver-Seattle Corridor." Your answers to the following questions will be the quantitative data for my research. In a personal interview, I would like to discuss your concerns about issues of regional sustainability in further detail.

1) Is the physical definition of the planning region adequate? How would you change its boundaries?
   () The definition of the planning region is satisfactory.
   () The planning region should be extended across the Strait of Georgia and Puget Sound to include parts of Vancouver Island, Kitsap County, the San Juan Islands, etc.
   () The planning region should be extended southward to include the Columbia and/or Willamette Valleys.
   () A transborder planning region is not necessary.

2) What are the major strengths and weaknesses of the planning system?
   Strengths
   Weaknesses
   () Level of simplicity/complexity
   () Meaningful opportunities for citizen involvement
   () Flexibility to permit community self-determination
   () Accommodates differences between U.S. and Canada
   () Reliance on voluntary cooperation
   () Reliance on mandatory measures
   () Potential for making progress toward sustainability
   Other? ______________

3) Would you describe the proposed planning system as...
   politically feasible? () Yes () No
   realistic? () Yes () No

4) Might the proposed planning system be viewed as a threat by...
   The U.S. Federal Government () Yes () No
   The Canadian Federal Govt. () Yes () No
   Washington State Govt. () Yes () No
   British Columbia Govt. () Yes () No
   Local govt. in Washington () Yes () No
   Local govt. in B.C. () Yes () No
   Citizens' groups in Wash. () Yes () No
   Citizens' groups in B.C. () Yes () No

5) Is the proposed timetable for implementation reasonable?
   () Yes
   () No. It does not take the drastic action that is needed immediately
   () No. It is overambitious. Too much is expected too fast.
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6) Is the planning system a response which is in the proper proportion to the seriousness of the problem?  
   ( ) Yes   ( ) No

7) Is the region ready to accept a transborder planning system?  
   ( ) Yes   ( ) No

8) Does the structure of the planning system reflect a national bias?  
   ( ) No  
   ( ) Yes - biased toward American political culture  
   ( ) Yes - biased toward Canadian political culture

9) Do the region’s governments have the will to make and enforce standards for sustainability in a meaningful manner?  
   ( ) Yes   ( ) No

10) Will the planning system help to develop the required level of determination to build sustainability?  
    ( ) Yes   ( ) No

11) In order for participants in the local planning process to make the difficult choices required for sustainability, the implementation and enforcement phase should emphasize:  
    ( ) punitive measures  
    ( ) positive incentives  
    ( ) both equally ("carrot and stick")

12) Does the proposed planning system overestimate the degree to which the region’s citizens value their quality of life over material consumption?  
    ( ) Yes   ( ) No

13) Is the structure of the planning system...  
    too rigid?   ( ) Yes   ( ) No  
    too loose?   ( ) Yes   ( ) No  
    too complicated?   ( ) Yes   ( ) No

14) Will the planning system be able to withstand changes in governments and in the region’s economic health?  
    ( ) Yes. Once it is underway, the public will not withdraw its support.  
    ( ) No. It is too fragile and will fall apart in difficult times.
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