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ABSTRACT

The question which this thesis addresses is how authority or responsibility for decision making influences the planning process. Planning is defined as a process which guides change, is future oriented, leads to action, is on-going, is linked to politics and is socially acceptable. The process consists of a series of sequential steps including goal formulation, identification and evaluation of alternatives, selection of appropriate alternatives, and implementation and evaluation of alternatives.

Three authority models of planning are discussed. They represent three points on a continuum. The Central Authority Model (CAM) is at one end of the continuum and is characterized by a strong well defined central authority which makes all decisions. At the other end of the continuum is the Participatory Adaptive Model (PAM). It is characterized by decentralized authority and the inclusion of impacted interests in all steps of the planning process. The third model discussed, the Lead Agency Model (LAM), lies in the middle of the continuum. It incorporates elements from both of the other models. Authority is somewhat decentralized but decision making is still the responsibility of a well defined authority. The public is, however, included in the planning process to a degree.

A case study of 7-Utes Mountain, located in the northern Colorado Rockies, is presented. Proposals have been submitted to develop the mountain as a destination ski resort. Several levels of government are responsible for making land use decisions for 7-Utes Mountain. Each level of government has a different approach to
decision making. Those different approaches have influenced the land use decisions which have been made regarding the mountain's development or, in this case, non-development.

The decision making approaches used by the different levels of government closely parallel the three authority models of planning. The case study can therefore be defined in a planning context by the models and the results of the planning processes can be analyzed.

It is the conclusion of this work that while each of the models has merit and can be successfully applied, none is by itself appropriate in every circumstance. In fact, more than one model may be necessary to achieve optimal land use decisions. Further, the models must be flexible to account for unanticipated events. Successful planning can be measured by its ability to educate participants and/or result in action. If the plan which results from the planning process is not implemented or if the process does not serve to educate participants, it makes no difference what type of process was used or how authority influenced that process.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

"We expect to spend the rest of our lives in the future, so we must be reasonably sure of what kind of future it's going to be. That is the reason for planning."

Author Unknown

The ultimate question which all planners must face and answer is why plan at all? For humans, planning is a way of life. Whether it is short term planning like what to wear in the morning or long term planning like where to go on vacation next year; we all plan. But planning does not exist only on a personal level. It is carried into all aspects of our lives. Entire government agencies and departments and countless private consulting firms exist with the task of planning our communities and our environment. By planning, we eliminate some of the uncertainty around us and guide change so that it is favorable to us. With proper planning, we are able to reduce conflict in our society thus making our lives less complex.

Planning, like every other facet of life, is influenced by many factors. The type of project under consideration (e.g. regional plan, city master plan, subdivision, hydro-electric dam) is a key factor. Other important factors which may influence planning at any given time include: historical development of institutions (cultural, economic and political), the relationship among various interest groups, government agencies and public officials, external political movements, changes in communications or technology, changes in attitudes toward elected officials, new settlements and unexpected events.
These factors which influence planning, as well as the substantive issues which are in each case the subject of planning, include so many broad variables and present so many different circumstances for meaningful analysis that some form of ordering is required. For this study the author has chosen the concept of authority or responsibility for decision making as the focus of analysis.

Planning occurs in our society as a part of the larger decision making process. Politics is often referred to as the art of decision making. Determining ways in which conflicts can be minimized or resolved in order to ensure that community life can proceed is the basis of politics. Planning is more specific in that it identifies problems which need to be solved, formulates responses to those problems, evaluates those responses to determine if they are working and adjusts or changes the responses if necessary. Peattie goes so far as to say that both politics and planning are merely elements of a single process by which social purposes are forwarded (1978, 83). It is the linkage between planning and decision making which makes analysis of authority for decision making an interesting topic.

The focus of this thesis is the various forms which authority can take and the influence of those different forms of authority on decision making and planning. This focus raises two questions: (1) how do the various forms of authority impact decision making and thus planning? and (2) how do those impacts change the results of the planning process? In order to answer these questions, several things will be done:

1. Planning as a process will be defined.
2. Three different authority models of planning will be discussed.
These models focus on the roles of state and local government in the areas of resource and land use planning in Colorado.

3. A case study will be presented to identify how these authority models have been used in practice.

4. An analysis of the various planning processes used in the case study will be presented.

1.1 PURPOSE AND RATIONALE

There are many reasons for undertaking a study of this type. This thesis provides an opportunity to discuss a process which could be generally applied to land use planning on a regional scale. This discussion is important because it establishes that planning is in fact a process.

This thesis further allows the author to explore one factor which influences the planning process, namely the allocation of authority or responsibility for planning. To accomplish this, three authority models of planning are discussed. This does not imply that no other factors influence planning or that the three authority models are the only approaches which might be used. Authority was chosen for two reasons. First and foremost, the author's interest and second, its importance in influencing the outcome of planning. Three models were chosen because they most accurately reflect the options available given the current political and socio-economic conditions which exist in the United States today and they are best suited to define the case study chosen for analysis.

The thesis also provides an opportunity to examine an actual case study. The case study focuses on a potential ski resort development in the northern Colorado Rockies. It was selected for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the author's
interest and knowledge of the area. The case study area lies in an unincorporated area of Jackson County and contains many acres of state owned forest land. As such, several levels of government are responsible for land use decisions affecting the area. Several planning approaches have been utilized to aid in making those decisions over the period from the late 1960's to the early 1980's. This makes it possible to document the results of the different authority models of planning conceptualized in this study and for an analysis of those results to be presented.

The reasons, or rationale, for undertaking this study can be summarized as follows: to determine if a well defined planning process could be applied to a "real world" circumstance; how different forms of authority would influence the results of that planning process; and finally, did the results of that planning process achieve the goals they were intended to achieve? This can be boiled down to the question, does the authority model used in the planning process make a difference in achieving optimal land use decisions?

1.2 MODEL DEVELOPMENT

The three authority models discussed are labeled the Central Authority Model (CAM), the Lead Agency Model (LAM) and the Participatory Adaptive Model (PAM). They can be envisioned as representing three points on a continuum. The Central Authority Model, as the name indicates, is characterized by a strong central authority and as such lies at one end of the continuum. At the other end of the continuum is the Participatory Adaptive Model which is decentralized and characterized by compromise and consensus. The Lead Agency Model lies in the middle and is marked
by strong, yet decentralized authority. The models reflect trends in the planning field over time and are based on the work of prominent planning theorists. They are not intended to represent new models of planning. The labels given to each of the models have been chosen by the author for purposes of this thesis.

In order to understand the models and how they relate to planning, five questions must be answered:

1. Who is being planned for?
2. Where do the goals for planning come from?
3. Who is participating in the planning process and how?
4. What is the role of the planner?
5. Who is responsible for decision making?

These questions are the most important and interesting ones to consider when looking at alternative planning approaches. The sections which follow discuss their importance.

1.2.1 Who is Being Planned For?

This question boils down to how the public interest is defined and who defines it. A broad definition of the public interest might specify the general welfare of all while a narrow definition might pertain to a single client. Whether the definition is broad or narrow is determined by who is defining the public interest. Elected or appointed officials are most likely to employ a broad definition, particularly in cases where they serve a large and/or diverse constituency. Special interest groups or private consultants on the other hand may have a much narrower definition of the public interest.
Once the public interest is defined, it is important to identify those individuals or groups that will be significantly impacted by the project or policy under consideration. This becomes increasingly complex at the end of the spectrum where the definition of the public interest is broadest. At that point what is being proposed may have no impacts on some groups and significant impacts on others. Of those groups impacted, some may be adversely impacted while others may benefit. It can be seen, and is confirmed by Yon in his work (1973, 3), that identifying a specific group to target in any planning process is difficult.

Determining which groups the proposed plan will ultimately impact is no easy task. If planning is to be successful in guiding land use decisions, those involved at the start must be aware of the importance of identifying impacted groups and individuals and some attempt must be made to include them in the process. By identifying which groups are likely to be impacted and in what ways, potential conflicts can be identified, examined and possibly avoided in the early planning stages.

1.2.2 Where do the Goals for Planning Come From?

The ultimate goal for all planning is to implement plans and establish policies which are in the best interest of society. In order to do that on a project by project basis, it is important to establish the goals the process will attempt to achieve and identify who sets those goals. Without goals it is impossible to know what is to be accomplished and, thus, successful planning cannot occur.
In determining goals for a particular project it must first be determined whether goals already exist or if the initial task of the planning process is to establish them. The degree of flexibility which exists with respect to formulating the goals is another factor which must be considered. If goals are legislated and require further legislation to change, they are much less flexible than a suggested goal statement proposed by a loosely organized group.

According to Herbert Gans, one of the fundamental objectives of all planning processes is to make all goals explicit (1968, 80). A difficulty arises in establishing whose goals and which goals are most appropriate in a particular situation. For planning to proceed, it is necessary to decide which goals to aim for and which to put aside. Gans promotes the idea of combining conflicting goals in some way to achieve as many as possible (1968, 80). The notion of combining goals is also one of the premises of Fisher and Ury's, Getting to Yes. The devote an entire chapter to "Inventing Options for Mutual Gain" (1981, 58-83).

1.2.3 Who is Participating in the Planning Process and How?

Who participates and how is a key factor in any planning process since it necessarily impacts the outcome of the process. Many factors - political, social and economic - contribute to who participates in the planning process and how.

Robert Dalh is most well known for his work in the area of pluralism (1961, Who Governs?; 1967, Pluralist Democracy in the United States: Conflict and Consent; 1972, Democracy in the United States: Promise and Performance; 1982,
Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy: Autonomy vs. Control. The basic premise of his work is that a multiplicity of interest groups exist and all exert pressure on decision makers. He stresses that since no single group is interested in all issues all of the time, no one interest influences decision making all of the time. This concept is important when considering the question of participation. Different groups will be involved for different issues. Thus, there is a need to identify those groups which are interested in the issues being considered by the planning process. Once identified, it is important to encourage those groups to somehow participate in the planning process.

Donald N. Michael points out another important factor likely to influence participation in and the final outcome of planning. That factor is society's interrelatedness. He argues that this interrelatedness has increased to such an extent that it is difficult to conceptualize let alone consider all the relationships which may result during the planning process (1974, 44). It may, in fact, be impossible to consider every issue and how it is connected to every other issue; however, if the process is to be effective, an attempt should be made to identify as many of these relationships as possible.

Participation in the planning process also serves an important function in information gathering. Those who actively participate are much more likely to freely volunteer vital information. If participation is limited, information gathering may be substantially more difficult. One reason for this reluctance on the part of non-participants is presented by Michael.
In a mistrusting society with large disparities in access to power and with increasing numbers who feel discriminated against, publics may resist being "exploited" for their information (1974, 46).

Taken from a different perspective, some non-participating interest groups may see information as a source of power. They may keep important information out of the process in the hope of using it to influence decision makers late in the process to slow down or stop a process which does not appear to favor their particular interest.

1.2.4 What is the Role of the Planner?

In all planning processes there is one individual or several who act as planner(s). While this role may or may not be critical to the outcome of the planning process, from the perspective of a professional planner, the question is of significant interest. While there are many individuals who might deserve the title planner, the focus of this thesis is the professional planner.

Training of professional planners began in the 1920's with a strong emphasis on physical planning. This emphasis persisted until the 1950's and 1960's when there was an influx of students with social science backgrounds. One distinguishing feature of all approaches to planning (e.g. Lindblom's disjointed incrementalism, Davidoff's advocacy, Etzioni's consensus, Friedman's social learning) is how each views the planner. Traditionally, the role of the planner has been that of technical expert. Burke points out that this may no longer be the case:
Planning no longer is the exclusive domain of technical experts. The task facing planners today is that of determining who should be involved, how they should be involved, what function citizens should serve and how to adapt a planning method to a process involving a wide range of interests and groups. The planner has become both technical expert and organizer. (1979, 14-15)

In their new and increased role, planners can act as agents of change. In order to effect these changes, particularly in the attitudes of those for whom they are planning, planners need to be well trained and have a variety of techniques to rely upon. Malizia sums up some of the things with which the modern planner must contend:

The local planner will need a good deal of skill, experience and good luck to achieve success. Successful implementation (of the plan) will depend mainly on the commitment of lead actors, the working consensus among them, the resources contributed by key organizations, the coordination among organizations, and the extent of local public support. In short, the planner endeavors to get the job done in spite of Murphy's Law. (1985, 24-25)

In addition, they must deal with such things as imperfect knowledge and economic uncertainty. Still they endeavor to develop techniques which "...define a problem in a way which bridges the gap between the goals and the means available to achieve them" (Harris, 1974, 65). Different views of planning issues or different planning techniques can lead to markedly different approaches to the task of planning.

1.2.5 Who is Responsible for Decision Making?

When looking at the influences of authority upon planning, probably the single most important element to consider is who ultimately makes decisions regarding adoption and implementation of the resulting plan. How those decisions are reached
and the accountability of those responsible for decision making are also significant factors to consider.

Decision makers at some level, be it Mayor of a town, Governor of a state or President of a country, must act to adopt and implement plans. Since the ultimate goal for every planning process is to produce something which will first be adopted but more importantly implemented, decision makers and decision making becomes a vital component of the planning process. It is more correct to view the planning process as a vital part of the larger decision making process. Too often completed and adopted plans end up "sitting on the shelf" because the officials responsible for implementation were never involved in their preparation and the adopted plan does not fit the needs of those agents responsible for implementation.

It is important to realize that determining the appropriate decision making body for each planning project may not be obvious. In fact, it may not be clear who has the ultimate decision making authority in each instance. Identifying the appropriate decision maker or makers is critical if the planning process is to be effective. The relationship of planning to decision making is of such importance that planning cannot be defined without discussing it in a decision making context. Therefore, a more detailed discussion of the linkage between planning and decision making is contained in Chapter 2.
1.3 CONSTRAINTS & LIMITATIONS

Cultural, political and economic institutions all impact upon the planning process. Those which exist in the United States today are not likely to change dramatically in the near future. While it might be an interesting academic exercise, it would not be realistic to offer for discussion a model of planning which would require a radical departure from existing structures.

It must be noted that the perspective of this thesis is the United States in the 1980's. If it were to encompass the perspective of say Eastern Europe or China in the late 1980's, it is quite likely that an entirely different document would have emerged.

Finally, it is important to note that the authority models of planning discussed in this document represent theories that can only exist in an academic sense. It is most likely that these models would have to be modified, perhaps significantly, in order to be applied to a real world case. This point will be clarified in Chapters 4 and 5 when the case study is defined using the models.

1.4 INTRODUCTION

This thesis first develops a generic working definition of the planning process in Chapter 2. It then discusses different models of planning which are used to analyze the influences of authority on the defined process. A literature review was completed to gain an understanding of various theoretical views of planning. This was necessary to develop the models of planning authority presented in Chapter 3.
After discussing the models, a case study is introduced in Chapter 4. The models serve as a means to define the case study in a planning context. The case study was developed through a series of interviews conducted with several officials with knowledge of the proposed ski area and/or knowledge of the various planning and decision making processes which applied to the proposal. In addition, various land use documents from local, county and state levels were reviewed in order to develop planning models which would prove useful in defining the chosen case study.

Chapter 5 presents an evaluation of the planning processes which were used in the case study to determine if appropriate land use decisions resulted from them. The final chapter generalizes the overall findings, summarizes the document and identifies areas worthy of further study.
CHAPTER 2
DEFINITIONS

2.1 PLANNING: THE CONCEPT

The generic term planning is quite ambiguous. Gillingwater sums it up quite well when he states, "Indeed it probably has as many interpretations as practitioners" (1975, 5). Planning, as defined by Webster's Dictionary, is to devise a scheme for making, doing or arranging something. Gillingwater defines planning, on the most broad level, as "...any action which can be thought of as being premeditated or anticipatory in nature." He goes on to say that, "...planning is what people do all the time anyway..." (1975, 5-6). These broad definitions tend to focus on planning on a personal level and are not very helpful in determining a suitable working definition for planning as it applies in this thesis.

Canty defines planning as, "...another term for making conscious decisions about the shape of the future." (1972, 33). Burke defines it as, "The application of conscious and deliberate methods to capture the future for the purpose of either altering the present to redirect the future, or changing the future in order to preserve the present" (1979, 16). The introduction of the concepts of decision making and the future make these definitions a bit more useful. They begin to address planning in a public as opposed to private sense.

Over the years planning has become specialized and compartmentalized. The American Planning Association (APA) currently lists 16 divisions or specialties to which its members can subscribe. These divisions range from Planning and Women
to Environmental Planning to Federal Installation Planning. As such, the emphasis of planning has shifted from being more goal oriented to more problem oriented. This may be due to a greater awareness of the function of planning or it may be due to the fact that as complexity increases planning becomes necessary to maintain order. Planning seeks not only to solve problems but to make the solutions acceptable in order that they may be implemented. Banovetz presents a definition of planning which points out several key concepts:

Planning helps prevent undesired changes from occurring. It gives order to a community by encouraging public officials and private citizens to work together to answer a basic question, 'what do we want our community to become?' ... Planning is the never-ending process of determining, and working toward, a set of developmental goals, evaluating the result, and then setting new goals and priorities (Banovetz 1984, 55-56).

There are several other characteristics of planning which are important in order to develop a working definition. First, planning must ultimately lead to action. As Gillingwater states, the concept of planning is most often linked to action. "It is generally accepted in political terms that planning is principally concerned with 'doing' rather than 'thinking', with action rather than words, with practice rather than theory" (1975, 1).

Second, implementation of plans is critical to the planning process. Plans and plan making cannot be separated from implementation because of the interaction between them. The best planning processes will be unable to gain local support without visible beneficial results. Thus, the success or failure of a plan ultimately rests in its implementation.
A third consideration regarding the concept of planning is that ultimately it must be socially acceptable. Gillingwater sums up this notion quite nicely:

In the final analysis, it is society which not only creates and maintains planners' positions but which succeeds in broadly tolerating their existence and intrusion of and accords them authority and status for planning. (1975, 3)

Finally, if planning is to lead to action, it must be closely linked to politics. The importance of this linkage is underscored by the many theorists who discuss it. Canty states that it is important for planning and politics to be united in order for plans to be recognized (1972, 34). Peattie is a bit more colorful in her linking of politics and planning. She states that without political muscle, even the best plan cannot lead to action (1978, 85). Gillingwater puts it cynically when he states that planning is a logical extension of our belief in the inevitability of government to intervene (1975, 1). While the planning community may not agree on how planning and politics are related, the strong linkage between the two cannot be denied. It could even be stated that planning, like politics, performs the task of deciding who gets what, when, where and how.

The critical element which separates planning from politics is decision making. Politics is the art of decision making. Planning is a means by which decision makers can become better informed about specific options for different projects. Planning is, thus, a process by which alternatives and options are evaluated in order to aid decision making. In his work, Banovetz asserts that planners should work in an advisory capacity to all policy-making and administrative officials (1984, 61). As
such, appropriate planning leads to better decisions.

Neither plans nor decisions exist in isolation. Malizia touches upon this concept when he talks about the execution of plans. According to his view, the success of a particular plan is directly related to the power expended to implement it (1985, 10). This, of course, ultimately depends upon the resources available and the power expended by others to execute different plans. The implementation of plans continually impacts upon and modifies the local environment. Both planning and decision making need to consider other decisions and plans which have been made in the past or which are being made concurrently. Both decision making and planning must be flexible enough to respond to unexpected circumstances. At the same time, planning should go further and identify in advance potential conflicts and devise ways to prevent or mitigate adverse consequences.

The previous viewpoints can be summarized and collapsed into a common point of reference for purposes of this thesis. The concept of public planning includes the following elements:

- Planning guides change. It prevents undesired change or randomness.
- Planning is future-oriented. It encourages people to make decisions about their future and what it will look like. It provides society with a mechanism to make that future real.
- Planning must lead to action. Plans must be implemented and evaluated to measure their success.
Planning is ongoing. The results of the implemented plans serve as a starting point for identifying how to fine tune plans to keep them successful or to identify problem areas in need of more detailed planning.

Planning is linked to politics.

Planning must be socially acceptable.

With the key elements of planning identified, the following section discusses how planning incorporates those elements to operate as a series of sequential steps commonly known as a process.

2.2 PLANNING AS A PROCESS

While the notion of planning as a process is relatively new, the concept has been embraced by most of the planning community. The current literature is full of different approaches which stress a process orientation for planning. Several of those views will be reviewed here.

Etzioni presents a very general view of planning as a process. He feels it is time to get rid of the extremes in planning from Lindblom's notion of muddling through to the ideas of the grand plan. He asserts that planning must become a process that is "...flexible, showing direction rather than detail--constantly subject to feedback and editing" (Etzioni 1978, 211).

The second account of planning as a process to be considered is that of Bendavid-Val:
Planning should follow sequential steps which should be linked to create a continuous planning process: analyzing data, defining community goals and objectives, designing alternative courses of action, assessing and comparing alternatives, selecting the preferred alternative, and implementing and evaluating the chosen alternative (1985, 16).

Donald N. Michael (1976) presents a third, somewhat more expanded, view of the planning process. He envisions a systematic approach containing a goal statement phase, a cost benefit analysis concentrating on non-monetary as well as monetary factors, a regionwide scope for the process in order to identify unanticipated adverse results, sequenced action to ensure the plan's implementation, and finally, continual evaluation which leads to new goals and programs in response to evaluation (1974, 40). He recognizes that a process of this nature may be somewhat unpopular but feels that it is necessary due to the fact that in his view, "...planning schemes rejecting this systematic approach have, for the most part, been failures" (1974, 40).

A fourth viewpoint is presented by Burke and focuses on the relationship between planning and decision making. He states that planning as a process consists of both substantive and social components. The substantive process is the nuts and bolts of planning. Included in this is fact finding, formulation and examination of alternatives and devising implementation strategies. The social process on the other hand is that part of planning which makes it part of the larger political (decision making) process. This component of the process is where facts and logic leave off and "gut feelings" and statesmanship enter in (1979, 17).
Burke goes on to give a very general overview of how the process should occur and introduces the notion of local involvement. In order for a plan to be adopted, first, the right actors must be identified, second, a strategy must be developed that links actors to the planning process and to the decision making process (1979, 28). In the present political climate, local actors are more directly involved in the planning process, especially the initial part. Banovetz elaborates on the local component in the planning process and on the importance of flexibility. Special attention has been given to planning at the local level.

The community planning process must take into account the changing values that are causing alterations in lifestyles; community plans must be no more static than are the community residents themselves (1984, 57).

By incorporating elements from the views presented above, it is clear that for planning to occur as a process several components are necessary and they must be combined and carried out in a specific manner. In an overall sense, planning as a process is a series of sequential steps which are carried out in a systematic manner to achieve a stated end. In other words, it must be goal oriented and lead to implementation. The process consists of the following steps:

**Step 1**  **Goal Formulation.** This is the step where goals for the process are stated. This is also the step where the rest of the process is defined.

**Step 2**  **Option Identification and Evaluation.** This is an analytical step where economic and/or non-economic factors or alternatives are first identified and then evaluated. This step is necessarily flexible and dynamic to allow for a range of alternatives to be considered.
Step 3  Option Selection and Implementation. This step is carried out by the relevant decision makers based on information gained from Step 2.

Step 4  Evaluation of the Results of Implementation. This step measures the success of the chosen option. It also serves as a mechanism to identify problem areas and acts as a springboard to start the next planning process.

It is important to keep in mind that the planning process must include some degree of flexibility and some level of local participation.

After summing up the concept of planning in a generic sense and then conceptualizing it as a process, the next task of this thesis is to look at the influence of authority upon the planning process. Chapter 3 does that by presenting three different authority models of planning.
This chapter presents the three authority models of planning. It utilizes the framework established in the preceding chapters to describe the models. A general overview of each model is presented and includes the sources on which the model is based and its basic premises. The model is then discussed in terms of the planning process described in Chapter 2. The model is further discussed in terms of the questions outlined in Chapter 1. A final section summarizes the model by presenting its positive and negative aspects.

3.1 THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY MODEL

3.1.1 Overview

The Central Authority Model (CAM) of planning is primarily based upon two sources, the principles of Jeffersonian or representative democracy and Susskind and Elliot's Paternalism. Its main premise is that planning is carried out by a legitimate central authority.

According to the principles of Jeffersonian Democracy, the public elects decision makers to represent them. Those decision makers are given the authority and entrusted to exercise good judgement in order to promote the "public good". In this case, the "public good" represents the best interests of society as a whole.

Susskind and Elliot's Paternalistic approach to decision making is based on the premise of centralized authority whose actions are intended to maintain or enhance
the "public good". A process such as this has only limited acceptance of advice offered by those whom the decision ultimately affect (1984, 159-60).

The CAM is a formalized, highly organized, legitimate system which depends upon information obtained from "experts". This information forms the basis by which decisions can be made in the best interests of the general public.

A majority of planning in the U.S. today is accomplished in a fashion which depends upon a central authority. This is particularly true in the case of land use planning or zoning where a planning board (commission) or zoning board of adjustment is given the responsibility of making the "best" decisions about the future development of the community on a project by project basis.

Norman and Susan Fainstein provide an interesting critique of what they term "traditional planning". They attribute five elements to the activity of planning. Those elements are:

1. The existence of the ruling class ideology which universalizes the state thus legitimizing its activities in the name of the public good. This is so even though, the state primary acts in the interests of the ruling class.

2. Planning is a necessary activity according to such an ideology in order to maintain social control by exercising "containment tactics" and providing social services.

3. Planners, whether employed directly by the state or not, are all agents of the state. This is due to the fact that they must all conform to the rules and regulations (laws) created by the state.
4. Planners act to manage the contradictions of the ruling class ideology (e.g. providing more low cost housing for the poor) yet at the same time create new contradictions (e.g. utilizing the government subsidized housing leads to social stigma).

5. Planners act to legitimize the role of the state by providing supposedly scientifically determined strategies which are in the public interest (1978, 6-7).

Those five elements, while intended as a critique, can be slightly modified to provide a good overview of CAM. Components of this model include:

1. A legitimate authority exists which acts to ensure the "public good".

2. Planning is a necessary activity to reduce conflict and allow for orderly development, growth and change.

3. Planners, whether employed by the public or private sector, are influenced by the laws established by the legitimate authority.

4. Solutions to identified problems may result in the creation of new problems, thus the planning process is ongoing.

5. It is the planner's responsibility to provide the legitimate authority with options based on sound professional expertise always keeping in mind the overriding "public good".

3.1.2 The Planning Process

3.1.2.1 Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives for planning utilizing a CAM approach are well defined and often legislated. They tend to be somewhat vague ("motherhood statements"), static and extremely difficult to deviate from. The legitimate central authority is the one and only source responsible for establishing these goals and objectives.
3.1.2.2 Alternative Identification and Evaluation

The central authority is responsible for hiring and/or appointing experts to carry out the identification and evaluation of various alternative methods to achieve the stated goals. These experts make recommendations to the central authority. Public comments on findings are solicited after the experts submit the preferred alternative.

In process of alternative identification and evaluation occurs on a tightly scheduled time frame. In many cases, the exact time frame for each step in the process is legislated (i.e. public comment periods limited to 30 days, a decision must be reached within 60 days of filing of application, etc.). The results of alternative identification and evaluation are a few (often only one) rigidly defined alternatives which go to decision makers for final approval.

3.1.2.3 Decision Making and Implementation

Decision making is done by the legitimate central authority. Implementation is carried out either by the central authority or its duly appointed agent. Decisions are based on input from the hired/appointed experts, the public and other (political, economic, social) factors. After considering all of these inputs, the decision makers determine the one best option.

Implementation is generally stated in the form of policy statements and procedures. The implementation is overseen by the central authority or its agents. It might even be legislated or judicially mandated.
3.1.2.4 Monitoring and Feedback Mechanisms

The monitoring and feedback associated with the chosen alternative is most often spelled out in the implementation documentation. It generally takes the form a stated length of time for which monitoring is required and/or a given length of time for which the policies are in effect (usually a 5, 10 or 20 year horizon). The document may indicate that policies are to be re-evaluated and updated in a specific number of years or it might indicate that after a given number of years the policies terminate (sunset clause).

3.1.3 Framework

3.1.3.1 Planning for Whom?

The CAM is characterized by a broad definition of the public interest. This reflects the fact that the central authority in a representative democracy is responsible to all of its constituents and includes those interests which are affected by the proposal and those which are not. It also includes interests which would benefit from the proposal and those which would lose.

In reality, it is impossible for this approach to serve all the varied interests of the central authority’s constituents. As such, the CAM serves those interests which are well organized and well funded. The model might also serve to a lesser extent the minority single (special) interest groups which tend to be extremely vocal.

The model could be thought of as elitist in that it represents only a small powerful segment of the population. Elitist theory holds that dominant interests
make all decisions in society. Modern elitist theories go so far as to assert that since
the interests of the elite have been dominant for such a long time, society as a whole
has adopted (been brainwashed into accepting) them as the public interest. This
theory is labeled ideological hegemony.

The CAM by and large makes no special attempts to encourage or include
specific members of the public in the process. It provides mechanisms which allow
public input and then leaves it up to the affected parties to take advantage of those
mechanisms. This approach includes a system of checks and balances which leaves
the process open to judicial intervention.

3.1.3.2 Where do Goals for Planning Come From?

Goal formulation in the CAM is a formalized process which often requires
legislation. Goals tend to be vague and broad in order to cover a variety of
circumstances. Modifying or changing goals can be quite difficult once they have
been established. Decision makers are responsible for formulating goals. They are
also ultimately held accountable for any goals which are established. In the arena in
which decision makers operate, changes in goals may lead constituents to questions
their credibility.

Decision makers are charged with the task of establishing goals which promote
the "best interests" of society. This is a monumental charge and the central authority
relies by and large on the advice of "experts". They also consider special indicators
which are designed to measure the "health" of society.
Small well organized groups may have influence on the goal formulation process through lobbying efforts. For the most part, this model is not responsive to specific concerns of small sectors of the public. It should be noted that the public can ultimately influence the process through the ballot. Unfortunately, this option is often merely a matter of approving or disapproving of goals or policies established by the decision makers. The public can also influence the results of decision making by using the system of checks and balances established in the Constitution of the United States and appealing the decisions to the courts.

3.1.3.3 Who Participates and How?

Susskind and Elliot's Paternalism can be directly applied to this component of the CAM. All forms of participation are formalized and closely regulated. One of the central features of the model is organization. According to Susskind and Elliot, "advice from the public is viewed as a supplement to, but not as a replacement for, representative democracy" (1984, 160). In other words, the public has exercised its input function in the action of electing the central authorities to represent them.

The actors with the most active role in the planning process are the experts and professionals who inform the decision makers. They range from consultants in fields as varied as economics, biology and sociology to lobbyists from the local "Save Our Field" group. The central authority also plays an important role in that it, in most cases, chooses the experts who participate and then makes the final decision on the action to be taken.
While the CAM does not exclude the public from the planning process, their participation is limited and forced to follow formal channels (e.g. written submissions, public hearings). Public input serves as a supplement to expert advice which the decision makers receive. Individuals or groups can also express their views through lobbying efforts. It is usually well-organized groups with a considerable amount of money which are most able to utilize lobbyists and thus have the most influence on the process.

No special attempt is made to encourage public participation. Those participants with a desire to participate do; those with no desire do not. Public participation in the CAM requires effort on the part of the participant. First, it is not always easy to be fully informed as to what is happening in the process and second, participating in public hearings tends to be intimidating.

Another avenue open to the public is through the formal appeals process which almost always exists in the CAM approach to planning. By utilizing this approach, land use decisions end up being decided in the courts by judges with little or no knowledge of the issues being discussed and almost invariably no stake in the outcome.

3.1.3.4 What is the Role of the Planner?

The professional planner plays a large role in the CAM. The planner acts as one of the experts responsible for informing decision makers. It is often the case that cities, counties, states and/or regions have planning departments established by law to serve
as aids to the decision makers. In those jurisdictions where there are no staff planners, decision makers may hire planning consultants to aid in data collection and analysis.

Planners who are agents of the central authority are in the position of synthesizing information obtained from many sources and providing the decision makers with the "best" option. In this case, planners actually control the planning process to a degree. The decision makers simply "rubber stamp" the planners' actions. Thus, planners are a vital source of information for decision makers. Also in those cases where decisions are appealed, staff planners serve as the expert witnesses for the central authority in court.

In order for the public to compete with the central authority or other vocal interests, they must employ their own experts. Thus, planners can also act as experts for public interest groups. This is particularly important when land use decisions have been appealed. It is interesting to note that many planners eventually go on to become land use lawyers. This trend points out the important role which the courts currently play in land use planning.

3.1.3.5 Who Makes Decisions and How?

The ultimate responsibility for decisions in this model rests with the central authority. The decision making process is influenced and aided by professionals, experts and a limited number of special interest representatives from the "public at large". In the ideal situation, the decision makers would analyze all possible
information and carefully weight selected alternatives in order to come up with a planning option which, once implemented, would be in the best interests of the community.

In reality, decisions in the political realm are often made based on circumstances which have little or nothing to do with the issue being considered. Decision making is quite often influenced by obscure "political factors". The fact that minority special interests may be more vocal than the silent majority also tends to have an undue influence on decision making. Finally and probably the most significant influence upon decision making according to this model is the appeals process. When actions end up in court, the judges act as the decision makers. In these instances, the decisions which are arrived at are legal decisions which may differ significantly from appropriate land use planning decisions.

3.1.4 Summary

The following positive and negative aspects of the CAM serve as a summary of the model:

**Positive Aspects of the CAM**

The model's major strength lies in its familiarity. A vast majority of planning in the U.S. today (as well as nearly all functions of government) utilizes this approach.
The model is a relatively quick and inexpensive approach to planning, eliminating lengthy and costly bargaining/negotiation processes which characterize other models.

The model is characterized by clear accountability. Decision makers are directly responsible for the decisions which they make. The CAM eliminates grey areas. Decisions are made and actions are taken.

Negative Aspects of the CAM

- The model has a broad mandate (to serve all constituents) which tends to lead to vague policies. These are then difficult to implement and often end up in court.

- The model has limited public participation which is rigidly formalized and tends to be intimidating, thus discouraging participation.

- The model utilizes an approach to decision making which is obscured by factors not relevant to the issue being decided. Thus, while the planning process may be a closely regulated formalized process, the actual decision making is cloaked in a great deal of uncertainty.

- The model incorporates a system of appeals which often moves the decision making arena to the courts. Decisions handed down by the judicial system are made by judges who, for the most part, have little or
no expertise in the area of land use planning. Judicial decisions tend to be piecemeal and may decide some but not all of the issues involved in the dispute. In fact, issues of lesser importance are often the only ones resolved by the courts. These piecemeal decisions do not form the basis of coherent policy programs and may be difficult to implement. Finally, the court's mandate and the mandate of the central authority are quite different. It is the court's responsibility to decide an issue, while it is the central authority's responsibility to resolve that issue. As such, legal decisions are zero-sum settlements where all too often everyone loses.
CENTRAL AUTHORITY MODEL (CAM)

Major Premise: Planning is carried out by a legitimate central authority to reflect the best interests of the general public.

Components

- Formalized
- Highly organized
- Broad definition of the public interest

Provides mechanisms for public participation (i.e. public hearings) but it is up to the public to take the initiative to be informed and to participate.

- Best serves well organized, well funded interests.

- Experts are the most active participants. Public input supplements expert advice.

- Its major strength lies in its familiarity. Most land use planning in the U.S. is done according to this approach.

- Relatively quick, inexpensive process where accountability is clear.

- Well established formal appeals process leaves process open to judicial intervention. Thus, decisions can be made in court by judges with little or no knowledge of the planning issues.
3.2 THE LEAD AGENCY MODEL

3.2.1 Overview

The Lead Agency Model (LAM) is based on two sources, Donald Canty's arguments in his 1972 work, "Metropolity" and the Colorado Review Process (CRP) - the method used to coordinate land use decisions in the state of Colorado. In both of these sources, planning is envisioned as a highly coordinated process. In Canty's view, planning is marked by a need for "...area wide instruments to carry out development strategies" (1972, 37). In the CRP, planning is coordinated on two levels: (1) statewide and (2) locally. The LAM incorporates both of these features to define an innovative method of land use planning.

The LAM falls in the middle of the authority continuum discussed in Chapter 1. This position suggests two basic assumptions. First, politicians (legitimate authority or central authority) are still responsible for making broad policy decisions regarding social goals or the public good. Second, it is the responsibility of decentralized agencies to carry out the day to day actions which move land use planning projects toward their ultimate goals. It is important to note that while authority is somewhat decentralized in this model, it is still firmly rooted in the notion of the legitimacy of the central authority. The lead agencies are granted limited authority to make land use decisions within the policy confines of the "powers that be".

On a day to day, project-by-project basis, the lead agencies are responsible for coordinating, organizing and facilitating planning. They also act as the ultimate
decision makers and are responsible for implementation and evaluation of plans.

The LAM functions at several levels. The first and highest level is the state clearing house. This level is for the most part administrative in nature. Its primary duties include receiving all proposals and keeping the various lead agencies informed as to important land use decisions as they are regularly updated and changed. In so doing, the clearing house coordinates all land use planning for the state. It is responsible for identifying the proper lead agency which has the responsibility for decision making. The clearing house also identifies all other relevant agencies which have an interest in reviewing the proposal. Finally, the clearing house must be regularly updated by the lead agencies about decisions and projects so that it can continue to properly coordinate land use planning efforts. To be successful, it is necessary that this state level clearing house has a legitimate mandate to act.

The next level is the designated lead agency. This is the critical level. It is where final decisions are made in terms of what will be implemented and how. The lead agencies can be thought of as the entities responsible for land use planning according to the LAM. The lead agencies act to coordinate the efforts of the other relevant agencies which were identified by the state clearing house and the public to come up with an implementable product. They must also keep in contact with the state level clearing house to remain updated on relevant decisions which have been made and to inform the clearing house of important decisions which they have made. The linkage between the state level clearing house and the lead agencies is critical to the coordination of planning on a statewide level.
Other relevant agencies and the public comprise the third and fourth levels, respectively. These levels can be thought of as the research and development levels of the model. They provide the vital input necessary for the lead agencies to make informed decisions.

3.2.2 The Planning Process

3.2.2.1 Goals and Objectives

The overriding goal of this model is to coordinate planning. This is accomplished by having a state clearing house which monitors the land use decisions which are being made throughout the state. Individual project-by-project goals and objectives for planning vary from agency to agency. Depending upon which agency is designated as the lead agency, goals and objectives may be legislated or may be comprised of a series of policy statements with room for interpretation.

3.2.2.2 Alternative Identification and Evaluation

The lead agency is responsible for determining the alternatives which will be evaluated by other relevant agencies and, to some extent, the public. The other agencies and the public are free to suggest other alternatives which they feel are appropriate.

The evaluation of alternatives is based on the policies of the particular agency conducting the evaluation. It may or may not include an element of public participation. Due to the decentralized nature of the evaluating agencies, the public has many more points of access. Also, since the participating agencies tend to be at
a level closer to the affected public, they tend to be more in tune with the area for which the land use decisions are being made.

It is important to note that the identification and evaluation of alternatives is still tied to a structured time frame. Since the lead agencies ultimately make decisions, they carry a big stick. They structure the format of agency and public input. If participants do not respond in a timely manner they may be excluded from the alternative identification and evaluation. If several viable options result from the alternative identification and evaluation the lead agency must choose which will be implemented.

3.2.2.3 Decision Making and Implementation

The lead agency makes the decision as to which alternative or combination of alternatives will be implemented and how. It designates which of the other agencies will be responsible for implementing what phase of the chosen strategy. Actual implementation of strategies is based on the policies of the implementing agencies.

3.2.2.4 Monitoring and Feedback Mechanisms

It is at this point that the state level clearing house is once again involved in the model. The clearing house is regularly updated on the status of a project, policy or action so it can better coordinate future planning endeavors.
3.2.3 Framework

3.2.3.1 Planning for Whom?

Canty's work discusses the need for coordinated state and local planning. He points out that as problems arise, the typical response of local governments is to create special districts, agencies or "blue ribbon" committees to deal with them. Over time, these entities necessarily begin to overlap and work at cross-purposes (1972, 37). The problem with this approach is obvious; as problems multiply, the public interest is not well served.

With few exceptions, local governments in our decentralized western society are split into an amazing number of fragmented units. Studies in 1967 showed that on the average metropolitan areas in the U.S. were served by 91 of these governmental units (Canty, 1972, 38). The problem with this fragmentation in any attempt to plan for a region is clear. The LAM is an attempt to coordinate the planning process in such a way as to promote the public interest.

Since the LAM operates at two basic levels (the state level clearing house and the regional or local level lead agency), the public interest is also defined at two levels. At the state level (clearing house) the public interest is broadly defined. At this level the model is similar to the CAM since the state is necessarily comprised of many interests, some of which may be in conflict.

The LAM differs from the CAM however when the lead agency is appointed. Just the act of identifying a lead agency significantly narrows the definition of the
public interest. In general, agencies which are appointed as the lead agency have a limited sphere of influence. They are also, in most cases, at a level of government close to the public, thus they are likely to be more responsive and more eager to serve those individuals or groups directly affected by the land use decisions being made.

3.2.3.2 Where do the Goals for Planning Come From?

The ultimate goal of the model is to improve decisions made in regard to land use planning by coordinating the various levels of government. As with other aspects of the LAM, goals for the process exist at each level. The state level clearing house has a small but vital role with only one goal. That goal is to ensure that the proper agencies are identified and included in the planning process and to keep those agencies informed as to other land use decisions which are being made and may influence future decision making.

The rationale behind appointing a lead agency is that better land use decisions can be made (the ultimate goal of the model) if decision making is brought closer to what is being decided. Lead agencies do just that while still allowing the decision making process to be accountable to government. By including other relevant agencies and the public, the model establishes a systems of checks. The goal at this level is to come up with workable options which will be acceptable to the lead agency.

Developing project specific goals is the responsibility of the lead agency. The level of public participation in this process is a function of the structure of the lead agency. More loosely structured agencies provide greater access to the public. More
rigidly structured agencies are likely to have a formal goal formulation process which may or may not include public input.

Burke makes an important point which is relevant here:

Experience reveals that once citizens are permitted to participate in a community activity they tend to demand increased influence. It is safe to predict therefore, that citizens will expect more rather than less influence in future community planning activities (1979, 27).

Thus as a precedent for public input is set or as channels are established for public access, it is likely that the public will demand a larger role in the formulation of goals. If, however, the region primarily solicits public input in the form of formalized participation (public hearings), then the public is less likely to gain an active role in goal formulation.

3.2.3.3 Who Participates and How?

Participation in the LAM occurs at several levels. The first level is at the state clearing house where all proposals are submitted. The clearing house staff review the proposal and based upon that review, identify the lead agency and the other relevant agencies which will participate. The clearing house participates in one other extremely important way; it keeps the process informed as to land use decisions which are being made and which may have an impact upon the process.

The second level, the lead agency acts as the facilitator for the planning process. It must identify the issues to be resolved and coordinate the actors involved.
It is at this level that input from the various relevant agencies and citizen involvement is coordinated. This coordination must occur in the planning, implementation and evaluation stages.

The final level of participation includes input from other relevant agencies and the public. This input may be solicited in formal or informal ways depending upon the structure of the lead agency. As was pointed out in section 3.2.3.2, once citizens are given an opportunity to actively participate in decision making, they are more likely to demand it in the future. The decentralized nature of the lead agencies and the other relevant agencies affords increased access points for public participation. The fact that the agencies tend to be at a level of government closer to the public also encourages increased participation. It is far easier and less intimidating to talk to the local public works director than to make a formal statement at a public hearing or to arrange an appointment with a busy congressman.

An interesting area of consideration involves land use decisions of a multi-jurisdictional nature. In cases where issues cross over into several jurisdictions, it is important to ensure that all jurisdictions are involved in the process. The Colorado Review Process (CRP) addresses this issue and suggests that it is necessary for a general cooperative agreement among all participating jurisdictions to be signed. This agreement not only commits the involved jurisdictions to participate in the process but assigns them responsibilities as well. The signed binding agreement acts as a reference point throughout the process (1976, 3). In addition to specifying the terms of participation, the cooperative agreement should
include a methodology for terminating the process if it should become necessary. It should also clearly spell out who becomes responsible for what in the event that the process is terminated.

Participation in the LAM is similar to the PAM in that a variety of actors are encouraged to participate in the process. The difference between the two models is the lead agency's authority. The lead agency can make final decisions in the event that the actors cannot reach consensus. This fact keeps the process moving. To an extent, the lead agency acts to ensure that no one interest dominates the process. It is the responsibility of the lead agency to see that resulting strategies are in the best interests of the entire region.

3.2.3.4 What is the Role of the Planner?

The professional planner serves an important function in the LAM at all levels. The clearing house level is staffed by planners. They review proposals in order to identify the appropriate lead agency and other relevant agencies. Clearing house staff planners are also required to determine if proposals are in conflict with existing land use decisions. In such cases, the proposal may be identified as being inappropriate.

Often the lead agency will be the city, county or regional planning agency. In these cases, the planner will be directly responsible for facilitating and coordinating all aspects of the process. If not the lead agency, these planning agencies will almost certainly be included as other relevant agencies in which case the planners act as
technical experts to provide the lead agency with information. In addition, lead agencies, other agencies or members of the public may contract with planning consultants to look at specific areas of concern.

3.2.3.5 Who Makes Decisions?

Decision making in the LAM is the responsibility of the lead agency. Those decisions are ideally based on input from other agencies, the public and information regarding relevant land use decisions obtained from the clearing house. It is important to keep in mind that the lead agencies are government agencies and as such are accountable to the politicians who have granted them legitimacy and ultimately the voters.

Because of its decision making authority, in cases where it seems that no decision can be reached, the lead agency has the responsibility to act. This provides the involved actors with a strong incentive to keep the process moving and reach workable agreements in a reasonable amount of time. In the LAM, there is always the threat that if the process gets bogged down, the lead agency will make a decision which would be less than optimal for the involved actors. It is in this area that the LAM most closely resembles the CAM.

The decision making process in the LAM is an iterative process. It encourages compromise and consensus between and among the various participants. Ideally, only if no decision can be reached or if the process terminates does the lead agency assert its decision making authority. Thus, the actors still have a large stake in
seeing that the resulting planning strategies are successfully implemented.

In the ideal case where the coordination of the various levels of involved actors is successful, the results will be a land use decision (or series of decisions) acceptable to the participants. If unsuccessful, the checks and balances which exist in our system of government would allow for decisions of the lead agency to be appealed to a higher governmental authority and/or the courts.

3.2.4 Summary

The LAM is characterized by both positive and negative aspects. Those aspects are listed below and serve as a summary of the model.

**Positive Aspect of the LAM**

- The model is a decentralized approach to decision making. This allows more public access and is less intimidating than a more centralized approach.

- The model encourages (in the case of other relevant agencies requires) the participation of a number of interests.

- The model allows for decisions to be made in a timely manner. Since the lead agency is ultimately the decision maker, it can keep the process moving by threatening to make the decision with or without other participants blessing.
The model includes an element of accountability in that lead agencies are legitimate. Also, the system of checks and balances ensures that dissatisfied participants have a legitimate recourse at a higher level of government or in the courts.

**Negative Aspects of the LAM**

The model might not serve the public interest if the lead agency acts irresponsibly. Since the lead agency is the ultimate decision maker, it could base its decision on purely "political" factors and ignore any input which resulted from the planning process.

The model is designed in such a way that if any important actors are not included in the process, the action being considered could end up in the courts. In such instances, it is likely that the process will be dragged out for a considerable length of time and the public interest will not be well served.

The model allows the lead agency to determine the type of participation in the process. This might lead to a lower level of participation if it is difficult or intimidating to participate.
LEAD AGENCY MODEL (LAM)

Major Premise: In order to cope with an increasingly fragmented governmental structure, coordination is necessary. Day-to-day authority is somewhat decentralized but guided by policies established by a strong central authority in the best interests of the general public.

Components

- LAM operates at two levels, state clearing house and regional or local lead agency.

  - State Clearing House

    Primarily administrative
    Starting point for all land use actions
    Routes actions to appropriate agencies
    Tracks actions through planning process
    Records results to coordinate at a statewide level

  - Lead Agency

    Coordinate
    Organize
    Facilitate

    Better land use decisions should result since they are made at a level of government closer to the affected public.

    Ideally, decisions result from a coordinated effort between lead agency, other agencies and the public.

    Process is kept moving by threat of lead agency making decisions.

    Potential exists for lead agency to act irresponsibly.

    Decisions still subject to appeal and judicial intervention.
3.3 THE PARTICIPATORY ADAPTIVE MODEL

3.3.1 Overview

The Participatory Adaptive Model (PAM) of land use planning is a result of the increased demand by the public to have a say in shaping the future of their communities and environment. This demand has manifested itself over the last two decades. In 1979, Burke published statistics based on the President's National Commission on Neighborhoods which showed that 62 pieces of federal legislation existed which mandated citizen participation in planning (1979, 13). This, combined with existing state and local legislation, creates a multiplicity of institutional arrangements designed to allow for, and in fact encourage, citizen participation.

One element of PAM is its emphasis on local participation which is the legacy of the turbulent sixties. It was that climate of thought which gave rise to advocacy planning. Advocacy planning, according to Peattie, was a direct result of the emergence of organized groups which were focused on specific problem areas. These groups were searching for solutions to many of the social problems which they perceived (1972, 88-89). The goal of advocacy planning is to ensure that all groups are fairly represented in the political process. In addition, advocacy is a mechanism for educating individuals and groups about the planning process as a whole and for aiding them in becoming more competent in influencing the existing political system.

Another element which shapes PAM is Susskind and Elliot's coproduction. They defined coproduction as:
...a distinct pattern of participation characterized by the direct involvement of unelected interest group representatives in the operation of government—in some cases on an ad hoc basis and in others as the result of decentralization of municipal decision making (1984, 172).

The Participatory Adaptive Model (PAM) of planning is a "grass roots", bottom-up approach to planning. The model is characterized by heavy reliance upon citizen participation and flexibility at all levels. A critical assumption of the model is that there is no "best" solution to any issue, therefore, change is always possible.

A key feature of PAM is its accessibility. At each stage of the process, actors who have a legitimate interest in the planning which is occurring are identified, consulted and involved. Not only is the public encouraged to participate, they are responsible for a majority of the planning which occurs in the PAM.

The model is further characterized by face to face bargaining and negotiation between and among citizens and government. Decisions are made and implemented as a result of this process.

Susskind and Elliot outline five elements which are necessary in order for coproduction to occur (1984, 171). A modified version of these elements proves useful in overviewing PAM.

1. Diversity must exist. Planning processes and organizations must be flexible in order to adapt to a variety of continually changing circumstances.

2. Interest groups and other involved actors must be encouraged to organize themselves instead of waiting for government to provide
the opportunity.

3. To be most successful, groups must first organize around small physical projects in order to develop a sense of cohesiveness.

4. It should be explicitly stated (perhaps in the form of a contract) who does and is responsible for what throughout the planning process.

5. "Give and take" planning should be encouraged. This is similar to a modified delphi approach where different groups are asked to review and comment on documents prepared by other groups before final decisions are reached.

3.3.2 The Planning Process

3.3.2.1 Goals and Objectives

Goal formulation in the PAM is an interactive process. The goals and objectives in this model are dynamic and subject to reinterpretation as the planning process progresses. This approach encourages compromise and consensus. Just as there is no one "best" solution in this model, there are an unlimited number of goals and goal combinations which may be adopted to fit the particular circumstance as the need arises.

3.3.2.2 Alternatives Identified and Evaluated

The most important point to keep in mind when considering identification and evaluation of goals in the PAM is that there are no time limits. Identification of alternatives is an interactive process similar to goal formulation. PAM relies upon brainstorming as the primary mechanism for identifying different alternatives. As alternatives are identified, an attempt is made to combine them in such a way as to maximize the number of participants who will be satisfied with the outcome. By
combining alternatives to create new ones and by eliminating those which cannot be achieved, a workable number of alternatives are proposed for further evaluation.

Some evaluation of the alternatives is necessary in the identification phase to combine reasonable alternatives and to reduce those suggested to a workable number. For the most part, the formal evaluation of the remaining alternatives is done by experts with input from the public as necessary. The evaluation process serves as a means for the public to become educated as to the benefits and costs of the proposed alternatives not merely informed as to which is best. The evaluation of the options does not necessarily result in only one alternative being selected. It may be decided that a series of alternatives would best meet the needs of those who are directly affected by a proposal. It might also be decided that none of the alternatives is suitable and the identification process may start again. It should also be noted that alternatives, like goals and objectives, may be modified as the process continues.

3.3.2.3 Decision Making and Implementation

Decision making and implementation in the PAM are carried out by those who actively participate in the process. This includes the public, agencies and any participating governmental body. In addition to decision making and implementation, the involved actors are also responsible for the results of the implemented strategies. This responsibility may result in investments of time and money and includes responsibility for failure as well as success.
3.3.2.4 Monitoring and Feedback Mechanism

The PAM incorporates feedback and monitoring into every phase of the process. It is a circular process with no real end. As problems are identified, they are plugged into the system for evaluation and eventual solution. Since the model is ongoing, as new phases are entered, new actors become involved and old actors drop out.

3.3.3 Framework

3.3.3.1 Planning for Whom?

The public interest in this model is narrowly defined as those who will be directly affected by the land use action being considered. It is a grass roots approach to planning. PAM is based on the assumption that the public interest is best served when the planning is done by affected individuals not for them. As such, the planning process is initiated and carried out by those actors who have the largest stake in seeing their strategies implemented. It should be noted that an approach such as PAM may not be as efficient as a more structured approach. Participants are free to enter and leave the process at will, thus making the process difficult to coordinate.

To ensure that changing values are reflected in the community’s planning endeavors, it is imperative that participation occurs from all segments of the affected public. Participants must include a diverse mix of interests to ensure that a fair cross section of the community is represented. Not only should may interests be represented, but individual views on may issues should be solicited as well. This, according to Banovetz, is necessary to ensure that the resulting planning strategies
and decisions will best reflect the citizens’ needs and desires for their community’s future development (1984, 58).

Securing public support for planning is important but is not enough. The public must also be educated so that they are able to understand the implications of planning and develop an better understanding of the planning process. This education includes identifying who benefits and who loses in each scenario which is developed. As losers are identified, attempts must be made to mitigate losses to ensure maximum satisfaction with the process. Once educated, individuals and groups are in a better position to make those land use decisions which will ultimately shape their future.

3.3.3.2 Where do Goals for Planning come from?

Goal formulation in this model is an iterative process. As such, it has the potential to be a lengthy step. It is the result of brainstorming, combining and rethinking the various available options. The model is flexible and open to new ideas at every phase. It is however, important that those who are participating agree on what it is they are trying to achieve. This is the first and most important step in the goal formulation process.

Susskind and Elliot suggest that in an iterative process such as PAM, the community must first identify its unique needs (1984, 171). Bramhall also pursues the issue of needs identification. He suggests that in order to effectively formulate goals, the community must have a well defined sense of process and establish
guidelines which lead to action. In addition to identifying existing needs within the community, it is important to define existing problems which currently have no solutions (1974, 2). It must also be stressed that the goals stated at this point are flexible and may be modified as the process proceeds.

The goal formulation phase of the process is the first opportunity to identify areas of common interest and potential conflicts between the various groups participating in the planning process. This, according to Fischer and Ury, is a critical first step in the planning process (1980, 6). It is possible - in fact probably due to the variety of interests involved - that many different goals may be stated. The purpose of this stage of the process is to recognize that opposing goals exist and to come up with as many mutual goals as possible. If areas of conflict do arise, mechanisms must exist to prioritize goals and, where possible, mitigation strategies must be developed for the losses which may result from goals being put aside.

3.3.3.3 Who Participates and How?

The key to participation in a PAM approach is to make every reasonable attempt to involve all affected actors. As such, the first task of the PAM is to identify the legitimate actors. The second step is to get a commitment from the actors identified. Participants must have enough of a stake in the outcome of the process to actively take part in and be responsible for the planning process. They must be willing to invest time and money to ensure that the outcome will be satisfactory.
Another element which distinguishes this model from the others is the role which government agencies play. In other models, it is the relevant government agency which is responsible for initiating the planning process. In the PAM, the relevant agency is only one participant in the process and may or may not be responsible for initiating or facilitating it. It is important however, that the appropriate government agencies are involved in the process at some level, if only in an advisory capacity. The relevant government agencies must be informed and involved enough in the process to ensure that the land use decisions which are made and strategies which result are legal and binding.

Monitoring and evaluation of chosen strategies will necessarily affect future planning endeavors. Susskind and Elliot point out that as a participatory approach to planning gains stature, its feedback mechanism becomes more formalized. As this occurs, public participation in the planning process decreases (1984, 176-177). This simply reflects that as the PAM is used and the community gains experience with the approach, the process tends to run more smoothly and less time, money and involvement is required from those who participate.

Active public participation does not preclude conflict from arising. Conflict is an important element in a participatory approach to planning. An area of conflict to avoid is when an important interest group or groups refuse or are not invited to participate in the process. If the non-participating group has significant power and/or resources, it could have serious consequences on the eventual outcome of the process. This reinforces the importance of including all relevant actors in the process.
Conflict may also exist between and among the various interests participating in the process. Conflict may serve to reinforce or undercut the process of public participation depending on where it exists and how it is resolved. Conflict resolution is an important step in the PAM. Ideally, it is through conflict resolution that mutually acceptable strategies can be developed. In so doing, conflict resolution serves to strengthen the participants commitment to the planning process.

The use of simulation and game theory is a well suited means of participation in this model. These methods are generally enjoyable and act as effective learning devices. Participants learn about specific projects while also gaining a better understanding of the importance of the planning process and how it operates. Two particularly useful learning devices are the computerized geographic information system (GIS) and interactive video imaging. These tools are extremely useful to the professional planner. They can also be used in a simulation/gaming environment to provide participants with immediate graphic results of proposed policies and programs.

3.3.3.4 What is the Role of the Planner?

In the PAM, all participants act as planners. The professional planner must act as the facilitator and educator to keep the process focused and moving toward action. The planner must also conduct the "up front" work which includes the critical task of identifying the legitimate actors.

A second task which the planner must complete before the process begins
includes developing a list of key planning issues and relevant unsolved problems. This list is not intended to be all inclusive but should serve as a catalyst to get the process started. This methodology is particularly useful in that it gives participants an idea of the types of issues they should focus on and gives them something to build from.

The planner must also attempt to anticipate potential sources of conflict and develop appropriate conflict management techniques to cope with those which do arise. Fischer and Ury's book "Getting to Yes" provides many insightful techniques which could benefit the planner involved in a PAM approach. The reader is referred to this work for an in-depth discussion of a participatory adaptive approach to conflict resolution.

The planner is responsible for coordinating the process in an unbiased manner. The planner's must "get the ball rolling". While the planner should influence the process in terms of techniques to accomplish goals, it is not the planner's duty to impose ideas or beliefs. Professional planners must constantly be aware of their role as facilitator in order not to bias or dominate the process. As the process evolves, if it is successful, the role of the planner should be less and less as the involved actors take on more responsibilities. The planner should however remain a part of the process to keep it moving toward an eventual implementable strategy.

In addition, the professional planner plays an important role as technical analyst. The planner provides the participants with critical technical expertise in
evaluation of identified strategies. The planner can also act as a liaison between the generally less politically sophisticated public and the legitimate government bodies to ensure that proper permits and approvals are obtained.

### 3.3.3.5 Who Makes Decisions and How?

The decision making process in PAM is a series of compromises which lead to consensus. All involved actors participate in this process. The involvement of relevant government agencies ensures that the decisions made are legal and binding. It is important to note that this approach does not supersede the need to obtain necessary governmental permits and/or approvals.

In PAM as in Susskind and Elliot's coproduction, the public and government, through a process of bargaining and negotiation, reach agreement on who will do what in the planning, implementing and monitoring stages of the process. The process must also allow for chosen strategies to be modified if necessary. The chosen groups or individuals do not necessarily have to be government agents but they must be in constant contact with relevant government agencies to ensure that implementation strategies remain legal.

It is important to stress that the PAM is not a static approach. Adaptability is the key. If a chosen strategy is not working as anticipated, it must be modified to become more acceptable to all involved. Michael points out another element which should be kept in mind in a PAM approach. He states that all involved parties necessarily share the risks involved in an adaptive planning approach (1974, 45).
is therefore important that participants are made aware of potential risks. It is always possible that a PAM approach may break down and not lead to the desired results. Even if the process is successful, the chosen strategy may fail. In these cases, the participants must be willing to take responsibility for the failure.

3.3.4 Summary

The PAM has both positive and negative aspects. Those aspects are listed below and serve as a summary of the model.

Positive Aspects of the PAM

- The model is quite flexible and the approach adaptable. Its emphasis on local participation allows for sensitivity to the unique character of the area for which the land use decisions are being made.

- The model tends to be proactive in its approach and encourages participants to look to the future. It focuses on considering mitigation measures at the earliest point in the process.

- The model educates the public and involves them in shaping their own future. This promotes a long-term comprehensive approach to land use planning.

- The model establishes a commitment from participants in terms of both time and money. This commitment ensures that participants have a
stake in seeing that the process works and that resulting strategies are implemented.

**Negative Aspects of the PAM**

- The model tends to be slow, frustrating and costly.

- The model has no clear accountability. If the approach fails, those who have participated in the process are responsible. However, accountability is difficult to assess.

- The model is heavily dependent upon the participation of all affected actors. It is likely that identifying and encouraging all parties to be involved would be a difficult, if not impossible, task. Furthermore, the possibility exists that a dominant interest will take over the process and only its interests will be served.

- The model does not account for the possibility that the legitimate governments may be unwilling to relinquish or even share their powers.
PARTICIPATORY ADAPTIVE MODEL (PAM)

Major Premise: In order to satisfy the public's demand for a larger stake in shaping their future, authority and responsibility are evenly distributed among participants in the planning process. The process gains its legitimacy by including relevant government officials and/or agencies.

Components

- Key elements are, Citizen Participation, Diversity and Flexibility.

- Process is iterative and dynamic.

- Process has no set time limits and is continually subject to reinterpretation. It is key that everyone agrees on what is to be accomplished.

- Proactive process.

- Process serves to educate the public as well as make decisions.

- Process attempts to maximize satisfaction.

- Formal evaluation done for the most part by trained experts.

- Everyone must be aware of risks and responsibilities of process and potential for failure of the process.

- Costly process, not necessarily efficient. Accountability not clear.

- Legitimate officials must be willing to give up some of their power.
CHAPTER 4
CASE STUDY

The purpose of including a case study in this thesis is to identify how the different authority models of planning discussed in the previous chapter can be applied to real life circumstances. The case study considered is a proposal to develop approximately 2,000 acres of land on the north face of the 7-Utes Mountain located in the northern Colorado Rockies, into a destination downhill ski resort.

This chapter serves as an introduction to the case study. It briefly overviews the area in which the study is located, discusses the history of the area as it relates to ski area development and finally discusses the proposals to develop the mountain and the resulting land use decisions.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The 7-Utes Mountain is part of the Medicine Bow Mountain Range in Jackson County, Colorado. The mountain soars to an elevation of 11,453 feet above seal level. It is located roughly three miles from Gould, Colorado, a small village with an estimated population of 29 and located approximately 25 miles from the town of Walden, Colorado which is the nearest service center.

The population of Jackson County is less than 2,000, more than half of which live in the County Seat of Walden. The economy of the area is resource-based, comprised of a combination of cattle ranching, native hay, production timber harvesting, lumber production and mining. In recent years, emphasis has been
placed on developing tourism and recreation.

The county has been characterized as conservation. Its rural nature and the fact that many of its residents are second or third generations of the original settlers, accounts for that characterization. Social and cultural activities are oriented toward a ranching and small town lifestyle. There is generally a strong pride and cohesiveness among the residents who have made their living primarily from the land. Jackson County residents have been classified as, "...strongly independent, taking great pride in their self-sufficiency" (Crowder 1974, 74).

The total land area of Jackson County is slightly smaller than the state of Delaware (1,041,920 acres). Over half of the land is under state or federal ownership (Keiser 1983, 5). Two government agencies play an important role in management of the county's publicly owned resources. They are, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Since the study area is not located within the incorporated boundaries of any town, it is under the jurisdiction of the county. The county government consists of three County Commissioners and the County Administrator/Planner.

The jurisdictional authority for regulating the study area is complex due to the fact it is owned by the state of Colorado and is part of the Colorado State Forest. As such, the Colorado State Forest Service is responsible for managing the area. This responsibility is legislatively mandated and must be done in a manner which promotes a mixed use of the forest, maintains the forest's environmental integrity.
and produces the maximum possible revenue to support the public schools. In addition, the state constitution grants the county the power and authority to plan for the use of unincorporated areas within its boundaries. The county is responsible for making land use decisions with regard to zoning, subdivision and site plan review and approval and building permits.

It is clear that jurisdictional overlap exists in regulating the land use of the study area. This overlap is what makes the case study interesting from the perspective of the authority models of planning. Chapter 5 provides a detailed discussion of how land use decision making has been applied in the management of the study area.

4.2 HISTORY OF CASE STUDY AREA

In the nine years between 1968 and 1977, numerous studies were conducted to determine the potential for the feasibility of developing the 7-Utes Mountain as a destination downhill ski facility (U.S. Forest Service 1968; McDowell & Associates 1968; Colorado State University School of Business 1977; and Sno-Engineering, Inc. 1977). The results of those studies varied somewhat; however, it was generally concluded that while the area could technically be developed as downhill ski facility, many other factors limited the feasibility of developing the site as a destination ski resort. Those factors included: the existing economy of the surrounding area, areas of sensitive wildlife habitat within and immediately adjacent to the site, the ambivalence of the county residents toward development of such a facility and the fact that overall, the terrain was only marginal in terms of a downhill ski facility.
In January of 1977, the Colorado Land Board was approached by a developer with the first serious proposal to develop a ski area on the 7-Utes Mountain. The project was known as the Tomahawk Project. In late January, the Colorado Joint Review Process (also called the CRP or JRP) was initiated (for an explanation, see Section 5.2 and Appendix A).

In May of 1977, the Jackson County Board of Commissioners, after being informed of the proposal as part of the CRP, requested that the U.S. Forest Service conduct a Winter Sports Site Evaluation Study of the 7-Utes Mountain (Trick, 1977). In response to this request, Chuck McConnel made field investigations of the mountain and wrote a report on the conditions. McConnel used the previously mentioned studies to help identify critical areas to be field checked and then conducted a two-day field study of the mountain.

McConnel's findings indicated that the area received adequate snow cover to support a ski area. Furthermore, good potential for base area development and parking relative to the size of the area existed. He found that provision of water supply to the mountain (to facilitate snow making where necessary) did not appear to be a problem. The area was readily accessible from the west by a good condition road. Since all areas of the mountain proposed to be developed as a ski area and a large portion of the surrounding area was state owned, only a small portion of private land (for base area development and access from the highway to the mountain) would need to be acquired (McConnel, 1977, 3-6).
He indicated that further study was necessary in several areas (e.g. to determine wind conditions, to determine if snowmaking would be necessary, study of air shed to determine if air quality reduction would occur as a result of development). He stressed that high visual impacts of ski area development would occur along the highway accessing the area. The trails would be visible for long distances along Colorado State Highway 14. McConnel also pointed out that the potential summer and fall recreational uses of the mountain (hiking, picnicking, camping, etc.) appeared to be greater than winter recreational potential (McConnel, 1977, 3-6).

McConnel concluded that the overall ski potential of 7-Utes Mountain appeared to be for a site of small size (1977, 6). He goes on to say, "I would rate the capability of the site as being a small marginal area" (1977, 3). He recommended that an inventory of the entire county be done to determine if a better location for a downhill ski facility existed.

In early 1978, the Jackson County Planning Commission conducted a survey of the residents of Jackson County. This was the fourth such survey which had been conducted in a 10-year period and the residents were beginning to resent being surveyed. The intent of the survey was to determine the existing local attitude toward a ski area development of any kind. Results of this survey showed that 43% of the residents favored development, 47% opposed development and 10% were undecided. The residents tended to favor a small facility capable of supporting 1,000 to 2,000 skiers per day with a combination of low density downhill skiing and
cross-country skiing (Jackson County Planning Commission, 1978).

In response to the McConnel report and the growing opposition to the project, in August of 1977, William G. Scott of McDowell, Scott & Cox, Inc., a consultant acting in the interest of the developers proposing the Tomahawk Project, submitted to the Joint Review Process Committee a letter reminding them of the work done in 1968 by McDowell and Associates. He stated that a majority of the field work done in their original study was carried out in the winter and that the potential trails were actually skied. He reminded the committee that the major concern of the 1968 report was a lack of terrain for intermediate skiers. He felt that this problem was somewhat lessened due to improved snow grooming techniques and the use of shorter skis. Scott requested that the committee postpone its decision regarding the area until a detailed physical suitability of the mountain could be completed (Scott, 1977).

In late 1978, County Commissioners voted unanimously to end the Joint Review Process which had been started for the Tomahawk Project. They informed the Colorado Land Board and the proponent of their decision. The decision was based on the report done by Chuck McConnel and the survey which showed that, in general, the county residents did not favor a ski area development at that time. The Land Board agreed with the Commissioners and the Joint Review Process was terminated.

4.3 MOST RECENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

A second proposal to develop the 7-Utes Mountain was made in April of 1978 by the 7-Utes Group. The proposal began as a low density ski facility. It stated that,
"This proposed project will not be a destination resort nor will it be promoted on a national basis" (Welch et. al., 1979, 5). The 7-Utes Group held a series of public informational meetings before sending a ski area questionnaire to the county residents. The developers then approached the State Land Board to initiate a Joint Review Process. The Jackson County Board of Commissioners had previously informed the Land Board that they would be unwilling to participate in a Joint Review Process on the 7-Utes Group's proposal. The Commissioners stated that, "if at a later date it can be clearly demonstrated that a major portion of the county's residents would be in favor of the type of recreational development proposed, the Board may reconsider initiation of the Joint Review Process" (Trick, 1978). The State Land Board agreed with the Jackson County Board of Commissioners and no Joint Review Process was started.

In 1979, due to their uncertainty about the Jackson County residents’ attitude toward the development of 7-Utes Mountain, the 7-Utes Group commissioned a study to be done by a group of undergraduate business students at Colorado State University (CSU). The scope of the study was to determine the attitudes of county residents toward a year-round recreational facility and to determine the specific nature of the area to be created (Jeffery et. al, 1979, 3). The CSU students conducted yet another survey of the Jackson County residents. They found that a majority (61%) favored development of 7-Utes Mountain (Jeffery et. al., 1979, 17). The report concluded that the residents of Jackson County generally favor development of the mountain, but had some concerns about the development becoming an economic burden with very little benefit to the county (Jeffery et. al., 1979, 19).
After reviewing the raw data, it appears that the students’ findings are somewhat misleading. The survey which they conducted was extremely limited. Of the 61% who favored the development only 20% were in favor of a major recreational development. The remaining 41% opposed a large development but would support a small, closely controlled area (Jeffery, 1979, Appendix).

In early 1980, based on the findings of the students and other alleged economic analyses of the county, the 7-Utes Group once again approached the Land Board. They presented a new proposal for a large destination ski resort with primary emphasis on downhill skiing and requested that a Joint Review Process be initiated. The State Division of Planning informed county officials of the possibility of initiating a Joint Review Process for the new proposal. In April of 1980, a public meeting was held to inform the public about the proposal as well as to inform them that the State Land Board was considering initiating a Joint Review.

Following the meeting, in May of 1980 another questionnaire was sent out to Jackson County residents to determine their attitudes toward the new, larger proposal. Results of this survey clearly indicated that 83% of the residents responding opposed the development while only 17% favored and supported it (Administrator’s Notes, 1983). The new proposal was far bigger than anything that had ever been anticipated by any of the previous studies. County officials strongly opposed the development of a major destination ski resort at 7-Utes unless public support could be clearly demonstrated (Interview, March 18, 1987).
As a result of the public meeting and the questionnaire that followed, two things were clear. First, the 7-Utes Group clearly intended to develop a major downhill ski facility. Second, a majority of the county residents the county officials opposed the development of 7-Utes as a destination ski resort. In December of 1980, the Colorado Board of Land Commissioners made a compromise decision and, without conducting a Joint Review Board, granted the 7-Utes Group a special use permit. The Land Board felt that some development of 7-Utes Mountain for recreational purposes was necessary in order to fulfill their state mandate of "producing the maximum amount of revenue for the support of the common schools" (Memorandum of Understanding, 1985, 1).

The permit entitled the 7-Utes Group to use the area for "general recreation mountaineering activities including horseback riding, hiking, cross-country and Nordic skiing." It specifically prohibited permanent improvements, lift and tow lines, the cutting of timber or disturbance of the land more than necessary to maintain safety and prevent avalanches (Special Use Permit 45-F, 1980). The permit did not entitle the 7-Utes Group to exclusive use of the area and the Land Board reserved the right to grant leases and other permits as it saw fit. The permit was effective from December 1, 1980 to December 1, 1985.

The Jackson County Commissioners were not involved in the decision to issue the special use permit even though they were responsible for issuing building permits and allowing zoning changes. They contacted the State Land Board and requested some wording changes in the permit which were granted. Once the updated special
use permit was received, the county issued the necessary building permits for development of a lodge facility and passed zoning changes to allow the 7-Utes Group to operate a cross-country ski facility.

In 1984, the State Board of Land Commissioners began work on a Request for Proposal (RFP) to lease the 7-Utes Mountain for development of a downhill ski facility. They established strict criteria to be met by the successful bidder including a complete Joint Review Process. The bidding was to begin on February 1, 1985. When the 7-Utes Group learned of the Land Board’s intentions to solicit bids, a disagreement between the two ensued. The 7-Utes Group assumed that since they were already operating a facility in the area, they would automatically obtain the lease for the downhill facility. The Land Board instead offered the 7-Utes Group a lease for a Nordic ski facility at the mountain which was not to their liking. The result of the disagreement was a law suit against the Colorado Board of Land Commissioners, the state of Colorado, the Jackson County Commissioners and several local land owners.

At the present time, all parties named in the suit have been released with the exception of the Colorado Board of Land Commissioners. Until the suit is settled, no development of the 7-Utes Mountain can occur. Since the original special use permit expired in 1985 and since the 7-Utes Group turned down the state’s offer to lease the area for a Nordic ski facility, the 7-Utes lodge and cross-country ski facility are vacant and no organized activities are taking place in the study area.
CHAPTER 5
ANALYSIS

This chapter discusses the planning processes which affected the land use decisions (or lack of decisions) in the case study area. These processes include the local (county) planning process, the state planning process and the process involving the proposal to develop the 7-Utes Mountain. The discussion will emphasize where and how each of the three planning models was utilized. In some cases, a different model or different approach may have been more appropriate. Such instances will also be discussed.

5.1 COUNTY PLANNING PROCESS

Healy presents a definition of local land use control which is applicable to the planning in Jackson County. He states that local control is control by the community. Its aim is to achieve community rather than statewide goals. Local officials fear that statewide influence on land use decisions will hinder local economic growth both in terms of dollars and type of economic activities. According to Healy, local residents and officials do not want their future being dictated by the state legislature. Local community members want to be in control of their own destiny (1976, 162). The strong pride and self-reliance which characterizes Jackson County residents fosters an attitude similar to that which Healy presents.

Land use planning in Jackson County is overseen by the County Administrator/Planner, Planning Commission and the County Commissioners. It is the County Commissioners' responsibility to appoint a planning commission. This
was done in the mid-1960's. The first Comprehensive Master Plan for the county was completed in 1968. In 1974, the state legislature passed amendments to House Bill 1041 (CRS 24-65 and 24-66 Colorado Land Use Act). That piece of legislation provides authority and funding for local governments to identify and plan for areas of statewide interest. In that same year, the Jackson County Commissioners created the County Administrator/Planner position.

Until the Administrator/Planner position was created, the county's land use planning had been done by outside consultants. Only one individual has held the position of County Administrator/Planner. With the aid of state money, he has been able to implement a mode of planning for Jackson County which reflects his personal planning philosophy. He believes that planning is an activity designed to both educate and improve the quality of life of humans. As such, the residents of Jackson County are responsible for its future and thus, must be responsible for land use planning. The most significant change which has been made to Jackson County's planning process is the inclusion and reliance upon public input. The county's planning has evolved in the period covering 1968 to the present from a system very much like the CAM to a process similar to the PAM.

A major step in the evolution of the Jackson County's planning process came when the Administrator/Planner, with assistance from Comarc Design Systems, conducted a series of public workshops. The workshops were intended to both gain input from and educate participants. Prior to the workshops, the Administrator/Planner conducted an extensive attitude survey of Jackson County residents to
identify broad planning issues. The first task for the workshops to accomplish was prioritizing the most significant planning issues which were identified as a result of the attitude survey. Once prioritized, sub-issues or criteria relating to the issues could be established.

The workshops were designed to define goals, objectives and policy statements on which to base an update of the County Master Plan. These goals, objectives and policy statements were to reflect local attitudes about the type of land use planning necessary to maintain and/or improve the quality of life in the county. It was necessary for participants to fully understand how the identified planning issues interrelated to impact the area’s quality of life. Several strategies were utilized to actively involve all participants. As a result of their participation, residents learned about the land use planning process. They became sensitive to the difficulties involved in accomplishing land use planning which would satisfy all of their varied interests.

The second task of the workshops was to devise policy statements aimed at achieving the goals or resolving the conflicts of the identified land use issues and sub-issues. To accomplish this step, a computer mapping and geographic information system (GIS) was used to help participants visualize the results of proposed policies. They could see how various policies would impact upon future development. This process was a valuable learning experience for those who participated. They became aware of the trade-offs involved in policy making. They were also made aware of the importance of conflict identification and resolution which necessarily becomes part
of any land use planning/decision making process.

The workshops educated participants on the intricacies of the land use planning process. It was a valuable experience where they were able to become "lay planners". By learning what is involved in the planning process, what the issues are and how they interrelate, county residents became more in tune to the importance of land use planning.

The workshop identified several important factors which influence land use planning in Jackson County. First was the strong desire to maintain the pristine quality of the county's air, water and scenic beauty. In addition, areas of prime agricultural lands were identified and set aside to preserve ranching; which has been the county's stable economic base. While limiting growth has historically been a major concern, county residents have begun to recognize the economic potential associated with development of tourism and fossil fuels. This trend is toward more acceptance of well planned, orderly development.

An inconsistency is evident in the residents' attitude toward future development. Tourism and fossil fuel development are not necessarily complementary activities. A comprehensive economic analysis might serve as a mechanism by which the county could evaluate whether both activities could coexist, and if not, which of the two would be in the area's long-term best interests.

A final factor which was identified as an issue was the management of public
lands. This is of particular importance in Jackson County since over half of its land area is publicly owned. Ideally, the county would like to adopt a modified LAM approach in the management of public lands. This approach would be structured so that county officials would take the lead in all cases. They would then coordinate the activities of the various state agencies also involved in the management of the different areas of the county. This, once again, reflects the county's strong desire to promote local rather than statewide interests.

It is interesting to note that while the preparation of the County Master Plan most closely resembles a PAM approach, its implementation is definitely CAM in nature. This is evidenced by the fact that the County Commissioners make development decisions on a case by case basis with little or no public input. It does not indicate that county residents will sit by passively and allow land use decisions to be made which they oppose. It must be remembered that the County Commissioners are elected officials and are thus held accountable for their actions. Since the precedent for public participation exists, it is likely that if a major or controversial land use decision were being considered, the county residents would demand to be involved.

5.2 STATE GOVERNMENT PLANNING PROCESS

Traditionally, land use planning in Colorado has been very CAM in nature. Legislation exists at the state level which consists of broad policy statements regarding the protection of the general health, safety and welfare of the state's residents and providing for the common support of the schools. The legislation grants
the local governments the power to regulate land use through zoning; subdivision and site plan review and approval; and building permits. Thus, the state has not traditionally taken an active role in land use planning.

As rural areas become more developed and open space decreases, public pressure is brought to bear on the state to take a more active role in the management of land. Urban residents see open space rapidly disappearing as cities grow and thus demand that the state intervene to preserve some rural areas before they are all developed. The rural governments on the other hand, view state intervention as a means by which rural residents are kept impoverished to benefit the generally more affluent urban residents. These opposing views naturally lead to controversy and leave the state government in a difficult position.

In an attempt to resolve the controversy and develop a means to coordinate planning, in the early 1970's Colorado passed innovative legislation. The "Colorado Land Use Act" (CRS 24-65 and 24-65.1), or as it is commonly known "House Bill 1041", was the first piece of legislation aimed at achieving some measure of statewide planning. Its intent and purpose are spelled out in the Legislative Declaration (CRS 24-65-102).

...the rapid growth and development of the state and resulting demands on its land resources make new and innovative measures necessary to encourage planned and orderly land use development...The general assembly further finds and declares that there is an increasing mutuality of interests and responsibility between the various levels of government in the state which calls for coordinated and unified policies in planning for growth and development in the interests of order and economy and that the most effective means of attaining the objectives
set forth in this article is the adoption of a statewide system of land use...It is the intent of the general assembly that land use, land use planning and quality of development are matters in which the state has responsibility for the health, welfare and safety of the people of the state and for the protection of the environment.

The act established the Colorado Land Use Commission. Its task was to develop a statewide land use planning program including model resolutions to serve as guidelines for County Planning Commissions. The Land Use Commission had at its disposal a staff to assist local planning efforts. It is interesting to note that while the mandate of the legislation was to develop a statewide planning program, the decision making authority was to remain at the "lowest level of government possible" (CRS 24-65-104). Thus, while the intent of the legislation was to achieve some coordinated statewide planning, the authority to implement land use regulations was left in the hands of the local governments. As was discussed in the previous section, local governments have a different agenda than state government in terms of land use planning and are, therefore, likely to continue to pursue land use regulation in a way which promotes local rather than statewide interests.

As part of its legislative mandate, the Land Use Commission was required to produce a progress report. In 1974, a report was sent to the legislature which resulted in an amendment to "House Bill 1041" (CRS 24-65.1) titled, "Areas and Activities of State Interest". Its purpose is quoted below:

(2) It is the purpose of this article that:

(a) The general assembly shall describe areas which may be of state interest and activities which may be of state interest and establish criteria for the administration of such areas and activities;
(b) Local governments shall be encouraged to designate areas and activities of state interest and, after such designation, shall administer such areas and activities of state interest and promulgate guidelines for the administration thereof; and

(c) Appropriate state agencies shall assist local governments to identify, designate and adopt guidelines for the administration of matters of state interest (CRS 24-65.1-101).

The amendment still left the authority for land use regulation at the local level. It authorized the state to act in an advisory capacity to identify areas of statewide interest, develop guidelines for managing identified areas and aid local governments in their overall planning efforts. The amendment did establish a stronger role for state agencies once areas of statewide interest had been identified and guidelines for their management adopted. At that point, the relevant state agencies were to become responsible for ensuring that the guidelines were carried out. This regulation also applied to state owned lands. It was clear that the state intended with this amendment to take a stronger role in land use planning for areas of statewide interest and state owned land.

The most significant result of the state's attempt to coordinate planning at a statewide level came in 1976 when the Department of Local Affairs Division of Planning published its Colorado Winter Resource Management Plan Manual for the Colorado Review Process (see Appendix A for summary). This manual was designed to process proposals for ski area development on state owned land. The process could be applied to any large development proposal. The Colorado Review Process (CRP) was developed by a group of planners and administrators interested in developing a mechanism to review large development proposals at several levels of government at
the same time. Its aim was to coordinate government responses to any project which would significantly affect "the social, economic, ecological or other conditions of the human environment of Colorado" (Department of Local Affairs, 1976, 1).

The intent of the Colorado planning legislation was to allow local governments to be directly responsible for planning and regulating land use within their jurisdiction. In areas where more than one local government had jurisdiction, regional organizations composed of several local governments were to be responsible for planning and reviewing proposals. It was the intent of the CRP to identify the government agencies commonly involved in the review and approval of resource development proposals. Their actions could then be coordinated in such a way as to ensure a timely standardized process of benefit not only to local and state governments, but to the proponent of the project as well.

The CRP represents a LAM approach to land use planning and, as was discussed in Chapter 3, forms the basis for the LAM approach. While in theory the process appears to be an innovative mechanism to coordinate the activities of several levels of government, in practice it has been less than successful. This may be due to the fact that the state legislature did not take a strong enough stance by allowing the implementation of land use regulations to remain at the local level. It may be due to the state's strong historical CAM background. It may also reflect the fact that the move from a CAM to a LAM approach is evolutionary and will only occur over time.
5.3 7-UTES PLANNING PROCESS

The development of 7-Utes Mountain as a ski resort would require a mix of both state and local land use planning. The mountain has been a source of interest from a development perspective since the 1960's. During the two decades which followed, numerous studies were carried out and two serious proposals to develop the mountain were promoted. The sections which follow outline the roles that the county and state have played in the mountain's history and discuss the preliminary studies and each of the proposals to develop the mountain.

5.3.1 Overview of State and County Roles

The 7-Utes Mountain is owned by the state of Colorado. The state is responsible for ensuring that the area is utilized to its fullest potential. The Colorado Board of Land Commissioners is the agency responsible for granting leases to develop state land. They accomplish this by conducting a general assessment of the feasibility of the area for development. In the case of 7-Utes Mountain, the Land Board had determined that a downhill destination ski resort is its optimal use. This is a result of the Board's mandate to "produce the maximum amount of revenue for the support of the common schools" (Memorandum of Understanding, 1985, 1).

The Board of Land Commissioners has a second mandate which is to facilitate the development of the mountain while protecting the "health, welfare, social and economic integrity of the residents of Jackson County" (Memorandum of Understanding, 1985, 1). Furthermore, the county has the authority for implementing land use regulations in the areas of zoning, site plan review and
approval and building permits. The county will, therefore, play an active and vital role in determining what type of facility will be developed on the 7-Utes Mountain.

In 1985, the responsibilities of both the state and the county in planning for development of the mountain were spelled out in a Memorandum of Understanding between the state and county. This document was drawn up in anticipation of the development of the 7-Utes Mountain as a destination ski resort. Both levels of government realized the need to establish, at the start, the roles of each. These roles are summarized below:

1. The state shall:
   A. Act as the lead agency in advertising for, drafting and issuing the Request for Proposal (RFP), for receiving and reviewing bids submitted in response to the RFP from interested potential lessees.
   B. Be solely responsible for the designation of the qualified lessee of the Property (7-Utes area).
   C. Seek county comments and recommendations on each bid submitted in response to the RFP and the state may, at its option, include said comments and recommendations in the state's findings of fact concerning the award of the final lease.
   D. Act as the lead agency within the Colorado Joint Review Process for the purposes of directing the review of environmental, social and economic data received in response to the lease requirements of Phase I (of the Colorado Joint Review Process).

2. The county shall:
   A. Have sole jurisdiction over the Property (7-Utes area) on matters related to zoning and subdivision requirements of said property.
   B. Provide to the state, at the county's option, written or oral recommendations concerning any or all of the bids submitted in response to the RFP or portions thereof.
C. Act as a member of the Colorado Joint Review Process for the purpose of reviewing and making comments regarding the adequacy and comprehensiveness of the environmental, social and economic material submitted for review. (Memorandum of Understanding, 1976, 2)

5.3.2 Preliminary Studies

A total of four studies were conducted on the suitability of the 7-Utes Mountain as a downhill ski facility between 1968 and 1977. All of the studies concluded that while the mountain could support such a facility, it was not an optimal location and was at best marginal. The studies included a public input component in the form of surveys. This input indicated that the county residents were split regarding the development of the mountain as a ski resort.

In the preliminary stages, a comprehensive economic analysis would have been a useful tool to establish if the county was able and willing to support a development of this nature. If a destination ski resort was found to be in the county's best economic interests and if the county could support such a development, a series of objectives and guidelines could have been established to promote the orderly development of the mountain.

A PAM approach would also have proved useful. Such an approach would have aided in determining exactly what county residents liked and disliked about the idea of developing a ski resort on the 7-Utes Mountain. The county officials and residents could have then prepared an optimal development scenario for the mountain. This scenario would have served as a guideline for future development of the mountain.
If a proposal were made which was based on the optimal scenario, it would have been guaranteed the necessary public support to see it through to completion.

5.3.3 Proposal 1: Tomahawk Project

The first serious proposal to develop the 7-Utes Mountain was made in 1977. It was known as the Tomahawk Project. This was to be the first test of the state/county planning process.

The Colorado Joint Review Process (also known as CRP or JRP) was initiated. At the county's request, the U. S. Forest Service conducted a feasibility study of the mountain. The study found that the mountain was not the best location for a downhill ski facility. It further found that the area had better potential as a summer recreation site. The report recommended that if there was genuine interest in developing a quality ski facility an inventory of the entire county should be conducted to find a better location (McConnel, 1977).

The U. S. Forest Service recommended that a comprehensive economic analysis of the county be conducted to determine the feasibility of considering a destination ski resort in Jackson County. This approach would have had three positive benefits. First and most important, it would have spelled out in detail the exact potential which existed for ski area development in Jackson County. Second, it would have served as a means to inform the public about the county's potential for a ski facility. Third, it would have been a way to gain support for a feasible project based on the county's capabilities to support a ski facility.
The state, as part of the review process, required studies of the physical suitability of the mountain be conducted. It is apparent from this focus that the major concern of the state was how to make a ski facility work in a physical sense. The county on the other hand was more concerned with making the ski area fit into its existing economy and lifestyle. As a result, existing studies were re-evaluated and a survey of the county residents was conducted. The survey showed that a clear majority of the residents opposed development of the mountain. This, in addition to the findings that the mountain was not an optimal location for a ski facility, led the County Commissioners to vote to terminate the review process. The state agreed that the project was inappropriate and it was stopped.

While the planning approach adopted for the Tomahawk Project was a combination of LAM and CAM, it lacked a strong public input component. A PAM approach would have provided the process with an opportunity to allow residents to outline exactly which aspects of the proposal they were opposed to and which they would have supported. This would have been beneficial to state and local officials and to the proponent. If such an approach had been adopted, the state would have had a better idea of the type of development the county would have supported and could have drafted a Request for Proposal which reflected that type of development.

The Tomahawk Project was terminated. The LAM/CAM process worked to stop an inappropriate proposal. The state was still convinced that a downhill ski facility was the best use for 7-Utes most likely due to the large revenues such a facility would generate. As such, it was still soliciting bids to lease the area for that purpose.
5.3.4 Proposal 2: 7-Utes Project

The second proposal to develop the 7-Utes Mountain came in 1978 and was known as the 7-Utes Project. The proponent began by taking what appeared to be a PAM approach to planning for the development. The developer conducted public meetings and attitude surveys in an attempt to gain public input into the development of the proposal. No attempt was made to include any of the public input gained from the meetings into the design of the resort. Thus, the proponent's approach only gave the illusion of being PAM in nature.

The proponent also hired a group of students from CSU to conduct a study of the residents' attitudes and desires in terms of a destination ski resort. Unfortunately, the study erroneously concluded that county residents, in general, favored the development of a ski facility on 7-Utes Mountain. The proponents made reference to other economic analyses of the county which they never made available. Thus, many individuals suspected that these analyses did not exist.

The proponent approached the Colorado Land Use Board and requested that a CRP be initiated for a large downhill destination ski resort. The Land Use Board opted not to begin a CRP but, in a compromise move, granted the proponents a special use permit for a small cross-country ski facility. The compromise was made with no input from the county. County officials were allowed to make minor wording changes to the special use permit after it had been determined that the permit would be issued. The state also made clear its intent to consider other bids for a large ski resort.
Several interesting points are illustrated by the Land Board’s decision to grant the special use permit. First, the state’s inability to cope with a system which differs from its CAM approach is made clear. The state could not achieve its mandate by using the LAM in the Tomahawk Project. The process halted the Tomahawk Project and the state did not get what it wanted (i.e. a source of revenue from the mountain). When the second proposal came along, the state had no confidence in the LAM approach. They therefore, opted to fall back on the traditional CAM approach to ensure that their mandate would be achieved. In an intelligent move, the state issued a permit for a small cross-country ski facility which would partly achieve their mandate while not creating a great deal of opposition at the county level.

It is obvious that the state clearly intended to see the 7-Utes Mountain developed as a destination ski resort. It was equally clear that the county opposed such a development. County residents had begun to feel that the project was being forced upon them and were becoming more and more opposed to any type of development. If the 7-Utes Group had not brought the entire process to a halt with its legal action, it is likely that future review processes would have experienced a great deal of conflict between the state and county participants.

Finally, a PAM approach in combination with a comprehensive economic analysis would have served to resolve many of the conflicts which existed throughout the process. Clear development goals and objectives for the mountain could have been outlined which may have led to the well-planned orderly development of 7-Utes. This would have benefitted local and state interests as well as the proponents.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS

The planning models presented represent three ways in which land use planning could be approached. The case study shows that each model can be successfully applied to a specific land use planning action. The county's PAM approach to planning served to develop guidelines for countywide land use planning. The state's LAM approach proved to be a useful mechanism to halt the inappropriate Tomahawk Project. The CAM proved useful at the state level to arrive at the compromise land use of the mountain as a cross-country ski facility, and also at the county level where land use decisions are made by the County Commissioners on a case by case basis.

By generalizing the results of the models discussed above and then applying them to planning in general, it can be concluded that each of the models has merit and would be appropriate in some circumstances. Taking that one step further, it can also be concluded that none of the models is appropriate in all situations. It would be wrong to attempt land use planning based solely on any one model. Each model is too narrow on its own to result in an effective process. General examples of where each model might be best applied would include:

PAM

- Extremely complex issues where information exchange is important.
- Long term comprehensive actions which require strong public commitment and support.
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Extremely controversial issues where conflict identification and resolution is critical.

LAM

- Inter-jurisdictional actions.
- Any action involving a number of government agencies or departments.
- Large projects proposed to be developed over a number of years.

CAM

- Routine actions.
- Actions which require immediate resolution.
- Actions which require clear accountability.

A second conclusion is that the planning models must be flexible. They must be able to adapt to a variety of circumstances. This is due to the fact that no two planning situations nor two communities are exactly alike. An illustration of how the models might be adapted would be the blending of the PAM and CAM approaches discussed in Jackson County’s planning process. In this case, there was a great deal of public participation (PAM) in developing how planning would occur in the county. When it came time to actually carry out the planning the County Commissioners were left on their own to make development decisions (CAM). It should also be noted that such blending is not always most appropriate. An example of this occurred when the Colorado Board of Land Commissioners, after not getting the results they had hoped for using a LAM approach, went back to a CAM approach to achieve their mandate.
A third conclusion which can be drawn from this thesis and applied to planning, in general, has to do with the mandate for planning. A problem arises when one or more of the participants has a different mandate, a broader mandate or in the worse case when all participants have different mandates. This issue becomes particularly problematic when the mandate involves revenues. A case in point is the Colorado Land Board. Not only is this agency charged with getting the most revenues for the state but it is also charged with protecting the welfare of the residents of the area where the development is to take place. These two mandates can come into conflict such as in the development of 7-Utes. Here again a combination of planning models might have been an effective way to resolve the conflicts in such a way as to satisfy both state and local goals. The compromise move of the state to issue a special use permit for a small cross-country facility is an example of the type of compromise which might have been reached if the state and local governments had worked together.

A good planning process is one that leads to action. Even if the alternative chosen is the option to do nothing. If the process has evaluated all options and the participants have been educated, it can be said to be effective. Ideally, a good process would result in a strategy which would be implemented. Even if the results of the implemented strategy are bad, if the process can identify them as bad and then start again to remedy them, it is a good process.

Planning does not, however, exist in a vacuum. The decision making process involved in making land use decisions includes, in addition to planning, a political
and a judicial component. Thus, a good planning process combined with bad political
decisions or decisions based on factors other than planning considerations can result
in bad or ineffective outcomes.

The 7-Utes case study is a good illustration of how non-planning factors can
influence an otherwise good planning process. The basic planning processes which
were utilized in the 7-Utes case study were, for the most part, examples of good
planning. However, good planning processes do not always lead to optimal land use
decisions. Land use studies for the 7-Utes Mountain were varied in their
recommendations, yet every study agreed that the most inappropriate use of the area
would be to leave it in its present state and do nothing. For the last six years,
nothing has been done in the 7-Utes area. The lodge and surrounding cabin facilities
remain empty and abandoned. What summer recreation occurs in the area is not
supervised by the state or county. No new trails, picnic or camping facilities have
been built. This is the direct result of judicial intervention, or a non-planning factor
influencing the decision making process.

While careful consideration of planning is common in Colorado and a process
for developing the 7-Utes area was started (the CRP), it is apparent from the lack of
development in the case study area that proper planning is not enough. It could be
said that in the case of the 7-Utes Mountain, the introduction of a planning process
by which the area was to be carefully developed was the cause of the resulting
judicial involvement and lack of any development.
The final conclusion to be drawn from this work is that for planning to be effective the process must accomplish something. If the process results in a plan which is successfully implemented and evaluated, it is successful. If the process breaks down and no plan is produced but the participants have been educated and are better prepared to face new problem areas, the process is successful. But a process which breaks down and no one is educated, or a process of which produces glossy plans which sit on the shelf and are never implemented is simply ineffective and unsuccessful.

The reality which faces professional planners is that planning is only a small component in a complex process of decision making. Planning can and has enhanced many decisions. This occurs when decision makers place a strong emphasis on the resulting planning strategies or on information obtained through the planning process. If other factors are given more weight the planning process, no matter how successful, will have little or no effect on achieving optimal land use decisions.

This thesis has focused on only one element which impacts planning. Many other elements could also influence the planning process. Further study might focus on one or more of these other elements including, but not limited to, the influence of the judicial system on the land use planning or regional economic development.
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Appendix

Steps Involved in the Colorado Review Process

The Colorado Review Process (CRP) is composed of 16 steps. The following is a brief overview of each step:

Step 1: The Initial Proposal

A proponent shows interest in developing an area which appears to be inter-jurisdictional in nature. Proponent receives copy of CRP Manual and is requested to provide information on the type of development proposed. Upon receipt of said information Step 2 can proceed.

Step 2: Inter-Jurisdiction Alert

All levels of government which would be significantly affected by the proposal are contacted. If the project is judged to be inter-jurisdictional in nature, appropriate government agencies receive copies of the proposal. Once a sufficient amount of time to review the proposal has passed, a meeting with the proponent and the government agencies is set up.

Step 3: The Meeting

At this meeting, an appropriate lead agency will be chosen from the agencies represented. It will be determined if other agencies not represented should be included in the process. The lead agency will prepare a statement reflecting the positions of all the agencies. This statement includes specific concerns or objections to the proposal, necessary data required from the proponent, data required by each agency and a time frame for collecting data. This statement will be circulated to the agencies for comment and then will be passed on to the proponent.

Step 4: The Joint Statement Transmittal

After the proponent has received the state from the lead agency, she has 30 days to decide whether to proceed, modify or withdraw her proposal.

Step 5: Notification of Intent

The proponent will have notified the lead agency as to her decision. If she elects to go ahead, a time frame will be set up for submitting more information. Also at this point, if appropriate, the proponent will begin the federal EAR process.
Step 6: **Meeting**

A meeting between all government agencies participating and the proponent will be held. This meeting is to prepare for upcoming public hearings. All present will have had ample opportunity to review all information submitted. Comments on the information will be compiled in preparation for the public hearings.

Step 7: **Public Hearings**

Public hearings will be held to inform the public about the proposal, to get their reaction and to allow the local jurisdiction the opportunity to take legal action on the proposal.

Step 8: **Notification of Intent and Possible Ad Hoc Committee Formation**

The proponent will, at this stage, have 30 days to decide if she wishes to proceed, modify or withdraw her proposal. If she wishes to modify her proposal, then she goes back to Step 5. If she elects to continue, she must submit a conceptual plan to the lead agency. At this point, an Ad Hoc Committee of the citizens of the area may be formed to aid in the preparation of the EIS.

Step 9: **Meeting, Site-Specific Agreement and Permit Application**

All agencies participating, the proponent and the Ad Hoc Committee, if there is one, meet to discuss areas for further study. If the project is subject to the NEPA legislation, a plan is developed for preparing an EIS. If the project is not subject to NEPA, a study plan will be developed for areas of further study and a plan for project approval will be drawn up. A site-specific agreement will be signed by all parties outlining the responsibilities of each. The proponent will then apply for all necessary permits.

Step 10: **Preparation of Draft EIS**

The different agencies and the proponent will carry out the responsibilities detailed in the site-specific agreement. Results of these studies will be submitted to the lead agency and then circulated to all interested agencies and groups.

Step 11: **Activities Leading to Final EIS**

Those who receive the draft EIS will have the opportunity to review and comment upon it. Public hearings will be held on the draft and all comments will be compiled by the lead agency. The lead agency will circulate the revised statement to interested parties. The new EIS, its
comments and all other information will then be sent to the Council of
Environmental Quality (CEQ). If the CEQ responds favorably, then
Steps 12-16 will be undertaken.

Steps 12-16: Implementation

At this point, if the CRP has been carried out as designed, all involved
parties should feel confident in the proposal. What remains to be done
consists of formalities. It is important that all problems have been
worked out prior to Step 12.