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The availability of Federal funds for planning assistance under Section 701 of the United States Housing Act of 1954 has helped bring to the surface many of the problems that face the planning profession today. This study, in an attempt to establish the nature of some of these problems, has endeavored to describe and analyze the public and private agencies involved in the operation of the Urban Planning Assistance Program.

The method used in this study centers around a sample of experience drawn from four New England States. The sample programs have been tested against the basic assumptions and selected criteria of the Federal legislation in an attempt to determine the relationship of the program in operation to the original motivations (as expressed in the Federal program).

The analysis of the sample programs and the public and private agencies involved in their operation indicates in some cases a wide diversity between Federal administrative criteria and local operation. For five selected criteria it was found that (1) costs generally are higher for smaller communities except where the State agency assumes part of the cost; (2) most of the communities had some prior planning experience, rather than having been stimulated to originate planning programs as a result of Federal aid; (3) only one of the four states has devised a method for ascertaining a community's ability to finance a planning program; (4) local planning rather than regional or metropolitan planning has received the most attention under this program; and (5) the great majority of local planning has been for limited planning studies rather than comprehensive plans, emphasizing the desire of local communities to solve immediate problems rather than embarking on long-term comprehensive plans.

In addition to the analysis of local experience with the program, an analysis of the methods of implementing the program was made. This analysis indicated that the best means for maintaining a continuing planning program was through a State staff or "force account" system that could be supplemented with private consultants working through the public agencies.

In summary, the Urban Planning Assistance Program has succeeded in stimulating a large amount of local planning activity and has once more provided the opportunity for an increasingly important role for State Planning agencies in the provision of local planning assistance.
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS BY JURY

1. This was considered to be an ambitious undertaking, which succeeded at least in part in bringing out the major weaknesses in the Urban Planning Assistance Program as it has operated in New England. It should prove useful as a reference document.

2. The jury felt there was some reluctance on the part of the writer to define in specific terms his concept of the way in which a forward-looking program should be developed. The alternatives consisted largely of a statement of desirable objectives rather than a positive program of methods of accomplishment.
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In the period following World War II, the Planning profession has found that its technical skills are more and more in demand. Limited personnel have attempted to carry the increasing load but the demand grows each day. Postwar planning, followed by housing programs, redevelopment and urban renewal have all served to tax the existing supply of planners. The time scale between plans and physical realization is becoming smaller and smaller, and the number of professional planners to fill the demand created by these activities has not as yet reached the point where the supply approaches the demand. As a result the planners have found themselves shouldered with more and more responsibility and less and less time to think about some of the implications of the increased demands being made on them. In an effort to shed some light on one of these demands this study is dedicated.

The Problem:

The facilitation of urban planning assistance by the Federal government under a matching funds program is one of the significant programs enlisting the aid of the professional planners. The degree to which it will affect national, regional or local planning will become more apparent in coming years, but at this point the program has already indicated the directions that it can or might take.

a. Does the program as presented represent a valid device for the stimulation of planning?

b. Does the program encourage the proper allocation of planning resources?

c. Are the announced objectives of the program being fulfilled in operation?

In an effort to ascertain answers to these question, the program will be examined at all levels of its operation--Federal, State and local--and
in light of information obtained, a critical evaluation will be attempted.

The Study Method:

The method used in this study endeavors to describe and analyze both the background to, and the operation of, the Federal Urban Planning Assistance Program. The procedure has been to:

I. Review the backgrounds of Federal assistance to planning with emphasis on the experience of the Tennessee State Planning Commission as a case study.

II. Summarize the events leading to the passage of the Urban Planning Assistance legislation.

III. Describe and analyze the experience of the public and private agencies involved in the program.

A. The Federal agencies at the national and regional level.

B. A selected study area comprising four New England states—Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire and Connecticut. A detailed description of this study area with an analysis and evaluation of:

1. Background of the State agencies
2. Methods of implementing the program
3. Volume of effort in the program
4. A review of sample programs to determine:
   a. Costs per capita as a source of possible cost standards.
   b. Prior planning to test the "stimulation" assumption of the program.
   c. Methods of ascertaining a community's ability to finance a planning program.
   d. The type of program to determine local, metropolitan, or regional emphasis.
e. The character of the program to ascertain what planning studies are receiving attention under this program.

C. A description and comparative analysis of the implementation methods.
   1. The State staff method
   2. The private planning consultant method

D. A description and analysis of the role of the local planning board to determine some of the long and short range effects of the program.

E. A summary of the effects on the planning profession that can be attributed to this program.

F. Recommendations designed to correct the deficiencies in the present legislation and administrative policies.

Limitations:

Though the limitations of this study are manifold, the general character of available information, and the relatively small amount of experience we have had to date are probably the major limiting factors.

To adequately test such a program, a continuing study that could observe changes in administrative methods and planning techniques, as well as the effects on the individual community's planning program, would be of great value.
CHAPTER I

Background

An essential part of the background for the Urban Planning Assistance program is the development of earlier Federal aids to planning.

Out of the New Deal legislation of the thirties came an enormously expanded area of Federal activity in fields previously reserved to the States. This expansion was slowed by judicial and legislative action in the late thirties which implied the idea that the central government in performing its constitutional obligations must observe certain limitations. In order, however, to do the job that needed to be done the Federal government embarked on a program of inducing and subsidizing State agencies to achieve the same ends. This technique proved palatable to the "reserved rights" interpretation of the Constitution, but did not necessarily produce the results hoped for in all fields.

In planning, the Federal government used inducements and subsidy through such agencies as the Work Projects Administration, National Resources Board, and National Resources Planning Board, to aid the States in setting up State planning boards. All but one of the states accepted the Federal invitation, but with the withdrawal of Federal funds in the late thirties many of the infant agencies withered. One of the states which did not succumb was Tennessee and the reasons for its virility are noteworthy.

The Tennessee State Planning Commission:

Of those states dramatically affected by the New Deal, Tennessee remains one of the foremost. The Tennessee Valley Authority, operating a vast system of public improvements, brought to Tennessee both prosperity and problems. Among the problems lay the question of planning for communities to be affected by TVA dam construction.
In 1933 the State legislature of Tennessee established a Tennessee Valley Committee to serve in a liaison capacity with the T.V.A. Out of discussion between this committee and the T.V.A. board arose the idea of a State planning board to work with the T.V.A. By mutual agreement, Alfred Bettman was retained as a legislative consultant to draft possible legislation for a State planning board. This proposed legislation was considered by the Tennessee legislature in 1935, and almost all of the proposed legislation was adopted. By this act the Tennessee State Planning Commission was created. Almost immediately the T.V.A. began to utilize the services of the agency on a contract basis. By supplying financial aid and professional personnel the T.V.A., using the offices of the State planning agency, helped establish a planning service that has proved to be of great value in the solution of both local and Federal problems. As representatives of the state, the personnel working out of the State planning agency brought technical services to communities being affected by T.V.A. construction. This kind of relationship helped in part to obviate local resentment toward the T.V.A. and the major changes that it was making in the area.

The contractual relationship between the T.V.A. and the State Planning agency had several important effects:

a. It gave much needed status to a new state agency.

b. It provided financial assistance during a period when W.P.A. and N.R.P.B. funds were being withdrawn generally from state planning agencies.

c. The local assistance character of the work was developing a strong grass roots support for the agency's service.

It is worthy of note that in contradistinction other state agencies were, during this same period, placing their personnel and financial resources
into statistical and research projects. This, however, is not meant to infer that the Tennessee State Planning Commission enjoyed any more than its share of clairvoyance. It had the added advantage of knowing that concrete changes were going to occur and to some degree what the measure of at least the physical changes would be. With this knowledge the agency was in an excellent position to transmit the sense of urgency that helped make the technical assistance program acceptable and utilized.³

The technical assistance provided under this program has more than proven itself, as the Tennessee Valley has expanded beyond the imagination of even the most optimistic. The program, continuing even after the first major impact of T.V.A. development, has meant that although the T.V.A. is no longer the mainstay of the agency, its support was sufficient to carry it over the lean years until it finally took root in the State governmental family.⁴

This example of inter-agency liaison is quite important to the problem at hand, and we shall see how it can be a vital factor in the stimulation and extension of other planning programs.

The lasting impression of the Tennessee program is documented by the growing number of communities in Tennessee that are engaged in local planning. More than 100 communities are being served by the T.S.P.C. with technical assistance programs that range from base map preparation to the development of comprehensive plans.

In the execution of these programs the planning commission has retained the staff or "force accounting" system that was utilized during the early days of its operation with the T.V.A. The staff provides a general advisory service to all communities, but encourages more advanced services to be done on a contract basis with the community sharing part of the cost. This financial involvement by the community has proven to be an important factor in developing
a greater responsibility toward implementation of work done by the planning agency.

The agency operates on the philosophy that a long-range continuing program leading toward the development of a comprehensive plan for a community is the most satisfactory approach for their local assistance planning program. In regard to the four metropolitan agencies that maintain their own staffs, the T.S.P.C. maintains only an advisory relationship.

As we will see, the Tennessee local assistance program served as a model for the framers of the Federal government's local assistance program under Section 701 of the 1954 Housing Act, and it is not surprising that the first local assistance grants approved under the Federal program were for the State of Tennessee.

The longevity of the Tennessee State Planning Commission points up a basic issue which serves as an important point of reference in this study. Where state governments undertake to accept Federal stimulation and utilize this inter-agency relationship to build a responsible and responsive planning tradition both the State and the Federal agencies gain. The State agency helps build a tradition of planning orientation into the community which serves its own local needs, and aids the Federal agency in as much as Federal activities (renewal, redevelopment, housing, etc.) in local areas can be achieved within the framework of locally or regionally arrived at planning decisions.

Events Leading to the 701 Program:

With the passage of the Housing Act of 1949 the Federal government once more began to take cognizance of the importance of planning as a prerequisite to sound investment of Federal funds. In determining changes for the 1954 Housing Act, the President's Advisory Commission on Housing pointed up the
positive experience with the requirements for planning, and discussed Federal responsibility to encourage planning on a wider basis. This statement was based on exhibits submitted by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, indicating the necessity for extension of Federal aid on a matching grant basis to smaller communities, metropolitan and regional areas to help cover the costs of planning. The emphasis in exhibit 6 of the President's Advisory Commission report sought to focus attention on the benefit to the Federal government of coordination with local community plans and the responsibility incumbent on the Federal government to "encourage adequate and sustained local planning." The core ideas submitted in recommendation 16 calling for a Federal matching grant program for planning assistance was included in the President's message to congress and was duly incorporated into the Housing Act of 1954 as Section 701.

The actual legislation was drawn up by planners in the H.H.F.A. whose desire it was to develop a broad simple program that would (1) serve to stimulate planning in smaller communities not likely to support a program alone, and (2) stimulate planning on a metropolitan and regional basis where the need for planning was becoming more imperative every day.

In the process of drawing up the program, the authors consulted with states such as Tennessee and Alabama which already had an active local assistance program operating out of their state agencies. The general character of the local assistance program in the Federal legislation reflects the thinking employed in the T.S.P.C. local assistance program. The population criterion which provides that only towns under 25,000 in population are eligible for aid under this program was essentially an arbitrary figure considered by the authors to be of about the general magnitude
of community that could reasonably be considered as falling under the
definition of a small community lacking adequate planning resources. The
use of slum and blight prevention in the language of the President's message was
a function of the political feasibility of such a motive. One of the
most important considerations, however, was the desire for simplicity, based
on the assumption that a complicated program would tend to run aground in
the legislative branch and make its acceptance less likely. 8

With the passage of the section, the administrators took the broad
outline of the program and devised a system of requirements and procedures
designed to make the best use of new planning resources appropriated by
the congress.
CHAPTER 2

The Federal Agencies:

The authority for the administration of Section 701 is delegated to the Urban Renewal commissioner by the H.H.F.A. administrator. The section actually handling the processing of 701 applications is staffed by two experienced planners. In describing their agency's role vis-a-vis this program, the administrators have expressed the attitude that Section 701 is a State-oriented program and the Federal government has only supervisory and administrative functions. They claim further that the responsibility for meeting the criteria as established in the Federal requirements and procedures manual belongs to the States.\(^9\)

In view of these expressed attitudes it would be valuable to appraise some of the administrative criteria that are employed, so that we may determine what role the Federal agency actually plays in determining policy in these programs.\(^10\)

1. To qualify for grants, the State must have a legally created planning agency: empowered to provide planning assistance by state law, and technically qualified to perform the planning work either with their own staffs or through acceptable contractual arrangements with other qualified agencies or with private professional organizations or individuals.

Here is a clear example of the Federal government's attempt once more to induce the creation and maintenance of a State planning agency. With full awareness of the partial failure of such attempts in the past, it carefully outlines the character of activities that the State agency should be qualified to perform and makes clear the necessary action the state legislature must take, by requiring it to invest the State agency with the responsibility for providing a planning service. It also implies, however, that the State agency will develop standards to determine the technical competence of both its own staff or those which it may hire to carry out the Federal program.
It is significant that the State planning agencies do not have to do State planning to be eligible for this program, but there is some validity to the argument that local planning authorities should not be punished for the failure of the State agency to fulfill State planning functions.

2. The purpose of the program is to stimulate and expand State assistance for local planning in small municipalities where such planning is not now being undertaken or not being undertaken on an adequate basis...the purpose of making grants to States is to facilitate urban planning for smaller communities lacking adequate planning resources.

The dual injunction by the Federal government to the State points up the State's responsibility to ascertain what constitutes an adequate program of planning and also what determines a community's ability to meet the costs of an adequate planning program out of its own resources.

3. Only municipalities of less than 25,000 population (as of the latest Federal census) may be eligible for assistance under this act.

The figure of under 25,000 is perhaps one of the most rigid of the program's criteria. It was, as pointed out earlier, a figure judged to be of about the right magnitude to fulfill the definition of a small community.

4. The duration of a project may cover a period of a few months or a year or more. The application should state the expected duration of the work and the results to be accomplished during that period.

The time criterion developed for this program strikes at two major questions. Is planning a commodity that can be delivered at a particular time? Should governmental agencies encourage the belief that the purchase of a plan or elements of a plan through contract represents official sanction of "one shot" planning?

5. In general, metropolitan planning is construed to mean planning for the urbanized or related area surrounding and including, a major city or group of cities. It does not necessarily embrace a "standard metropolitan area" as
defined by the Bureau of the Census. Metropolitan planning may be concerned with an urban area with a central city of less than the 50,000 specified in the census definition provided its growth and development is actually metropolitan in character.

In giving at least a general definition of what the program means when it refers to metropolitan planning the States or applicant agencies are given guide posts from which to operate in the definition of areas for purposes of contracting with the Federal government under this program. The inference here again is that the State or planning authority, whichever is vested with powers for planning in metropolitan areas is responsible for the delineation of such areas and shall have done the ground work in laying a basis for the selection of such areas as a part of the basic responsibility of the agency.

6. Metropolitan planning is not limited to the area outside of the central city or cities. Its purpose is to secure coordinated planning of the entire area and this may well involve general land use plans, major thoroughfares plans, uniform platting controls and other measures dealing with the central city and its environs....City plans as distinguished from metropolitan plans are excluded from consideration for Federal grants for planning in metropolitan areas.

The Federal legislation in this section, by further refining what is meant by the area of responsibility of a metropolitan planning agency, has also given the agency a clear view of the area in which they may safely work and still be eligible for aid under this program.

7. Regional planning may also include areas that are not metropolitan in the sense of being centered in a major city, but which are characterized by other types of urban development. A grouping of cities, physically and economically related to one another and the intervening and surrounding countryside might constitute such an urban region.

Though generally recognizing that definitions for such planning areas as regions may have many meanings, the Federal government has assigned at least the basis for an acceptable definition for the purposes of this program. In so doing, it once again places responsibility on the planning
agency for delineating an acceptable urban region.

The general qualifications of applicants for metropolitan and regional planning grants follow the pattern set by the local assistance program. They differ only in that metropolitan and regional agencies may deal with the Federal government directly (if they have the proper enabling legislation), and the requirement concerning a "lack of adequate resources" does not appear in the criteria for metropolitan and regional planning although the program does state:

8. The purpose of this type of Federal urban planning assistance is to stimulate and expand metropolitan and regional planning where it is not now being undertaken or not being undertaken on an adequate basis.

These then are the criteria and policy that the Federal agency promulgates to the States. The Federal agency, however, plays an equally important role in the processing and reviewing of applications that come to it from the State and other qualified planning agencies.

Until the summer of 1956 the processing was all done in Washington. The concentration of staff available for processing these applications seemed to move the program along fairly rapidly. The agency personnel were familiar with the situations in the states where the first requests originated, and the simplicity of the program lent itself to expeditious processing.

The decentralization of the H.H.F.A. in the Fall of 1956 altered this picture considerably. The major body of the staff moved to regional offices and set up an intermediary reviewing procedure. The director and assistant director remained in Washington with a secondary reviewing function, and most important of all, the approval power. As the work load increased the time lag between review and approval grew until the time element from submission to
approval had tripled. In addition to these internal problems a sister organization, The Federal Housing Administration, was undergoing severe investigation which increased the scrutiny given any contract issued by the parent agency. The combination of these and other not easily deducible factors have generally slowed the process of reviewing and approving grants under this program.

The Regional Agency:

The role of the regional agency mirrors the national agency with some important exceptions. Its function is to review applications for grants under this program, and if the application seems to have fulfilled the requirements it is sent on to Washington for final approval. In addition to this review function for the 701 program, the staff in New York is also responsible for reviewing Title 1 projects. This function overshadows the review function for 701 due to the complexity of procedures and requirements that are outlined in the Title 1 manual. The comparative simplicity of 701 applications does not give them a separate status, and policy has determined that they must wait their turn.

In reference to the actual review procedures, the Federal agency assumes that the State agency has fulfilled the Federal requirements if it so indicates in the project application. In ascertaining the character of the "general plan" and other eligible planning activities the agency uses the broad definition offered in the Local Public Agencies manual. on community planning. In effect from the combination of the definition offered in the manual and the general planning knowledge of the administrator comes the sense of what may be included. On the other hand, for regional and metropolitan studies the submitting agency must thoroughly document the application as to validity of the region or metropolitan area ( on the
Acceptance of the application is based on the strength of the arguments submitted.

Evaluation:

Any evaluation of the operation of the Federal agency must of course take cognizance of the difficulties it shares with any other planning agency: availability of staff, the turnover of available staff and the general workload. However, we can measure the effectiveness with which the agency has been able to get participating states to observe the administrative criteria, and the manner in which the reviewing procedure affects the State's observance of the criteria.

Of the selected criteria previously discussed, we find that the State agencies in the study region have all become legally qualified to provide a planning service and to accept Federal funds for the purposes of this program. Those States utilizing personnel other than their own staff resources for the execution of technical assistance have to some extent run aground on the problem of ascertaining technical competence of planning consultants. In two of the four States, lists of consultants have been prepared for distribution to interested communities. They suggest, although they do not make it mandatory, that the consultants have the qualifications for membership in the professional society American Institute of Planners. In one state where the planning agency sought to make membership in the A.I.P. a prerequisite to eligibility for contracts under this program, an adverse ruling by the State Attorney General forced the agency to return to a suggested list. In two states the suggested list attempts to give the qualifications of the listed planners by noting their A.I.P. membership as well as their planning experience. In one other state the agency does not provide a printed list, but will suggest to interested towns names of consultants willing to
operate in the state's locale. In the one state utilizing only its own staff, the examination for staff positions are considered by the agency sufficient to satisfy the Federal criteria.

In effect, then, this criterion/only partially fulfilled by the states and the Federal agency has not as yet insisted that the states set up a satisfactory system that would provide safeguards for all concerned.

In response to the criterion dealing with the adequacy of a planning program, none of the states has yet set up a system of ascertaining the adequacy of existing programs, and the States seemingly operate on the assumption that none of the communities eligible for aid have adequate planning programs.

As regards the financial ability of the community, only Connecticut has set up a formula to test the adequacy of a community's resources, but it should be noted that the State legislation which provided additional State funds for planning assistance was the instrument which contained the specific language requiring that a formula be established. The Federal agency has not insisted that similar action be taken by other participating states.

The population criterion as established by the Federal program is leavened only by disaster situations, and Connecticut is the only state in the study area which has made use of this flexibility. In all other cases the criterion is rigidly adhered to.

The duration of the project requirements are highly affected by the original contract (may run for one or two years), but most of the states have generally complied with this requirement.

The criteria concerned with metropolitan and regional planning are at this point difficult to evaluate, since so limited an effort has been expended in this area. The implied prerequisite for aid under this section of the program, namely the delineation of regions and metropolitan areas,
has for the most part been limited to disaster situations.\textsuperscript{16} At present only one state (Connecticut) has received funds to carry out the implied responsibility in the Federal program. In the smallest of the four states (Rhode Island) the physical character of the state makes the criteria somewhat inapplicable since the state as a whole can be considered one metropolitan area. Massachusetts with one regional program submitted, has not as yet been able to find the resources which would enable her to develop a state-wide breakdown of meaningful regions and metropolitan areas, though under the Massachusetts Regional Planning law the state agency has the responsibility for determining what constitutes "an effective region for planning purposes."\textsuperscript{17} New Hampshire has attempted without success to develop a planning region for purposes of this program, but has still not attempted to fulfill the implied responsibilities of the Federal legislation on a state-wide basis. In some cases the New Hampshire recreational regions could be meaningful regions, but the State agency is not convinced that they represent meaningful planning regions.

In citing the foregoing response to the criteria set forth in the Federal program, it should be noted that it is conditioned by the Federal agency's policy of assuming no responsibility for the enforcement of these criteria. However, in the exercise of the review function the Federal agency does take upon itself the responsibility for overseeing the fulfillment of at least one area of its administrative requirements; i.e., the scope of services must fall within the prescribed area of eligible activities.

In outlining the program the Federal agency alludes to the value of comprehensive planning to defeat the causes of slums and blight. It further recognizes the comprehensive plan when it outlines the eligible services to be performed under this program.
With some exceptions, i.e., disaster areas, the number of elements in the list of eligible planning studies leading to a comprehensive plan is limited. With the use of the L.P.A. manual and other sources the agency has in effect defined a master plan, and for the purpose of this program the accomplishment of any or all of the studies in the accepted list is tantamount to the final completion of one or more parts of the comprehensive plan depending on the scope of services in the individual contract. This alone would assume that the agency supports a non-continuous program of planning but in properly evaluating the Federal agency's position it must be noted that the agency's mission is to introduce a stimulant, and it does not assume the responsibility for financing a permanent program.

The reticence of the Federal agency to expand its control over the program can possibly be attributed to a variety of things, but high on the list would be:

1. The attitude that the State planning agency should take the initiative in expanding its own area of responsibility.
2. The lack of staff facilities to enforce, even if it desired to, other criteria outlined in the program's requirements.

In brief, then, the Federal agency has chosen to take responsibility for only those criteria whose fulfillment can be ascertained by review of the proposed contract submitted by the state agency. The remaining criteria they assume are the state's responsibility. In reviewing the operation of the program, however, we see that the states are reluctant for the most part to accept this responsibility; consequently, there is a void which must be filled if the governmental agencies are to protect adequately the expenditure of public funds.
CHAPTER 3

The Study Region:

For the purpose of this study, four states in New England have been chosen for examination. Their choice is conditioned by the level of activity and the consequent availability of data plus the variety of methods that have been used to implement this program.

As of January 1, 1957, the four states (Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and New Hampshire) had a total of 66 contracts with the Federal government for aid under this program. This figure represents one-fourth of the national total of aid to smaller communities and four-fifths of the national total of regional planning grants.

Massachusetts:

The history of the state planning agency in Massachusetts begins with the creation of the State Planning Board in the thirties, as a result of Federal aids in the form of financial and personnel support. The agency remained active during the period of Federal aid, but declined as Federal support diminished. The agency continued to operate until 1953, when it was superseded by the Division of Planning of the newly created Department of Commerce. Control of all State Planning Board activities and personnel was assumed by the newly created agency, and with the passage of the Housing Act of 1954 it was designated the official state planning agency and enabled to accept Federal funds under the 701 program. 18

Massachusetts Method of Implementation:

Though both the State planning Board and the Division of Planning had maintained a local advisory service on zoning, subdivision control, and other planning activities through its own staff resources, the state agency generally advocates the use of private planning consultants for the execution
of the technical services available under this program. The state agency gives as its reason for this choice of method, the generally limited availability of staff for small communities or for the state agency itself.

Massachusetts Volume of Effort:

The present volume of effort in the program in Massachusetts amounts to 46 of the total of 315 eligible municipalities (population under 25,000). This further represents 27 per cent of the State's population and 13 per cent of the State's area.

The agency is presently in contact with 46 additional communities bringing the total number of potentially involved and involved communities to 30 per cent of the State's total number of communities eligible for the program.

Of a sample group of 19 communities in various stages of implementing the technical assistance program, all have chosen private planning consultants to perform the work.

Consultant Lists:

To expedite the selection of planning consultants the state agency has prepared a list of consultants for distribution to local planning agencies. The list includes names of individuals and firms that have requested placement on the agency's consultant list.

For the 19 sample communities, 7 planning consultant firms and individuals serve as technical consultants.

A breakdown of the consultant's membership in the A.I.P. is as follows:

1. One full member
2. One associate member
3. One associate member, two provisionals
4. One associate, one provisional
5. Five associates, one provisional
6. Two full members, one associate, one affiliate
7. One affiliate.
This group of selected consultants represents 19 per cent of the total number listed with the state agency. A further review indicates that of the 36 firms and individuals listed 7 do not hold any membership in A.I.P. Twenty-three list their major practice as planners, 6 as engineering, 2 as architects, and the remainder distributed over law, economics, and landscape architecture. In addition to the above information, the state list includes information on the consultants specialties, prior planning activity in Massachusetts, and the geographical preference of the consultant.

In an attempt to set some standard by which a community can choose a consultant, the state agency defines a planning consultant as "an individual of accepted professional standing according to standards set by the A.I.P."

The agency, however, states that membership in the AIP is not prerequisite to obtaining a contract, but the qualifications demanded by the Institute are. By listing the types of experience required by the Institute for full membership the state agency has attempted to fulfill its responsibility to communities desiring aid under this program. Once a contract has been awarded, however, the state agency requires a monthly meeting with the consultant to discuss the progress of the work.

Character of the Planning Activities:

Local assistance to small communities has made up the bulk of the State effort. One regional program was rejected by the Federal agency on grounds that it did not fulfill the requirements of a meaningful region, 23 and another is in process of review by the Federal agencies. There has been no metropolitan effort under this program either by individual metropolitan areas or under the aegis of the state planning agency.

The scope of services for the 19 sample towns have been divided into three categories to simplify their use for comparative purposes.
1. Special Studies - one or two elements of a general plan.
2. Limited Study - three to five elements of a general plan.
3. Comprehensive - including all the elements of a comprehensive plan.

A breakdown of the 19 sample communities indicates that 5 of the programs have been for special studies, 7 have been for limited studies, and 7 have been for comprehensive plans.

Of the ninety-five studies being undertaken in the 19 sample communities; 13 were for land use inventories; 13 were for zoning; 11 were for land use plans; 11 were circulation studies; 8 were population studies; 8 were utility studies; and the remaining 27 studies were distributed over special studies, subdivision control ordinances, capital budget programs, recreation, and housing studies.

Costs:

Annual costs per capita for the 19 sample communities in Massachusetts suggest a correlation between costs and population, but between communities of from six to fourteen thousand, the assumption that costs decline as population rises does not hold up. There is a wide diversity of costs per capita in this group which indicates to some extent the variety of their scope of services. Since the state provides no guide for normal annual planning expenditures to these communities we can assume that the costs exhibited here are to a large degree a function of the range of contracts and prices offered by the various consultants, plus a reflection of what the local board felt the community could afford. For the 19 sample communities the annual per capita cost was $.43. (Based on local contribution). The State contributes nothing to the non-Federal share.

Prior Planning:

Of those 5 communities initiating special studies, all had planning
boards, zoning ordinances and were exercising subdivision control prior to 1954. Only one of the communities did not have a building code. Of the 7 communities with limited programs, all communities had planning boards and zoning ordinances prior to 1948 and all but 2 were exercising subdivision control. Three of the 7 had building codes. Of the 7 communities with comprehensive programs, 6 had planning boards and zoning ordinances prior to 1949, all but one were exercising subdivision control and 3 had building codes.24

Priority:
The state agency uses no priority system to determine eligibility of a community. If a community falls within the population limit, it need only apply to the state agency for aid under the program to qualify.

Agency's Appraisal:
Within the framework of the state agency's available staff resources, the Division of Planning evaluates the program's progress in Massachusetts as satisfactory. In executing the role of intermediary between the Federal government and communities the agency feels it has played an important part in extending supplementary planning funds to eligible communities. Regionally the agency feels that an expansion of regional and metropolitan programs is dependent on a higher financial contribution from the Federal government.

The continuation of these activities by the state agency is considered ample fulfillment of the agency's responsibility under this program. In reference to other aspects of the program, the agency feels that the time lag in Federal approval is detrimental to the program, and problems arising out of the consultant relationship need ironing out. These problems include such items as cost analysis for communities by the consultants and expansion of continuing programs.
In reference to regional planning, the agency feels that both its present application for Berkshire County and the cooperative efforts being made with local consultants in the Lower Merrimack Valley are indicators of important steps in the expansion of regional planning.

Evaluation - Massachusetts:

With a thorough respect for the problems of organization and staff that the state agency has, its participation in this program cannot be thought of as having fulfilled all the implied and specific criteria contained in the Federal legislation. With the second largest program in the study area, the planning agency has to date met only the minimal requirements of the Federal program. Though the demand for aid under this program is increasing the state agency has not attempted to devise any method of priorities for the allocation of aid under this program. No system for testing a community's resources has been set up by the agency and no test of the town's prior planning efforts as an indicator of the "stimulant" value of the program, and a further means of allocating existing planning resources.

The program as it presently operates is being used by communities of which prior to 1954, 18 had planning boards, 17 had zoning ordinances, 16 were exercising subdivision control and 10 had building codes. This is strong indication that rather than a stimulant to communities which would not have begun planning activity without this aid, it indicates that the local communities already exercising some planning functions are eager to expand their planning activity by taking advantage of funds provided by the Federal government. This general statement is somewhat tempered by the inclusion currently of towns whose planning needs and limited resources are quite obvious.
The state agency makes no substantial financial contribution to the program nor has it attempted to obtain funds from the State Legislature for such purposes. Satisfied that its role as administrator and supervisor is sufficient, it has only superficially accepted that one of the purposes of the program is the stimulation and expansion of state assistance for local planning. 25

Though the agency recognizes that planning is a continuing process 26 it has made little or no attempt formally (other than continue its existing advisory services) to encourage a continuing planning program.

The agency is legally responsible for the initiation of regional and metropolitan planning, 27 but it has yet to take any major steps in this direction. The agency's experience with regional planning applications under this program has demonstrated the real need for the delineation and encouragement of planning regions. The agency has only recently begun to coordinate the activities of a group of local consultants operating in the lower Merrimack valley, but even this move was stimulated by the consultants rather than originating with the planning agency.

The character of the contracts for planning assistance indicates that 63 per cent of the work is for limited and special studies and the remaining 37 per cent for comprehensive planning. In contracting for these programs the state agency plays a limited role in the determination and cost of the program. Communities are given no guides as to reasonable planning budgets on the basis of population or other criteria, which leads to a situation in which the local planning board, operating with only limited experience at its disposal, may see this program as a commodity to be purchased at a bargain rate rather than the beginning of a basic relationship that will arouse the community to the realization that planning expenditures should be a continuing budget item.
The state agency's role in Massachusetts is complicated by its weak political position, which in turn reflects itself in the inability of the agency to raise its salary and operating budgets to a point where it can expand its activities both for this program and other important state planning efforts.

Rhode Island - Background:

Rhode Island, as with many other states, had for a short period of years an active New Deal stimulated State Planning Board. The agency followed the now common course of events--active as long as Federal financial support continued, but quietly passing from its active position as Federal funds diminished. In the post-war period, Governor Roberts of Rhode Island initiated a study for the revitalization of a state planning effort, which resulted in the creation of the Rhode Island Development Council in 1951.28

The Planning Division of the Council was at first concerned primarily with state planning activities and industrial site location. The lack of planning in many of the local communities eager for new industrial activity led to the development of a local planning assistance program.

Under the Council's enabling legislation a technical planning assistance program to help local planning agencies with local planning problems and the development of long-range community plans had been outlined, and was now put into operation.

This charge to the agency required the selection of an administrative technique with which to operate the program. The agency staff consulted with Harold Miller of the T.S.P.C. and developed the Rhode Island assistance program along the lines of the T.S.P.C.'s program. This service was announced by Governor Roberts in 1952.
1953-1954 brought the first two local contracts--E. Greenwich and Narrangansett.

In August of 1954 Section 701 of the United States Housing Act became effective and two months later Hurricane Carol descended on Rhode Island. These two events occurring almost simultaneously play an important role in the development of the Urban Planning Assistance Program in Rhode Island.

With $16,000 from the Governor's fund, a special hurricane study was begun and the planning staff was expanded for the purpose of carrying out the study. This was followed by a request for a regional grant under Section 701. (The Regional Shore Study). This incidentally was the first regional planning grant authorized by the H.H.F.A. under the new program. The Federal matching grant, however, did more than help pay for the study: it made possible the retention of recently acquired staff and helped cement the force accounting system in Rhode Island.

With the completion of the Shore Study the agency embarked on an expanded program of local assistance under the Urban Planning Assistance Program.

**Volume of Effort:**

As of January 1, 1957, ten of the thirty-two communities eligible were involved in the program. This represents 28 per cent of the state's area and almost 10 per cent of the state's population. (If we add to this communities who have active planning programs but are not eligible due to the population criteria, we find that 40 per cent of the state's area and 75 per cent of the population is receiving technical planning services.)

Of the remaining twenty-two communities, several high-income communities in Eastern Rhode Island have maintained their own planning program through the use of consultants (e.g., Barrington), while at least one-third are
in rural western Rhode Island. Several of the latter group plan to come into the program this year.

The Technical Operation:

The staff of the planning agency has a normal complement of 1 chief planner, 5 principal planners and additional junior planners and technicians (draftsmen). Four of the five principal planners are involved in 701 work. The responsibility for servicing a group of normally contiguous communities under the program is delegated to each of the four principal planners and his staff. This team becomes in essence the resident planners for the communities they serve.

For special studies requiring skills unavailable in the state staff, the agency uses consultants (e.g., Kingston's marina study).

Priorities:

In reference to the allocation of the state's planning resources to those in greatest need, the agency does not have a formal priority system, but merely attempts to direct more information at the community whose needs seem greatest in an effort to encourage involvement in the program (e.g., Central Falls).

Character of Effort:

Local Assistance:

The planning studies being carried out under the Rhode Island force accounting system emphasize the solution of the community's most pressing problems at first, and the completion of elements of a comprehensive plan over a period of years. Consequently the character of the efforts in Rhode Island have been in the nature of limited studies.

Of the 44 separate studies, 10 zoning and 8 basic land use studies represent the greatest effort followed by 4 subdivision control ordinances, 4 industrial location studies, 2 recreation, 2 capital budgets, and the
remaining 17 for population, circulation base map preparation, and special studies. Though no comprehensive plans have as yet been developed, all the communities but 1 have started with a preliminary land use plan under this program.

Regional

The Rhode Island shore study is the only work that has been done under the regional provisions of the 701 program in Rhode Island. It was a direct result of the hurricane study and generally covers the area most likely to be affected by hurricanes in the future.

Costs:

In an attempt to work out a reasonable relationship of work to ability to pay, the agency has evolved a suggested schedule of fees based on population (annually estimated). The state contribution in staff time and overhead is added to the local contribution which is then matched by the Federal government.

Considering the economies of scale in the population based fee system, the cost per capita for the smallest community (New Shoreham, population 732) is $1.38, whereas the largest eligible community (Central Falls, population 23,550) drops to $ .19 per capita. In practice the state's contribution attempts to make up out of available funds for the operation of other variables which determine the community's ability to pay. The actual per capita cost to New Shoreham (Block Island), for example, was $ .68 per capita, the state making up the remaining half of the basic cost out of its general funds.

The average annual per capita cost for communities in the program was $ .21. (Based on the local contribution). The state contributed an average of $1,200 in services per town or $ .65 per capita. Combined these make up the non-Federal share of the program's cost.
Prior Planning:

As an indicator of prior planning in the communities presently engaged in the local assistance program, we note that in 1937, of the ten sample communities 31 had planning boards, 4 had zoning ordinances, 3 had both planning boards and zoning ordinances and 4 had neither planning board or zoning ordinance. In 1951, however, 10 had planning boards, 8 had zoning ordinances and planning boards, and 2 were exercising subdivision control.

Community Resources:

The Rhode Island Development Council maintains no selective system to test the adequacy of community resources for this program. The agency, aware of the general economic status of the state's communities, assumes the need is very real in almost all eligible communities. The few exceptions to this have generally maintained their own planning service through the use of private consultants. This, however, would not exclude such communities from the state service if they wished to enter the program.

Agency appraisal:

Considering the initial start made by the state in local assistance, the Federal program has been a significant impetus toward the development of the program, and was vital in getting the local assistance program begun by the state off the ground.

The staff, force account system has proven itself a good service at low cost and the system of developing comprehensive plans over a period of years is proving valuable in bringing up the level of planning education in the smaller communities.

The maturity of this kind of thinking will play an important part in developing the attitude that planning is a normal part of the general public expenditure picture, and can become an institution rooted in the community's
normal budget. Five of the seven communities in the first program have continued into a second program. To date 30 per cent of the studies have resulted in positive action by the communities served by the program.\textsuperscript{33}

In the utilization of state employees as the planners in these communities, the agency encourages its staff to envision that their major responsibility is to the towns they serve. This is an attempt to make the planners working in a group of contiguous towns a very real part of the community's services. As a reflection of the success of the program, the work load for community assistance has increased from two communities in 1953 to 10 in 1957. At present there is only a small portion of the state that is not covered by some kind of planning and as the program expands it should eventually cover the remaining eligible communities.

One of the major problems facing the agency has been the problem of retaining staff under the presently highly competitive situation in the planning field. This has necessitated the up-grading of members of the staff whose experience is not necessarily commensurate with the grade. However, it is hoped that in the coming year the expected raises in salaries will give the agency a competitive position in attracting additional staff.

As regards private planning consultants, the agency feels that skilled planning consultants have a role in the Rhode Island program. Their use in the area of special studies at least to augment though not supersede the state program could be an important contribution.

Regional:

The impetus for regional planning is not as significant as in most states due to the size of Rhode Island. The close liaison that exists between most of the communities makes for a metropolitan rather than a regional character. As regards metropolitan planning the agency has the support of the Governor and a bill is presently before the Legislature.
However, there are many differences to be ironed out between the communities before real progress can be made in this area. The experience in local planning should be quite valuable, however, when metropolitan legislation becomes feasible.

Evaluation:

The problem in Rhode Island should be seen in its proper context if it is to be properly evaluated. This includes first, the creation of a state local assistance program to meet the acute economic problems in the state prior to the inauguration of aid under Section 701; secondly, the effect of a disaster situation in arousing public interest to the importance of planning; and lastly the size and character of the state.

The existence of an administrative mechanism to provide local assistance gave Rhode Island the advantage of at least a small amount of experience prior to the inauguration of the Federal program (which to some extent was designed after that of such agencies as the Development Council). The disaster situation caused by the hurricane aided the planning effort in two ways. 1. It brought to Rhode Island professional planners recruited for the special hurricane study, many of whom remained to work on the federally assisted shore study and the continuing and expanded local assistance program. 2. The hurricane disaster dramatized the need for planning as perhaps no other single event could, and communities were quick to take advantage of the agency's expanded planning service.

The size and character of the state have also played an important role in that the state staff is capable of reaching almost any part of the state in a few hours and, further, the small size of the state encourages a higher degree of communication between communities and the state capital.

In light of this context we can proceed with an evaluation of the Urban Planning Assistance Program in Rhode Island.
The state agency has had substantial success in implementing its staff-community relationship and its system of continuing planning as evidenced by a number of second programs for the same towns.

The agency, in addition to salary problems, has had difficulty retaining its staff due to an adverse political situation in the last gubernatorial election.34

The volume of effort presently underway indicates the very good possibility that the agency may in the course of a few years blanket the entire state with planning programs. With 25 per cent of the population and 60 per cent of the state's area (mostly rural) remaining, the agency must take positive action to retain its staff so that its ultimate goal of a continuing planning program can be achieved.

The character of the planning effort is in large part a reflection of the agency's policy of a gradual build up of planning studies as components of a general plan. The heavy emphasis on zoning, land use and subdivision control indicate that a great deal of basic work on general plan elements is being done, but the industrial location, school, parking, and other special studies reflect the agency's policy of solving the community's most urgent problems first. This might on the other hand indicate that the community is only interested in solving immediate problems and does not intend to involve itself in a continuing program. The level of participation in second programs would seem to indicate that this is not necessarily the case. In addition, the Rhode Island agency shapes its contracts with a relatively high degree of flexibility so that the agency can participate in local problems as they arise during the course of the contract period.

On the regional level the state agency has a good record, but aside from special studies for the port of Providence (undertaken outside this program), metropolitan planning is a field yet to be aggressively explored.
Though a rigid priority system for a state like Rhode Island may seem unnecessary, the proper allocation of limited financial and staff resources of the state would seem to require some control. Though the control may take the form of a higher ratio of state aid to communities with special problems, this kind of priority system would help insure that such communities receive planning assistance commensurate with their problems.

To date, the Rhode Island program has had the lowest local costs per capita in the study area, $.21. This is a function both of the type of program and the fact that the state agency absorbs the overhead (which is added to the local contribution and matched by the Federal government). In addition, the ability of the state agency to spread the existing resources over a group of towns makes for lower costs.

Rhode Island is the only state which has attempted to set up a cost guide for communities in the program. The guide spells out the minimum outlay for an adequate program, but implies that a more extensive program would require a higher level of participation. In effect, the agency recognizes the variety of community problems that exist and attempts to establish a cost floor. In practice 6 of the communities in the program have met the agency's suggested local contribution.

The sharp rise in planning activity in the sample communities over a fifteen year period indicates to some extent the pressures building up in these communities. Coupled with this, the present level of activity in the planning program reveals that the desire for additional planning has been steadily gaining momentum. The state's economic problems, the state and Federal assistance programs and the disaster situation have all helped in establishing a high level of planning activity in Rhode Island.

New Hampshire - Background:

The New Hampshire State Planning and Development Commission came
into being in 1935, and its early years followed the new common path of State Planning Commissions and Boards in relation to Federal aid. The relationship of state and local planning agencies was characterized by this statement in the Commission's biennial report in 1937:

The Commission believes the existence and work of local planning boards to be of primary importance in the preparation of a State Plan. Local boards know local conditions far better than could the Commission. Where state plans affect any given community, the ability to refer these plans to the local board will insure their being as harmonious as possible with local desires.

At that time 56 towns and cities in the state had some kind of planning activity, though only a dozen communities had official planning boards. Ten years later the planning commission had changed its emphasis and in addition to state and regional studies was supplying technical assistance to communities in the organization of planning boards, outlining of programs, and the preparation of plans. The increased requests for aid from the state agency prompted the agency to state in its biennial report for 1947:

It is readily apparent that communities, regardless of the amount of interest, cannot plan effectively without technical assistance. Most of our New Hampshire communities cannot afford to employ the necessary technical assistance and must consequently rely upon the state for this aid....

In addition to local assistance, the agency gave limited assistance to the recreational regions, consisting mostly of mapping for publicity purposes, to be used by the regional associations in their own promotional programs.

With the appearance of the Urban Planning Assistance Program, the state agency continued in its predetermined role as the provider of technical assistance, but the increased problem of obtaining adequate staff resulted in a partial change in the agency's operation so as to utilize the services of private planning consultants. In the provision of
technical assistance through its own staff and private consultants it has combined the two major methods of implementing the 701 program.

In reference to the selection of planning consultants for towns requesting aid under this program, the agency does not prepare a formal list of planning consultants, but rather, suggests to interested communities a number of consultants willing and able to serve communities in New Hampshire. There is as yet no attempt to develop any special criteria for private consultants above that which the agency sets up for its own staff. The state does, however, attempt to work out the general quality of the contracts with the towns prior to the selection of a consultant in order to give the generally inexperienced planning board some idea of the problems and their magnitude.

Priorities:

The state uses no specific device to determine priority for communities desiring aid under this program, but it has within the limits of its own budget allocated on an informal basis a degree of aid to communities in a rough ratio to the communities' contribution. The attitude of the agency is, however, that almost all communities in New Hampshire need aid in obtaining technical assistance and can be accurately classified as lacking sufficient resources to sustain a program on their own.

Consultants:

Only three private consultants have operated within this program thus far. All three hold membership in AIP. The consultants operating in New Hampshire each represent a different approach to the consultant-town relationship. One consulting firm established a resident planner in the community, one firm has its planner at the state capital, and the third firm operating in a community close to the Massachusetts border operated out of Boston on a periodic visit basis.
Volume of Effort:

The eight projects now in various stages of the program represent technical planning assistance for 75,000 persons and 250 square miles. This is 13 per cent of the State's population and 2.7 per cent of its area. The number of eligible communities on the basis of population is 246.

Character of the Program:

New Hampshire's experience with the 701 program has been entirely with local assistance to small communities. The only attempt at regional planning under this program was for the seacoast area, but the parochial outlook of some of the key communities has limited the possibility for any major activity in metropolitan planning, either by the state or any of the three major cities.

A general review of the 6 contracts in New Hampshire indicates that 1 is for a special study, 4 are for limited studies, and 1 is for a comprehensive study. A further breakdown of the 31 studies shows that 6 circulation and traffic studies represent the largest effort, followed by 5 land use studies. Zoning ordinances follow with 4, population with 4, urban renewal with 3, subdivision, building activity, and recreation with 2, industrial development, capital improvement, and community facility studies, 1 each.

Costs:

Funds to cover the cost of programs for communities in New Hampshire come as they do for three of the four states from three sources--the local community, the state agency, and the Federal government.

On an annual per capita basis the costs borne by the community generally follow the pattern of higher costs for smaller communities. The present record of costs per capita for communities in the program runs relatively low, but it should be noted that the state agency's contributions are often
close to the community's and in some cases exceed the local contribution. These additional state funds have helped offset locational and economic factors that would have limited the opportunities for these communities to obtain technical assistance. The average annual per capita cost for the New Hampshire communities is $0.51. (Based on the local contribution). The State contributed an average of $1,600 per town or $0.28 per capita. Combined, the state and local contribution make up the non-Federal share of the program's costs.

**Prior Planning:**

A review of planning activity in the communities now involved in the program indicates that 5 out of 8 had planning boards prior to 1950. Three of the communities had obtained some advisory assistance from the state planning agency and two had made abortive attempts to develop a comprehensive plan in 1947. Four of the eight had zoning ordinances and only one community had neither a planning or zoning board prior to 1946.

**State Appraisal:**

The agency's experience with the program has led it to the position that a state staff, force account system similar to those of Rhode Island and Tennessee is the only means of adequately implementing local assistance in New Hampshire. The agency's attitude is based on the proposition that only through close association of community and planner can a really adequate planning program be inaugurated and maintained. The realization that most consulting firms find it difficult to provide a resident planner and find it equally difficult to maintain a long-term relationship with a community in many parts of New Hampshire has led the agency to its present position. In addition, the state agency recognizes that local prejudices tend to prefer indigenous planners rather than those from the large metro-
politan areas. "The local communities feel that only if the consultant is close by can they get maximum service." This of course is difficult because of the very nature of the state's location.

In reviewing the two programs that have utilized state staff for these programs, the agency finds it has had a variety of experience. In one situation the resident planner has worked out well and has succeeded in maintaining a continuing program. In the other situation the planning effort made by the state's resident planner miscarried because of the lack of experience on the part of the planner, lack of adequate direction by the state agency, and the inability of the planner to gauge the character of the community and its ability to digest certain types of planning tools.

The agency feels that the program has played a vital role in helping to expand planning activity in the state, and with an expanded state staff and operating budget the agency feels it can make the best use of the planning stimulant embodied in the Federal program.

**Evaluation:**

The New Hampshire program's operation is significant in that it represents two kinds of experience. In the utilization of both state staff and private consultants, the agency has attempted both to maintain its traditional practice of providing a planning service, and to supplement its relatively small staff with experienced consultant planners.

The agency's experience with staff planning clearly shows that without adequate supervision of junior staff a planning program can run into serious difficulty. On the other hand, junior staff assigned as resident planners and receiving supervisory support from the state agency can perform very adequately.

In reference to the agency's experience with private planning consultants, it is apparent that only when the consultant provides a resident planner can
a long-range continuing program be expected to flourish.

In light of this experience and taking into consideration the character of the state (246 out of 249 communities under 25,000 in population), the agency's decision to expand the state staff service and operate on a force account basis seems reasonable.

The state agency's lack of a priority system for the allocation of existing resources is in some part due to their basic assumption that almost all the communities need such assistance. However, to round out the picture, it must be said that the demand for the program's service has not been as great in New Hampshire as it has in the other three states in the study area. The state agency in light of its experience with expanding Federal installations, and population pressures along its Massachusetts border, could well afford to devise a simple priority system for the allocation of its staff and financial resources so that when the need arises it can be prepared to meet the challenge.

New Hampshire is the only state in the study area that has not applied for a regional grant, and consequently has had all its experience in local assistance work. The one attempt at regional planning in the seacoast region points up the limited use of existing recreational regions set up during the thirties, and maintained by the local communities. Although primarily promotional, these regions are fairly well entrenched in the state fabric and could provide a strong base of operations for the state agency's future regional programs.

Although the agency has provided assistance in setting up programs in an effort to help inexperienced planning boards understand some of the problems involved, the agency has not adequately followed through with continuing supervision. This is basically due to the lack of staff resources,
but in extenuation it must be said that the agency has performed reasonably well in the provision of physical aids, maps, data, etc.

On the metropolitan level the three cities potentially eligible for such grants have not indicated a strong desire for such a program, and the state agency has not expended any major effort in this direction.

The per capita costs in New Hampshire ($0.51) reflect the high cost for programs serving small populations and can be brought down only through the most efficient use of technical resources. In this case, it behooves the State agency to attempt a system whereby its resident staff would serve more than one community at a time.

In summary, the New Hampshire program's success in the future will depend on the number and quality of staff planners it can recruit and the manner in which these planners are used. If the agency is to commit itself to a force account system and obtain maximum results, it must seek to fulfill the above-mentioned requirements.

Connecticut - Background:

The Connecticut Development Commission, the state agency authorized to accept Federal funds for the 701 program, was created in 1939. Its activities were geared to a large degree to industrial development during its early years, but in the post-war period, the need for expanded planning facilities began to change the character of the agency. The post-war planning board pointed to the need of expanded planning facilities and suggested that such activities could well be located in the State Development Commission. 38

The following year, 1946, the C.D.C. in its special study of "Planning and Zoning in Connecticut" 39 documented the planning situation in Connecticut and followed through with specific recommendations for the empowering of State provision of technical planning assistance on a shared cost basis.
As a result of this study the Connecticut legislature amended the municipal planning and zoning legislation but the state planning agency continued to provide merely an advisory planning service.

After the passage of the Housing Act of 1949 the agency was directed to give technical advisory assistance to communities eligible for funds for redevelopment programs. 41

In the summer and fall of 1955, coincident with the inauguration of Section 701 of the Federal Housing Act, floods devastated large sections of Connecticut. Among the emergency measures drafted to aid flood devastated towns was the provision of funds by the state legislature for planning assistance. 42 With these funds the state planning agency contracted with private consultants to begin work on flood damaged towns.

With the declaration of Connecticut as a disaster area by the President, H.H.F.A. personnel came into Connecticut to augment the state agency's staff and help draft the first 701 contracts. Under these first applications the state was paying the non-Federal share of the cost.

Soon after, the state legislature passed legislation making clear the agency's ability to accept Federal funds under this program and further expanded the agency's appropriation for planning, 40 per cent of which was to go to local planning assistance and 60 per cent to regional assistance. The state legislature, however, required that the apportionment of funds be based on a formula reflecting population, assessed valuations, average per capita tax levy and the Commission's available resources. 43 (A proviso was included that set aside the formula in disaster areas.)

The present role of the agency is the administration and supervision of both the Federal and State programs as outlined above.

Method:

The method of implementation of the technical assistance program
involves the use of private planning consultants. This decision is based in large part upon the recommendations of the Governor's Emergency Planning Advisory Commission. The use of consultants rather than state staff was based upon the existing immediate needs, the time available, the reservoir of experienced planning consultants in the general area, as against the difficulty of assembling an experienced staff.

The Consultants:

The problem of assuring competent consultants to perform the technical planning work has proven difficult for the agency. At first the agency attempted to use the A.I.P. criteria for membership (full), but the Connecticut Attorney General disallowed the validity of these criteria.

In an attempt to provide communities with some aid in the selection of consultants, the Connecticut Federation of Planning and Zoning agencies has prepared a list of consultants with information taken from questionnaires sent to the consultants upon their request. The published list includes information on the consultant's major practice, planning specialty, geographical preference, membership in the A.I.P., and previous Connecticut work. Of the 45 individuals and firms listed, 18 have been employed in Connecticut under this program. A breakdown of their membership status in the A.I.P. is as follows:

1. Three full, one associate, two provisional
2. Two full, one associate
3. One full, one associate, two provisional
4. One full, one associate
5. One full
6. One full
7. One full
8. One full
9. Two associates, two provisional
10. Three associates
11. One associate, one provisional
12. One associate
13. One associate
14. One affiliate, one provisional
15. None
16. None
17. none
18. none

Of the total of 18 individuals and firms working in Connecticut, 2
serve on the staff of planning agencies and engage in the program on
a part-time basis.

Priority System:

Connecticut has the only formal priority system for ascertaining
a community's ability to finance a planning program. It is a two-fold
system in that it applies both to the State and Federal technical assistance
programs. The formula used governs the amount of State assistance given
to the local contract, and in addition to the Federal population criteria,
employs density and tax revenue measurements, i.e., the state formula
excludes towns from the Federal assistance program if the average per
capita tax revenue is $90, or more. As tax revenue decreases and population
increases (up to 25,000 in non-disaster areas) the State assumes a larger
share of the non-Federal costs when applying for a grant under 701.

The agency has as yet not developed a formula for ascertaining
assistance to regional planning. The non-Federal share of the three
regional planning studies (river valleys) was assumed by the state agency.

Volume of Effort:

Thirteen per cent of Connecticut's population and 16 per cent of its
area have been covered by 35 contracts under this program. In determining
potential activity, we note that 18 per cent (27 of the 169 communities
in the state) of the State's communities are not involved in any kind of
technical planning activity. Most of these communities lie in the Eastern
and Western extremes of the state, whereas the greatest planning activity
has occurred in the Central industrial areas and the Southwestern corner
of the state, which is heavily affected by the New York metropolitan area.
Character of the Program:

Connecticut has both the largest local and regional programs. Its local programs amounted to almost 50 percent of the study area's total, and it had three of the four regional programs awarded. As yet there has been no metropolitan program.

In attempting to establish the character of the programs it becomes necessary to distinguish between those communities coming into the program as a result of flooding and those unaffected by floods. For purposes of this study communities not affected by floods will be used in Connecticut's analysis. This decision is based on the assumption that the latter group more closely reflects the normal pattern of community involvement in such a program. This is of course not to imply that those communities affected by the flood would not have become involved in the program under more normal conditions, but rather it is an attempt to discount the overemphasis on planning activity dealing primarily with flood problems or flood-stimulated problems.

The ten sample non-flood towns have initiated programs, of which seven were limited studies, two were special studies, and one was a comprehensive plan. In one case the special study was a re-evaluation of a general plan study made prior to this program.

A detailed breakdown of the contract for the 10 sample towns indicates that of the 60 studies undertaken, there were 9 basic land use inventories, 8 circulation studies, 8 zoning studies, 7 land use plans, 7 community facility studies, 7 population studies, and 14 other studies including subdivision control, capital budget, and special studies.

Costs:

A review of the sample communities costs indicate an average annual per capita cost of $.55 (based on local contribution). The State contributed an average of $652 per town or $.11 per capita. Combined, these
represent the non-Federal share costs of the program.

With one major exception, the cost per capita adheres to the assumption of higher costs per capita for lower populations.

**Prior Planning:**

Eight of the ten communities had zoning as of 1946 and one of the towns also had a planning agency. The remaining 2 had no planning or zoning agency operating in the community. Ten years later 9 had both planning and zoning agencies. The remaining 1 had planning throughout the community but zoning only in the urban area.

**Community Resources:**

As mentioned above, Connecticut is the only state which sets up criteria to measure a community's ability to finance a program. In so doing the agency fulfills the requirements implied by the Federal act, and specified by the State act. The formula for determining planning assistance to municipal agencies uses population, average per capita tax revenue, and density criteria.

The population criterion is drawn from the Federal act, while the average per capita tax revenue criterion was devised by the State. The density criterion (to test the urban character of a community) is based on the U.S. Census definition of "urbanized areas."

The State act provides for the waiving of any of the formula requirements if an area is affected by a disaster situation. The amendment to the Federal act in 1956 reflects this need spoken of in the Connecticut legislation, by dropping the population requirements in cases of disaster.

**State Appraisal:**

The state agency's reaction to the program is generally positive. Connecticut came into the program early under the pressure of a disaster situation. Its staff and appropriations were expanded in an attempt to
process the heavy demand for aid under the program. In evaluation, the agency feels the program is working reasonably well.

Problems:

As a result of an inadequate accreditation system for consultants, the agency has required a detailed scope of services from the consultants and also requires a regular report (monthly or bi-monthly) on per cent of contract completed. This latter requirement originates with the state fiscal officer's experience in letting highway contracts.

These two items have raised questions from the consultants, some of whom consider the reporting system cumbersome. The state agency, however, feels that because of the variety of consultants engaged in the work and the variety of technical competence demonstrated, the additional bookkeeping is of value in fulfilling their supervisory responsibilities.

The agency feels strongly that the lengthening approval time at the Federal level is of major concern. During the early days of the program, applications were processed in a matter of weeks. The time interval is presently about six months. This time lag tends to discourage communities who have done the ground work in preparation for a planning program and then find that they must wait six months before work can begin.

Future Activity:

The agency sees its future role as encouraging the expansion of limited programs; the possible submission of second programs for towns already under contract, and the definition of regional planning areas. The major activity of the agency is presumed to be aiding metropolitan and regional planning and encouraging towns to work with consultants on a continuing basis.
Needs:

To accomplish the aforementioned, the agency feels that local planners and/or regional and metropolitan planning staffs must be created. The state agency must expand its present staff; state planning powers and mandatory referral powers should be obtained; a more sensitive formula is needed for allocating planning assistance which would take into consideration factors of urban pressures; and an effective screening process should be instituted at the Federal level to help move applications along more rapidly.

Reaction:

In evaluating public reaction to the program, the agency has had no specific negative reactions, some positive reaction, and some complete lack of reaction. The latter, the agency assumes to be indicative of a low possibility for a continuing planning program.

Connecticut: Evaluation

One of the two states in the study area affected by disaster, Connecticut, has had the most active program (numerically) in the region. The early programs in/disaster area all had a "crash program" character and in an attempt to spread the thin supervisory staff resources, the agency attempted through the writing of "tight" contracts to fulfill its supervisory responsibilities. This device has carried over into the non-flood contracts and tended to reinforce the problem of flexibility, which has all but been eliminated. Though the agency has through this method undoubtedly received full contract satisfaction, there is real question as to the long-range value of the work to the communities involved. The 18 consulting firms and individuals have been forced by this method to work toward a presentation of report date rather than the installation
of a planning process into the community's fabric.

For those communities whose program called for the completion of most of the elements of a comprehensive plan there is considerable question as to whether the Federal government will participate in a second contract covering the re-study of the same elements.

In other words, with a strong possibility that Federal aid will not be forthcoming, there may be a sharp drop in the community planning effort. The consultants, having completed their contract obligations have no further responsibility to the community; and with no continuing funds forthcoming to aid the program, their initial work may well find its way to the shelf.

Connecticut's priority system reflects both Federal and State criteria for the allocation of aid, but although generally satisfactory, the formula, necessarily arbitrary in some respects, is insensitive to such problems as population changes and the non-geometric character of density (measures density in square miles). In addition, the non-inclusion of seasonal dwellings may be an inequity to those communities experiencing increasing summer population pressures.

The programs in the 10 sample towns indicate that the character of the planning effort for which local planning assistance is being requested is primarily limited or special studies. A further review shows that basic elements of a comprehensive planning program are receiving a good deal of attention. The trends represented in these programs may well allow us to assume that the agency will be dealing with this kind of application in the future. Another element of the sample programs is the re-appraisal of former programs not done under this matching grant program. This might indicate there is a rising interest in continuing programs, but it also may reflect the notion that the communities have been encouraged to continue
their planning effort now because of the availability of Federal funds.

The cost picture for the sample communities in Connecticut shows a lower per capita cost than Massachusetts', but still twice the per capita cost of Rhode Island's programs. The State contribution has been limited to costs involved in servicing the program for these communities, and not for actual planning purposes.

Ninety per cent of these sample communities are under 10,000 in population; and if the assumption of higher costs for lower population holds, these communities are at a disadvantage. In reference to this, the formula for allocation of resources might be adjusted to consider this problem.
CHAPTER 4

The Planners:

This chapter attempts to describe the two major methods of implementing the 701 program--(1) the state staff or Force Account and (2) the private planning consultant. The description will concentrate on the positive aspects and the problems of each method in an attempt to identify the situations under which each of these methods (or combination of methods) can be used to greatest advantage.

State Staff

By way of definition the state staff or force account system assumes a permanent salaried staff employed by the state planning agency. It implies the continuing availability of professional planning services for individual communities or other planning areas within the state. The services it would provide are generally of two types:

a. An advisory service, available upon request for aid in the solution of general problems.

b. A technical service for aid in the solution of extensive planning problems involving major allocations of staff time.

The latter service implies the sharing of costs on a contract basis between the state planning agency and the local planning agency.

Such a continuing planning service affords the pooling of experience within the agency's staff. It develops extensive personal contact between the staff of the state agency and local communities; it brings to the community experienced personnel familiar with and sensitive to local desires, problems, and aspirations; and it can develop an important source of "grass roots" support for the state planning agency.

The state staff system provides the opportunity for the efficient utilization of planning resources in that a staff planner can provide
concurrent service to a group of towns; further, the state and local agency's contract can provide for a degree of flexibility which would allow the staff planner to cope with unforeseen problems as they arise.

In regard to programs providing Federal assistance such as the 701 program, the state staff system simplifies the contractual relationship by eliminating the necessity for a third party contract. Lastly, in the provision of a permanent planning service the agency can encourage a tradition of planning rather than planned communities.

The problems of the state staff system revolve around several major issues:

1. The highly competitive market for trained planners makes it difficult for a public agency to keep its salary schedule in line with current offerings by competing agencies or firms. This situation leads to a high turnover of experienced personnel who depart from the agency with their valuable local experience and personal contacts.

2. In a rapid turnover of personnel situation, the agency is sometimes forced to use less experienced personnel who often cannot give communities the level of technical competence they should expect. The top level personnel find that they must devote more and more time to the detailed supervision of inexperienced staff and consequently cannot devote their efforts to other equally vital functions of the agency.

3. In its position as a public body, the agency may be subject to political pressures, especially in its formative years. This measure may take the form of attempts to place non-qualified personnel on the staff, or it may take the form of direct attacks on the agency's validity. The only recourse the agency has in such a case is to gain and maintain bi-partisan support for the planning function.
The Planning Consultant

The planning consultant is defined for purposes of this analysis as an individual or firm engaged in providing technical planning services for a public agency on a contract basis.

Among the positive aspects of a private planning consultant relationship:

1. One of the major values of the planning consultant as defined above is his ability to bring to a planning problem his planning experience quickly and efficiently. This is especially true where problems have developed without warning and require the immediate services of experienced personnel in their solution; e.g., floods, hurricanes, etc.

2. The consultant, operating as a private entrepreneur, is not subject to the normal problems of a civil service situation, which enables him to shortcut certain methods of normal agency operation, e.g., paying higher salaries. In addition, he can operate in an apolitical manner when the need arises.

3. The private consultant can provide services without reference to political boundaries, which means in effect that his high degree of mobility allows him to operate in several states at the same time if necessary. In addition he can service civil service staffs for short term jobs.

Problems:

The consultant relationship carries along with its values certain problems which are particularly germane to this program.

1. The consultant relationship does not imply a continuity of planning effort and with the completion of a contract the consultant ends his responsibilities to the community.

2. The contract device used in the local assistance programs plays
an important role in shaping the character of the relationship between consultant and community.

a. The consultant finds that often he is placed in competition with other planning consultants and may be forced to accept the role of a salesman selling planning as a commodity in order to obtain a contract, a role he does not normally find enjoyable.

b. Once the contract is signed the consultant is responsible for only those planning activities specified. Only through an amendment process which requires time-consuming Federal approval can the major elements of the scope of services be changed. In effect, the consultant is legally prohibited from assigning any of the contract time to planning activities not included within the scope of services. This may prove to work to the detriment of the long-range planning program if a local problem should arise that would normally merit the planner's immediate attention.

c. The time limitation placed on these contracts presents another problem in that it tends to make the consultant's goal the presentation of a document or documents which may in turn strengthen the misconception at the local level that planning is a commodity that can be delivered at a particular place and time.

d. The consultant enjoys a very limited pooling of information with other consultants, and has no assurance of the continuity of contracts in any one state.

Costs:

In general the consultant estimates the cost of a program on the basis of the length of time it will take to complete a proposed program, and the
amount of staff time and supervision required. Some consultants operating on a salary-based system use a technique borrowed from other professional consultants. This system estimates cost of consultant services as two to two and one-half times salary. In addition, both techniques estimate additional costs for extraordinary items of overhead, such as lengthy transportation.

**Personal contact:**

With few exceptions, the consultant's contact with a community is limited. In most cases his personal contact is with the local planning agency and town officials who serve as information sources. If the consultant is located some distance from the community he is serving, his contacts with the community may only fulfill the number of visits specified in the contract (usually monthly).

**Peripheral Groups and Accreditation:**

A relatively new problem has arisen as a result of this program, and deals with the entrance of peripheral groups into what was formerly the sole domain of the planner. These groups of professional consultants state their major practice in the consultant lists as other than planning: engineering, landscape architecture, architecture, etc. In Massachusetts, this group represents 25 per cent of all consultants listed, whereas in Connecticut the group represents 15 per cent of the total listed.

The situation described by these figures touches on the problem of professional accreditation, a problem which has aroused long debate in planning circles but has as yet to be resolved.
CHAPTER 5 - The Planned

The Role of the Local Planning Agency:

The local assistance program has placed upon local planning agencies responsibilities which in many cases are quite new to the average lay planning board. In an effort to round out the inquiry into this program it is important at least to identify the problems that the local agency is confronted with as it engages in the Urban Planning Assistance Program.

The level of broad planning education is understandably lacking in local planning boards. In many cases the planning board's activity is almost exclusively devoted to action arising out of the board's exercise of subdivision control or over a matter dealing with zoning. For the lay board members (mostly elected for a relatively short term), these activities may come to represent the planning function in toto. The effect of this orientation becomes apparent when the local agency becomes involved in applying for technical assistance under the 701 program.

If the community is in a state whose staff does not provide the technical service, the planning board is responsible for selecting a consultant to do the work. The state planning agency normally provides the local planning board with such aids as a suggested list of planning activities and planning consultants. The state agency will also normally meet with the local agency to help explain the basic character of the program, but the state agency normally drops out of the picture during the final consultant and program selection process (in an attempt to avoid the potential problem of seeming to exercise a bias for one consultant or another).

Confronted with the responsibility of selecting a consultant and a program commensurate with the needs and financial capabilities of the community, the planning board may find itself on very unfamiliar ground.
It may consult with neighboring communities already in the program in an attempt to profit from their experience, but often it will proceed to invite a number of consultants to submit a proposed program.

In selecting the program, the planning board more often than not is seeking the solution to many of the community's everyday problems, and is oriented toward the production of physical solutions to the community's problems. This may take the form of a physical plan, i.e., a parking study, or an ordinance, i.e., zoning, subdivision control.

In the face of such attitudes the consultant may acquiesce in the hope that during the contract period he may have an opportunity to educate the planning agency to the point where it realizes the limitations of such an approach, and the importance of a continuing process.

The planning board's problems do not end, however, with the signing of a contract. The local agency faces the responsibility of its implementation role. In fulfilling this role the local board may be satisfied with merely presenting the consultant's work to the community to accept or reject, or it may embark upon an educational program of its own. The latter case is rare.

In effect then, the procedures governing the mechanics of these programs lend themselves to the idea that a technical assistance program is a commodity which may be purchased by the planning board from the technician, rather than a series of planning tools, with which the planning process can be effectively carried on.

Where the state agency provides the technical service many of the same problems will arise, but the existence of a continuing service has the advantage of being able to pick up the threads of a community's program at a later date.
CHAPTER 6

Summary and Conclusions:

The product of the present effort in the study area indicates that there has been a substantial response to the Federal program, and the steady increase of applications does not imply any lessening of interest.

The majority of planning activity being accomplished under this program can be classified as limited or special studies. This results from two kinds of situations:

a. An announced state agency policy that favors the accomplishment of basic elements of a general plan slowly but continuously.

b. A general lack of policy direction which has allowed a wide range of choice to the local board and has often resulted in programs geared only to the solution of immediate problems.

The relatively large number of communities engaged in the program which had set up the mechanics for planning (planning and zoning boards) and which have been exercising some planning functions (zoning and subdivision), indicate that the value of the program has been the continuation of planning activity through the availability of matching funds rather than the stimulation of an original planning effort. There is, however, a strong indication that communities eligible for this program are significantly interested in expanding their planning activity and are willing to expend funds for planning purposes.

The State Agencies:

The state agencies administering this program have experienced a degree of stimulation also. Only one agency (Massachusetts) has not expanded
its staff as a result of this program.

In the implementation of the program, two of the four states, have used private consultants exclusively. One of these (Connecticut) employed the consultant method as a direct result of a disaster situation, while the other (Massachusetts) employed consultants as a matter of policy based on the general availability of professional planners. A third state (New Hampshire) has used both state staff and consultants, and finds that a state staff is a more satisfactory solution for a long-range planning program. The fourth state (Rhode Island) using primarily a state staff system, has found its solution highly successful and assumes the continuation and expansion of that policy. In reviewing the cost picture we find that those states using a consultant for the provision of technical services have higher costs than either of the states using both staff and consultants or staff alone. In making these observations, the fact that a state staff can absorb overhead costs and can spread its resources over a group of towns should be plainly seen.

Reflection on the fulfillment of the Federal administrative criteria for this program indicates only one state (Connecticut) making a formal effort to ascertain eligibility on the basis of population, density and financial resources. The other states have either disposed of this subject by rationalization, or by statements which imply that all the communities eligible under the population criteria are valid recipients of aid under this program.

Regional Planning:

Regional planning activity arising out of aid under this program has been all disaster stimulated (with the exception of the Berkshire study, which is yet to be approved). The lack of experience with a more normal
kind of regional planning has tended to limit an evaluation of regional planning done under this program. However, the regional river valley programs in Connecticut have dramatized the importance of broad public interest and support plus the availability of continuing staff services. 51

State Staff

A summary of the state staff (force account) method of implementing this program in Rhode Island indicates that continuity of planning activities has been achieved in a majority of the communities involved in the program. The pooling of staff experience has proved invaluable especially where communities are contiguous and share a similar character.

The high level of personal contact which has accompanied this method has played an important role in continuing programs, and the flexibility which has characterized the programs has aided the educational efforts being made by the staff planners.

The problems of a state staff are amply illustrated in Rhode Island and New Hampshire, and illustrate that as with the entire range of professional planning activities the state agencies have difficulty in obtaining and maintaining staff. In most cases the problem is a financial one which must be realized and corrected if experienced staff are to be retained.

The potential political problems of such an agency also find Rhode Island a fair example of the importance of grass roots and bi-partisan support. However, it also points to the need for state planning agencies which can provide the technical skills at all planning levels that will help invoke the respect and support of the general citizenry.

Consultants:

Experience with consultants provided technical services, suggests
that the initial value of speed in bringing to bear their experience at the local level has generally been neutralized by the lengthening approval time. In addition the diminished disaster character of new programs makes the value of speed less significant.

Though the consultant has maintained a high degree of flexibility in his ability to serve communities located in various states, the distance factor reflects itself in added costs to the community (to mention one overhead item).

In reference to continuity of programs, the consultants have had only limited success (as indicated by the number of new contracts for the same town). In some cases of course, the original contract runs for as much as two years, but the top limit of three years as set by the Federal administrators limits this kind of continuity. In the one-year programs there has been very little evidence of a continuing technical program. We do, however, note that where the consultant provides a resident planner, continuity is quite likely. The difficulty of this solution is apparent since the consultant and the public agencies are looking for personnel in the same market place.

The consultant is further hampered by the general inflexibility of contracts in this program. The legal limitations placed on the allocation of his time and professional skills may become detrimental to the whole planning effort when the consultant is unable for contract reasons to cope with important community problems as they arise.

The contract bidding system that has developed as a result of this program has been a cause of major concern to the consultant who finds that rather than strengthening the concept of planning as a process it implies strongly that planning services like engineering studies are
commodities to be purchased. The consultant operating in such a situation, and unable to develop for physical reasons a close rapport with the community finds that the job of educating a community toward the acceptance of a continuing planning process is very difficult.

The planning consultant's position is further complicated by the competition of peripheral groups--engineering firms, etc.--whose other activities enable them to underbid the planner for the provision of consulting services, and the inefficiency of operating in non-contiguous locales. These two problems, when linked to the consultant's lack of a research and information pool, serve to make his operations far from ideal.

Many of the above limitations could be overcome in a well balanced relationship between staff and consultant services, with the latter operating on a per diem basis and employed either by the municipality or by the State.

**Effect of the Program on Planning:**

The salient feature of the program is that it has indeed increased planning activity in the smaller communities, increased with some qualification regional planning and may yet provide aid for metropolitan planning.

The program has, however, drawn professional planners out of public agencies where there is already short supply, and into private consulting operations. This may indeed be a function of what Perry Norton refers to as "the need for a genuine planning experience," but it also reflects the problem of public agencies in trying to maintain a level of financial remuneration commensurate with the demands for planning skills.

In this regard, the question of the proper allocation of limited planning resources becomes vital. With the expansion of consulting oppor-
tunities, we see the most experienced planners utilizing their invaluable experience on problems inordinate to their capacities while major cities, metropolitan areas and urban regions go begging. 54

On another front the program has revived the possibility of an important planning role for state planning agencies through the provision of federally aided planning assistance. The allocation of Federal funds to these agencies provides the possibility of strengthening an important part of the state agency's functions to the point where the agency may achieve sufficient local support to extend the area of its service.

The Federal agency is quite explicit when it states that the purpose of the program is to stimulate and expand state assistance for local planning and can be taken by the state agency as an indicator of the role it should be playing. The state agency has a choice of methods in the implementation of this program, but it also has an opportunity to expand its own position and range of activities. It behooves the agency to choose that method that will both serve to achieve the purposes of the program and develop a broad base of public support for the agency and its services.

The extension of Federal funds for planning assistance brings to the surface another important question that touches on the potentially expanded role of the Federal government.

Much of the work being carried out under this program is being done without the benefit of the kind of research that would be an invaluable addition to the existing planning tools used widely in 701 programs. The creation of a Planning and Research extension service as a part of a Federal Agency could play an important role in the proper allocation of financial and technical planning resources.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The Federal Legislation:

1. In the foregoing discussion of costs, it was noted that the smaller communities, because of economies of scale pay a higher rate per capita than larger communities. This may be sufficient justification for the Federal allocation of local aid to the smaller communities, but we also note that in disaster situations, the population criterion is dropped. If the Federal legislation is to be sensitive to physical disaster, then it must surely recognize that abnormal population and economic changes may assume disaster proportions for communities unequipped to meet such changes.

On this basis, the present legislation should be amended to reflect a policy of aiding communities subject to abnormal population or economic changes without regard to the population criterion.

2. Though regional planning in the study area has been limited to disaster stimulated programs, the experience has indicated the existence of a problem which is significant enough to merit amendment to existing legislation. This problem deals with regional and metropolitan areas that lie in two or more states. The problem is amply illustrated by the Farmington Valley study in Connecticut, where a substantial part of the valley lay in Massachusetts and was not subject to study. In view of this, the legislation should be amended so as to encourage interstate cooperation for regional and metropolitan studies.
3. If we accept the premise that planning is a continuing process, it should follow that the planning mechanism should have a measure of permanence. Experience in the State planning agencies treated in this study indicates that without a permanent, working agency, initial planning efforts may be of limited value. In this context it would seem that if the Urban Planning Assistance Program is to be of lasting significance it should be a part of a permanent Federal agency concerned primarily with planning and urban affairs.

FEDERAL POLICY:

1. Without inferring that centralization of Federal activities is basically good, the experience in this program indicates that as long as the existing shortage of planning personnel remains a problem, the decentralization of the existing limited supply of personnel does not constitute their most efficient use. Until such time as the Federal agency has sufficient staff to handle its obligations, it should return to a centralized situation.

2. Experience in this program has indicated that the lack of continuity is one of the major problems that has accompanied the use of the contract device. Where the State provides a staff for the technical assistance, the follow-up of a particular planning project can be accomplished relatively easily, though the cost of the follow-up advisory service is usually borne by the agency.

For private consultants, this is a more serious problem in that they normally cannot absorb the costs of such a service. If we assume that continuity is vital, then contract requirements for the scope of services should include the setting aside of a
certain portion of the funds for a periodic advisory service whether the work is done by a State staff or by private consultants.

3. As evidenced by the description of the State agency's reaction to the Federal criteria, we have seen that the States are for the most part loath to accept the responsibility of implementing tests of a community's eligibility. If the Federal agency feels that the administrative criteria are valid, then it should require of some evidence/fulfillment, e.g., a formula for allocating funds on a priority basis.

THE STATE AGENCY

1. In reviewing and analyzing the two major methods of implementing this program, (State staffs and Consultants) we have found that both methods share many of the same problems. We also note that each has its distinct advantages. In an attempt to find a technique that minimizes the disadvantages and maximizes the advantages, it would seem that a State staff system following the lines of the Rhode Island or Tennessee system provides the permanence and facility for continuity that is basic to planning. If we add to this the supplementary resources of consultant planners functioning through the public agency, we may approach a situation within which the available planning resources are being used most efficiently.

2. Though three of the four states in the study area participate financially in the program, only one state, Connecticut, has specifically allocated funds for a planning assistance program.
If the State agencies are to achieve the permanence that we assume is important in keeping a major planning program alive, these agencies must encourage the appropriation of funds to at least supplement the Federal aid. The failure to build a tradition of State appropriation of sufficient size to maintain the necessary staff to provide local planning assistance may, if Federal aid ceases or is curtailed, find that the important beginnings made under this program to date may die on the vine. To insure the proper allocation of funds and personnel resources, the agencies should be required to devise a method of testing community planning needs.

3. Though regional and metropolitan planning experience in the study area has been limited to disaster stimulated programs, it has served to dramatize the need for a really adequate delineation of regional and metropolitan planning areas. In view of this experience, the State agencies should seek funds to lay the ground work for the delineation of regional and metropolitan planning areas as a first step in meeting the requirements for metropolitan and regional planning grants—in addition, and in the long run, probably far more important, a first step in aiding the creation of regional and metropolitan planning agencies to continue the work begun under the Federal program.
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APPENDIX A

THE FEDERAL LAW

Section 701 of Title VII of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended by Housing Act of 1956, in its entirety reads:

"To facilitate urban planning for smaller communities lacking adequate planning resources, the Administrator is authorized to make planning grants to State planning agencies for the provision of planning assistance (including surveys, land use studies, urban renewal plans, technical services and other planning work, but excluding plans for specific public works) to cities and other municipalities having a population of less than 25,000 according to the latest decennial census. The Administrator is further authorized to make planning grants for similar planning work (1) in metropolitan and regional areas to official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agencies empowered under State or local laws to perform such planning; (2) to cities, other municipalities, and counties having a population of twenty-five thousand or more according to the latest decennial census which have suffered substantial damage as a result of flood, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which the President, pursuant to section 2 (a) of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes (Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 30, 1950), as amended, has determined to be a major disaster; and (3) to State planning agencies, to be used for the provision of planning assistance to the cities, other municipalities, and counties referred to in clause (2) hereof. Any grant made under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated cost of the work for which the grant is made and shall be subject to terms and conditions prescribed by the Administrator to carry out this section. The Administrator is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the revised Statutes, as amended, to make advance or progress payments on account of any planning grant made under this section. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not exceeding $10,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this action, and any amounts so appropriated shall remain available until expended."
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE COMMUNITIES IN FOUR NEW ENGLAND STATES

Connecticut:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Population 1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>7,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>1,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>3,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Windsor</td>
<td>4,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>9,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbury</td>
<td>3,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>5,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>6,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>7,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southington</td>
<td>13,061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rhode Island:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Population 1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Kingstown</td>
<td>14,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerly</td>
<td>12,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>11,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kingston</td>
<td>10,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>9,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>6,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiverton</td>
<td>5,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Greenwich</td>
<td>4,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Shoreham</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Massachusetts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Population 1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>11,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkinton</td>
<td>3,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynard</td>
<td>6,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Adams</td>
<td>21,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saugus</td>
<td>17,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andover</td>
<td>12,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dracut</td>
<td>8,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Andover</td>
<td>8,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paxton</td>
<td>1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seekonk</td>
<td>6,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>7,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>11,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hingham</td>
<td>10,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>3,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Population 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scituate</td>
<td>5,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walpole</td>
<td>9,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td>5,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woburn</td>
<td>20,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>7,465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Hampshire:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Population 1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>15,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>18,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>2,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>8,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>6,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>5,131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>