Joint planning activity is one means of overcoming the lack of political integration in areas (particularly metropolitan areas) where physical planning problems extend over political boundaries. The trend toward joint planning has been intensified by the rapid postwar development of areas that were predominantly rural before the second world war. Often rural legislators finding that their own political subdivision could not finance the needed technical planning services, sought cooperation with adjoining political subdivisions in supporting an adequate technical staff.

Essentially, the reason for joint planning is a need for coordination and economy in the planning activities between adjacent governmental units.

Official joint planning first appeared in the mid-twenties with the establishment of the Paducah Planning and Zoning Commission, a joint agency serving the Paducah-McCracken County, Kentucky, area. Today, there are between thirty-five and forty official joint planning agencies. Thirty-three were investigated for this study. It is interesting to note that eighty percent of the agencies studied here were organized since 1940, and about two-thirds of them since 1945. In addition to the agencies that now function, eight others were being organized at the date of this survey.

* The following extract was adapted from the last chapter in a thesis written by Robert J. Piper, entitled "Official Joint-Planning In The United States." This thesis was submitted as partial fulfillment for the degree of Master of Regional Planning, Cornell University, June 1953. The summary sheets on joint organizations were taken verbatim from Mr. Piper's thesis.
Official joint planning agencies which comprise about one percent of all planning agencies, are complex in organization, purpose and legal status. Therefore, it is important to develop a method for the classification of all planning agencies. A logical way of classifying all planning agencies is on the basis of four characteristics:

1. Purpose and scope of the planning activities.
2. Organizational, governmental, administrative or geographical units served.
3. Legal status.

Each characteristic involves study of subsidiary factors if a comprehensive classification system is to be developed. In outline form, the main characteristics and subsidiary factors may be set down as follows:

### Classification of Types of Planning Agencies

1. **Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities**
   a. Purpose of Planning Activities:
      Physical or land use planning; land and water conservation planning; economic or industrial development planning; or fiscal and administrative planning.
   b. Scope of Planning Activities:
      Single-purpose or multiple-purpose activities; and the studies involved in pursuit of each of these purposes.

2. **Organizational, Governmental, Administrative or Geographical Units Served**
   a. Single Units Served:
      City, county, township, state, park district, school district, water and sewer district, etc.
   b. Multiple Units Served:
      Bi-city, city-township, city-county, bi-county, metropolitan, regional, bi-state, international.
   c. Cooperation Agreement between Units Served:
      Gentlemen's agreement, mutual representation agreement, joint commission agreement, contract.

3. **Legal Status**
   a. Extent of Legislative sanction for Establishment and Support:
Unofficial, quasi-official, or official.

b. Extent of Legislative Sanction to Act:

Authority to study, plan and recommend; authority to review, implement or administer; authority to recommend, review and finance.

4. Position in the Structure of Government Held

a. Departmental:

Similar to a line, auxiliary, or staff agency.

b. Semi-Independent:

An appointed commission, or a public authority.

c. Independent:

A citizen's agency having no place in the structure of government.

The Joint Planning Agency

As previously mentioned, the above system of classification applies to all planning agencies. Since this study is concerned with official joint planning agencies it is necessary to indicate the characteristics of such agencies as they would be found within the system of classification.

Purpose and Scope. The agencies investigated in this report are principally concerned with physical or land use planning - the planning activities commonly associated with city planning organizations. These agencies may also undertake studies in economic or industrial development, land and water conservation.

Units Served. Planning organizations analyzed here served two or more governmental or administrative units. They may be city-county, city-township, city-school district-county (or other governmental-administrative combination) agencies. The cooperation agreement by which they qualify as joint agencies will be any one of the three listed above (Item 2-c).

Legal Status. The joint planning agencies considered in this study are all official. They are created by legislation and are supported by two or more governmental or administrative units. Powers may be advisory only, or the agencies may have authority to implement and administer plans.

Position in the Structure of Government. The official joint planning agencies covered here hold either a departmental or semi-independent position in the structure of government. Because of the widespread practice of using the unpaid citizen commission as the agency for physical or land use planning, these agencies hold a semi-independent position in government.

Cooperation Agreements. The underlying basis of all official joint planning agencies is some form of cooperation agreement between two or more governmental or administrative units. The agreement may take one of three forms which are here designated as gentlemen's agreement, mutual representation agreement, and joint commission agreement.
A joint commission has not always been an integral part of the joint planning agency. Of the thirty-three official joint planning agencies surveyed in this study, seven were found to operate under a gentlemen's agreement, three under a mutual representation agreement, and twenty-three under a joint commission agreement. Thirty percent of the agencies surveyed function without an official joint commission.

Gentlemen's Agreement. An official joint planning agency operating under a gentlemen's agreement exhibits two chief characteristics:

First, each of the participating governmental or administrative units has its own official planning body. This may be the city council, school board, planning commission or other governmental or administrative body. There is no joint commission that concerns itself with developing plans for the local areas represented by the participating units. There may be a central committee, but such body is concerned with distribution of information, exchange of ideas, etc.

Secondly, all participating units contribute to the support of a central planning staff. In turn, this technical staff works directly with the local planning bodies. Financial support for the joint staff may be in the form of budget allocations from each of the participating units or in the form of payments for services rendered by the staff.

Two factors have contributed to the rise of the gentlemen's agreement. First, local governments, particularly those within the shadow of large cities, tend to fear that any official form of cooperation may lead to their domination by the larger municipality. In recognition of this attitude, enabling legislation in New York provides for the formation of planning agencies or federations. Such federations are designed to promote community and inter-community planning through the collection and distribution of information on planning and kindred subjects. The law does not indicate that these organizations may create plans on their own initiative. Second, the lack of state enabling legislation providing for any other type of joint cooperation has contributed to the rise of the gentlemen's agreement.

Mutual Representation Agreement. An official joint planning agency operating under a mutual representation agreement has two chief characteristics.

First, each of the participating units has its own planning body. One of these bodies has, as part of its membership, one or more representatives of the other participating units. There is no single official joint commission.

Second, all participating units contribute to the support of a central planning staff, even though they may also have their own planning staffs. Financial support for the joint staff is usually in the form of budget allocations from each of the participating units.

Mutual representation agencies occur on the city-county level. Of the participating commissions that may be included in a city-county agency, it is the county planning commission that contains mutual representation, i.e., whose membership consists of persons drawn from both the city and the county.

Mutual representation agencies are organized under specific state enabling legislation. Some state planning statutes specify that a county planning commission must include representation from the largest city in the county.
In contrast to the gentlemen's agreement, the mutual representation cooperation agreement strengthens planning at the commission level, creating greater understanding of city-county problems, reducing commission contacts for technical staff, and reducing staff responsibility for achieving coordination between participating units.

The mutual representation as used today is restricted to promoting cooperation between the unincorporated areas of the county and the largest city of that county. Therefore, it would seem to be a less suitable agreement for those metropolitan areas wherein a number of small cities surround a large urban center.

Joint Commission Agreement. An official joint planning agency operating under a joint commission agreement exhibits three chief characteristics.

First, each participating unit has its own official planning body.

Second, each participating planning body appoints one or more of its members as its representative on a joint planning commission, whose formation is provided for in state enabling legislation. The joint commission is a planning body that has authority to create development schemes for the entire planning area.

Third, there may be a single joint staff, that derives its support from contributions of the participating units, or there may be several staffs whose work is coordinated through the joint commission.

The great majority of joint planning agencies are based on a joint commission agreement. All such agencies plan for the entire area represented. Some draw membership only from the larger participating units, such as the county and the largest city of the county, while others have a membership drawn from all the participating units.

Without assessing the accomplishments of individual agencies, it would seem that the joint commission form of cooperation agreement offers the most desirable organization. The joint commission provides for communication among the representatives of each participating unit, to deal with common problems and to understand the particular problems of each unit.

Other Ways of Organizing Joint Planning

Two other forms for joint planning are worth mentioning though at present they are receiving very limited application. They are interesting and may be of use in the future.

Joint Planning by Contract. The California law provides for city-county planning cooperation by contract. The law authorizes the county planning commission to perform planning services for any municipality upon such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed. This authority has been put to use in only a few instances.

Joint planning by contract is not necessarily a permanent or continuing operation. Joint planning by contract may still be useful, though less desirable than the joint commission form of cooperation agreement.

City-County-State Cooperation. An instance of city-county-state cooperation in planning is to be found among the city of Wilmington, the county of New Castle, and certain agencies of the state of Delaware. The Regional Planning Commission of New Castle County consists of representatives from Wilmington, New Castle County,
the State Highway Department, and State Board of Health. This Commission has authority to prepare a master plan for that portion of the county not included within the corporate limits of any city or town. Such cities or towns may request the Regional Planning Commission to undertake studies for them and be included in the master plan. However, there is no provision for their representation on the commission.

State representation on local planning commissions is questioned by many planners. However, it is unusual when one metropolitan area holds a predominant position in the affairs of its state. State participation in local planning is not surprising in Delaware which has only three counties with seventy percent of the state population in New Castle County alone.

**Joint Planning Operations**

It was stated earlier that the basic principles underlying joint planning were the need for coordination and economy in the planning activities between adjacent governmental units. Whether or not a joint agency is successful will depend upon the day-to-day operations of the agency which should involve effective use of commission members and the promotion of planning on the local level. The allocation of staff time and budget contributions among participating units will also affect the success of the operation.

**Use of Executive Committees.** Effective use of a joint commission will depend on two factors: (1) the representative nature of the commissions and, (2) the internal organization of the commission.

If a city-county, metropolitan, or regional agency is representative of all the governmental units within the planning area, the joint commission may be of considerable size. The Franklin County agency, for example, has thirty-two commission members, Detroit forty-six members; Saginaw Valley twenty-three members. All of them have executive committees to handle their everyday business affairs. These committees are authorized to exercise all the powers of the commission in the intervals between commission meetings. The size of executive committees varies from five to fifteen members, with the chairman or vice-chairman of the commission automatically assuming the office of chairman of the executive committee. The remaining membership of the executive committee may be composed of other commission officers, of representatives of certain political units within the planning area, or of representatives of geographic subdivisions of the metropolitan area or region.

**Budget Contribution.** Two methods of allocating budget contributions between participating units of a joint planning agency are described here. One method employs various formulas which through a variety of indices such as population and assessed valuation determines the amount to be paid by each unit. A second method is that of simple agreement between participating units on the respective shares of the total budget. Of these two methods, the latter is by far the most popular.

The products of the planning operations cannot always be measured in terms of direct benefit to persons or property. Further, the justification for a joint planning agency is the existence of problems that overlap political boundaries, and it is often impossible to divide the total magnitude of any one problem into a number of smaller units that may be assigned to one of the participating groups. For this reason the formula system of budget contribution is open to criticism and in some cases, has proven to be impractical.

Formulas based on population are the most popular. One agency, after drawing up
its own budget, bases the contribution to be made by each participating unit upon the percentage of total population residing in each unit. Other agencies base their contributions on a per capita allocation, varying from five to twenty-five cents.

When used alone, the per capita method of budget contribution leaves much to be desired. It is unrealistic to the extent that it does not represent the amount of planning services required. Further, it does not vary with the demands made upon the planning agency - it fluctuates only with an increase or decrease in the population base.

Some agencies combine a per capita method of allocation with a base or minimum contribution from the largest political units participating in the joint operation. For instance, the articles of agreement of the Franklin County Regional Planning Commission specify that each municipality cooperating therein shall contribute five cents per capita, with the City of Columbus and Franklin County contributing a minimum of $30,000 each per year.

The simple agreement method of budget allocation is used by most agencies. Nearly all single city-county agencies split the budget fifty-fifty. In more complex agencies composed of several governmental and administrative units, the budget contribution system is somewhat more complex, but is still based upon a simple agreement - either between the members of the joint commission or between the governing bodies of the participating units in conference with the director of the joint technical staff. In a few instances one participating unit, usually the county, will pay all the expenses of the planning agency and will bill the other participating units for services rendered.

Allocation of Staff Time. At present it is difficult to make recommendations regarding an adequate staff for a joint planning agency. In the first place, joint planning is so new that the agencies themselves do not know all their staff requirements. Directors agree, however, that their commissions are understaffed. Further, there is little uniformity between the types or amounts of work carried on by the joint agencies. Finally, the size of existing joint staffs does not depend upon the work requirements of the staff, but rather on the appropriation with which they must operate.

The allocation of staff time should be made on the basis of project need and not in accordance with the budget contributions made by the participating units, or by strength of representation on the joint commission. Furthermore, some directors have pointed out that the agency must have control of its budget in order to control the allocation of staff time.

If some sort of division of work within the agency is necessary such division must be made within staff personnel rather than staff time. One metropolitan agency - whose work includes equal amounts of metropolitan or inter-municipal planning and community planning - makes a division within its staff personnel between these two types of work. Another agency, a single city-county organization has half of its staff paid directly by the city, the other half by the county. Only the director is paid jointly by the city and county.

Selling Planning on the Local Level. A major responsibility of any planning agency is to sell its product to the people. The very existence of a planning agency may depend on how well its sales campaign is carried to the public. Nearly all planning agencies are delegated the power to prepare and publish reports on their own initiative, and many agencies rely on this tool for reaching the public. In those agencies that seem to be most successful, however, it has been found that the sales technique of the organization is inherent in the organizational structure of the agency.
This theory is forcefully demonstrated in the case of the Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission and the Franklin County Regional Planning Commission, Ohio, which were established with the belief that the public should participate in plan-making. Toward that end, the Detroit commission established its system of citizen advisory committees and development area councils. The Franklin County commission specifies that its membership include representatives of every participating unit, plus delegates-at-large to ensure area-wide representation. The organizational structure of these agencies, in addition to the technical excellence of their staffs, is responsible for the success of planning in these areas. Although these agencies are young, they have made notable progress.

*****

The following summary sheets contain the major organizational details of each of the thirty-three joint planning agencies considered in this study. The summary sheets were compiled from a questionnaire sent to seventy-five planning agencies of which ninety percent responded. On the basis of the responses, thirty-three were classified as official joint planning agencies. They are described below.
Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; principally devoted to the development of recreational areas around Folsom and Nimbus Lakes adjacent to Folsom and Nimbus Dams; studies include urban and rural land use, and zoning legislation, recreation, rural roadside control, subdivision control, fringe development and general (master) plan.

Units Served

Sacramento, El Dorado and Placer Counties

Cooperation Agreement

Joint commission Agreement; commission totals 9 members - 3 from each county, as appointed by the respective County Board of Supervisors.

Legal Status

Official; see Chapter 1711 of the Conservation and Planning Act of 1947, State of California.

Budget

Total 1952 Budget $30,000; budget contributed on the basis of one cent per $1000 assessed valuation in each county; Sacramento County 70%, Placer County 20%, El Dorado County 10%.

Staff

2 full-time persons; duties of the Director in this instance are to promote legislation, public relations and obtain finances from various Federal, State and local agencies, and to act as a liaison man between the County Planning Commissions and the County Boards of Supervisors.

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports directly to the respective County Boards of Supervisors; Director may work directly with the planning commissions of the counties if he so wishes.
NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
816 Brown Street, Napa, California

Director: Clyde Cassidy
Population: 46,000

Est: 1953

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, urban and rural zoning legislation, subdivision control.

Units Served

Napa County, City of Napa, City of Saint Helena, City of Calistoga

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 9 members - 3 appointed by County Board of Supervisors, 1 appointed by each of the three City Councils; 3 ex-officio members - the engineers of the County of Napa and the City of Napa and the Napa City Attorney; members are paid $10 per meeting, not to exceed $50 in any one month.

Legal Status

Official; see Deering's California Laws, including 1949 Supplement, Volume 2, Act 521 lc, Articles 1 to 7, Sections 1 to 78.

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $29,800; budget contributed entirely by County; budget contribution based upon County assessment.

Staff

9 full-time persons; Director, 3 Senior Planners (one for each city), 1 Junior Planner, 2 Draftsmen, 2 clerks; consultants are hired on full-time basis.

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports directly to local governing bodies; Director may work directly with local governing bodies as there are no local planning bodies.

NOTE: This agency to begin operations fiscal year 1953-1954.
Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, circulation, recreations and schools, subdivision controls, capital improvement program and building and housing codes.

Units Served

County of Boulder, City of Boulder, Boulder County School District No. 3

Cooperation Agreement

Gentlemen's Agreement; each of the participating units has its own planning body. Meeting jointly, these three bodies comprise the Regional Board. As a matter of practice the Regional Board never meets - inter-commission cooperation is the responsibility of the planning director.

Legal Status

Official; the participant planning bodies are official as is the Regional Planning Board; see Colorado Statutes Annotated (1935), including 1950 Supplement, Chapter 163, Sections 160-183.

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $6000; budget contributed on basis of a simple agreement - City and County 40% each, School District 20%.

Staff

1 full-time person; Planning Coordinator (Director) does the planning for all participating units.

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Planning Coordinator is responsible to all three participating planning commissions or boards.
REGIONAL PLANNING AUTHORITY OF SOUTH CENTRAL CONNECTICUT
Room 207, 200 Orange Street, New Haven, Connecticut

Director: Milo D. Wilcox, Jr. Est: 1948
Population: 300,000

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities
Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use and zoning; industrial dispersion; highway relocation

Units Served
City of New Haven and eight townships in the New Haven metropolitan area

Cooperation Agreement
Joint Commission Agreement; each member unit is entitled to two representatives - those having over 25,000 population may have one additional member for each 50,000 or fraction thereof over 25,000. The commission is called the Board of Representatives and at present it has 21 members as appointed by the planning commissions of the member units

Legal Status
Official; see Connecticut General Statutes, Chapter 46, 1949 Revision

Budget
Total 1952 Budget: $525; budget contributed on basis of membership dues - $2.5 per representative

Staff
No full-time staff; staff of New Haven City Planning Commission does occasional work for this agency; some work is done by student help during the summer months

Position in Governmental Structure
Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports to local planning bodies; Director may work directly with local planning bodies
Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include rural zoning legislation, official map and subdivision controls. Nearly all of this agency's activities are devoted to inspection and approval of subdivision plats.

Units Served

City of Wilmington, New Castle County and State of Delaware. The law specifies that this agency may serve other governmental units within the County; this is optional on the part of the local governing bodies

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 11 members - 1 appointed by Mayor and Council of Wilmington, 4 appointed by County Levy Court; 6 ex-officio members - County Engineer, Division Engineer of the State Highway Department, representative of State Department of Health, Superintendent of City Parks, Chief Engineer of City Water Department and Chief Engineer of City Street and Sewer Department

Legal Status

Official; see Revised Code of Delaware (1935), Chapter 168 as amended by Chapter 266, Volume 43 (1941 Laws), Chapter 198, Volume 44 (1943 Laws) and Chapter 293, Volume 46 (1947 Laws)

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $3500; budget contributed entirely by County

Staff

3 part-time personnel; staff time is devoted to inspection of subdivision plats

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports directly to Levy Court
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

Director: Blair Lee III

Population: 1,000,000

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; the Council is authorized to amend and adopt a general plan for the development of the Region (see below) to serve as a general framework of development within which each part of the region may be more precisely planned by the appropriate planning agency or agencies.

Units Served

The National Capital Region includes the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland, Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun and Prince William Counties in Virginia; and all the cities now or hereafter existing in Maryland and Virginia within the geographic area bounded by the outer boundaries of the combined area of said counties.

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 10 members - 2 members of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, one member from each of the portions of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties (Maryland) that are not included in the Maryland National Capital Commission, 4 members appointed by the Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission, Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia and the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission (Local planning agency for the District of Columbia) ex-officio.

Legal Status

Official; see Public Law 592, 82nd Congress, "National Capital Planning Act of 1952."

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: not specified; contributed entirely by Federal Government.

Staff

Not specified.

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Council is responsible to Federal Government; individual members are responsible to participating units they represent.
METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION
502 Title Building, Atlanta 3, Georgia

Director: Robert C. Stuart

Population: 609,967

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban land use, city streets and traffic, arterials, capital improvements, public schools and general (master) plan; this agency places special emphasis on the assistance of local planning bodies who initiate their own programs.

Units Served

City of Atlanta, Fulton and DeKalb Counties and all of the area included therein.

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 14 members - 4 citizens of Atlanta appointed by the Mayor, 3 citizens from each of the Counties as appointed by the County Boards; ex-officio members (4), the Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Fulton County, the Commissioner of DeKalb County; and the Mayors of the County Seats (Atlanta and Decatur).

Legal Status

Official; see Georgia Laws of 1951, p.p. 3124 to 3130.

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $64,200; budget contributed by all three units - Atlanta 40%, Fulton and DeKalb Counties 60% in proportion to the total amounts shown of the respective County tax digests.

Staff

5 full-time persons; Director, 1 Planning Technician, 1 Research Director, 2 Draftsmen, 1 Clerk

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports to local governing bodies; staff may work directly with parties requesting services.
CITY-COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
City Hall, Augusta, Georgia

Director: Sydney Carter  
Est: 1951

Population: 109,000

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, city streets and traffic, farm to market roads, arterials, sub-division control, general (master) plan, annexation and metropolitan planning.

Units Served

City of Augusta and all of the territorial area of Richmond County

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 9 members - 4 city members appointed by City Council, 3 members of county area appointed by County Board of Commissioners; 2 ex-officio members - Mayor of City and Chairman of County Board of Commissioners; appointed members are paid $10 per meeting not to exceed $120 per year

Legal Status

Official; see Acts of Georgia, 1951, p.p. 481 to 493

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $30,000; budget contributed by simple agreement - 50% by City, 50% by County

Staff

4 full-time persons; Director, 1 Draftsman, 1 Clerk; also a Special Traffic Assistant from the Augusta Police Department Traffic Division

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports directly to the City Council and the County Board of Commissioners
PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION - HILO-HAWAII COUNTY
City Hall, Hilo, Hawaii

Director: Hiroshi Kausamoto  Est: 1945
Population: 69,000

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, housing, zoning, legislation, city streets and traffic, rural roadside control, subdivision control and general (master) plan

Units Served

City of Hilo and entire area of County (island) of Hawaii

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 15 members - 11 members appointed by Chairman of the County Board of Supervisors - appointed members come from both the city and the county - there is no set method of selection; 4 advisory members (ex-officio) - Chairman of the County Board, County Attorney, County Chief Engineer and Chief of City Police

Legal Status

Official; see H.B. 166, Act 77 of the Session Laws of Hawaii (1947) - (This is probably the shortest enabling legislation in the world) - exact composition of commission was determined by County Ordinance #44 (1945)

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $15,000; budget contributed entirely by County

Staff

2 full-time persons; Director and 1 clerk; this staff does all the planning for the city and the entire county

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports directly to County Board of Supervisors; Director may work directly with parties requesting assistance
CITY-COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONS
Old City Hall, Rockford, Illinois

Director: G.W. Gayle
Population: 152,400

Est: 1941

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, city streets and traffic, arterials, urban and rural zoning legislation, subdivision control, fringe development and general (master) plan

Units Served

City of Rockford and unincorporated areas of Winnebago County surrounding the city and extending a distance of six miles from its corporate limits

Cooperation Agreement

Gentlemen's Agreement; separate City and County Planning Commissions always meet jointly; City Commission has 16 members - 15 appointed by Mayor with the Mayor ex-officio; County Commission has 16 members - 15 appointed by Chairman of County Board of Supervisors with the Chairman of the Board ex-officio; the Chairman of the City and County Planning Commissions are automatically co-vice-chairmen of the joint commission

Legal Status

City and County Planning Commissions are official - joint commission is unofficial; see Illinois Statutes of 1949, Chapter 24, Article 53 and Chapter 34, Article 152

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $12,000; budget contributed by simple agreement - 50% by City, 50% by County

Staff

2 full-time persons on joint staff; Director and 1 Draftsman-Secretary

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to the individual planning commissions; commissions report directly to their respective governing bodies
WICHITA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, and
SEDGWICK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
City Building, Wichita, Kansas

Director: J. Thomas Via       Est: 1952
Population: 222,300

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, city streets and traffic, farm to market roads, rural zoning legislation, capital budgeting, subdivision controls, general (master) plan, and metropolitan planning

Units Served

City of Wichita and the unincorporated areas of Sedgwick County

Cooperation Agreement

Gentleman's Agreement; there is no joint commission; City and County Planning Commissions meet separately; agreement to cooperate through joint staff is entirely voluntary

Legal Status

City and County Planning Commissions are official; there are no state planning statutes pertaining to joint city-county planning agencies; see General Statutes of Kansas, Annotated (1949), Chapter 12, Article 2, Section 12-701 to 12-706, and Chapter 13, Article 11, Sections 13-1108 to 13-1114

Budget

Total 1952 Budget; not specified; budget contributed by simple agreement - 60% by City, 40% by County

Staff

9 full-time persons and 2 part-time persons on joint staff; Director, 1 Senior Planner, 2 Associate Planners, 1 Planning Assistant, 1 Planning Inspector, 2 Draftsmen, 3 Clerks

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to the individual commissions; commissions report directly to their respective governing bodies
CITY-COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
City Hall, Lexington, Kentucky

Director: William B. Rogers
Population: 100,750

Est: 1948

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include city streets and traffic, arterials, urban and rural zoning legislation, subdivision control and general (master) plan

Units Served

City of Lexington and municipal area of Fayette County - this agency also handles the zoning for the entire County

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 7 members - 3 appointed by Mayor of Lexington, 1 appointed by County Fiscal Court; 3 ex-officio members - Mayor and City Engineer and the County Road Engineer

Legal Status

Official; see Kentucky Revised Statutes (1948); including 1949 Supplement, Chapter 100, Sections 100.010 to 100.990 and Sections 147.130 to 147.180 inclusive

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $10,000; budget contributed by simple agreement - 50% by City - 50% by County

Staff

2 full-time persons; Director and 1 Clerk

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to the joint commission; joint commission reports to the City Board of Commissioners and the County Fiscal Court
LOUISVILLE AND JEFFERSON COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
302 Fiscal Court Building, Louisville, Kentucky

Director: William L. Watts

Population: 404,600

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, arterials, subdivision control, zoning legislation and administration and general (master) plan

Units Served

City of Louisville and the entire area of Jefferson County

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 10 members - 3 members appointed by Mayor of Louisville, 3 members appointed by County Judge; 4 ex-officio members - the Mayor, the City Director of Public Works, the County Judge and the County Road Engineer; appointed members are paid $10 per meeting, not to exceed $250 per year

Legal Status

Official; see Kentucky Revised Statutes (1948), including 1949 Supplyment, Chapter 100, Sections 100.010 to 100.990 and Section 147.130 to 147.180 inclusive

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $110,554; budget contributed by simple agreement - 50% by City, 50% by County; about $15,000 of this budget goes for wages of four full-time zoning enforcement officers

Staff

20 full-time persons; including Director, Community Planner, Secretary, Engineer, Planning Assistant, Zoning Enforcement Officers, Draftsmen, Stenographers and Clerks

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports directly to the City Board of Aldermen and the County Fiscal Court
KENTUCKY, PADUCAH

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PADUCAH AND MUNICIPAL
AREA, MCCrackEN COUNTY, KENTUCKY
(Short Title: Paducah Planning and Zoning Commission)
Paducah, Kentucky

Director: Thomas R. Burleigh  Est: About 1926
Population: 37,000

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land
use, city streets and traffic, urban and rural zoning legislation,
subdivision control and general (master) plan; agency also undertakes
some economic and industrial development planning

Units Served

City of Paducah and the municipal area (3 miles from city limits)
of McCracken County

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 7 members - 3 members
appointed by City Manager of Paducah, 1 member appointed by County
Fiscal Court; 3 ex-officio members - City Manager, City Engineer
and County Engineer

Legal Status

Official; see Kentucky Revised Statutes (1948), including 1949 Supplement,
Chapter 100, Sections 100.010 to 100.990

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $15,500; budget contributed jointly by City and
County on basis of simple agreement - no exact percentage division
specified

Staff

1 full-time person; consultant is hired on a contract basis to prepare
the master plan

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint
commission reports directly to City Board of Commissioners and to the
County Fiscal Court
MARYLAND - NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
8500 Colesville Road, Silver Spring, Maryland

Director: Jesse F. Nicholson

Population: 342,000

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, subdivision control, building inspection, zoning administration, park planning and acquisition, and general (master) plan

Units Served

Suburban portions (surrounding Washington D.C.) of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Maryland

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 6 members - 3 members appointed from each County; all members appointed by Governor of Maryland

Legal Status

Official; see Chapter 448 of the Laws of Maryland of 1927, Chapter 992 of the 1943 Laws and Chapter 1008 of the 1943 Laws

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: not specified; budget derived from:
1. An administrative tax (3¢ per $100 assessed valuation)
2. A park tax (7¢ per $100 in Montgomery County and 5¢ per $100 in Prince George's County)
3. A recreational tax (5¢ per $100 in Montgomery County) for operation and maintenance of recreation program
4. Allocation of portions of improvement bond issues for park acquisition and development in Prince Georges County

Staff

Usually about 20 full-time persons

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports to respective Boards of County Commissioners; agency is a participant in National Capital Regional Planning Council
DETROIT METROPOLITAN AREA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
1002 Cadillac Square Building, Detroit 26, Michigan

Director: T. Ledyard Blakeman
Est: 1947

Population: 3,000,000

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, arterials, transportation, urban and rural zoning legislation; agency also undertakes studies in land and water conservation planning; all studies undertaken are carried out on a metropolitan area basis

Units Served

Wayne, Oakland and Macomb Counties and the 4 eastern townships of Washtenaw County, and all the governmental units included therein. Agency does not operate for the City of Detroit but is in very close contact with the City Planning Commission

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 46 members - 23 representatives of civic, economic and social fields, 23 public officials, all appointed by the Governor of Michigan; metropolitan area divided into Development Areas, and each area has its own joint (city-county, city-township) commission; some members of these local commissions belong to the Regional Commission

Legal Status

Official; see Michigan Legislative Act 281, P.A. 1945 as amended by Act 194, P.A. 1952

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $90,781; budget contributed by Counties on basis of percentage of total metropolitan area population residing in each county; Wayne 55%, Oakland 9%, Macomb 2.5%, Washtenaw 0.4%; State contributes a sum roughly equivalent to one-half that contributed by Wayne County; also some private (industrial) contributions

Staff

17 full-time persons; staff may do planning for local units, or these units may have staffs or consultants of their own. Regional Commission retains consultants at regular intervals

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports directly to the respective County Boards of Supervisors
SAGINAW VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
411 West Michigan Avenue, Lansing 15, Michigan  

Director: Gale H. Gibson  
Population: 650,000  

Est: 1946  

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities  
Land and water conservation planning; agency is devoted to securing Federal, State and local funds for the implementation of flood control and attendant projects that have been developed by the Army Engineers, Fish and Wildlife Service, etc.; these projects were originally coordinated by the staff of this agency  

Units Served  
21 Counties and the 400 units of local government therein, as included in the drainage basin of the Saginaw River - includes the cities of Saginaw, Flint, Bay City, Midland and Owosso and others  

Cooperation Agreement  
Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 26 members - 1 member appointed from each of the 21 counties and from the 5 cities having over 10,000 population; all members appointed by the Governor of Michigan  

Legal Status  
Official; see Michigan Legislative Act 281, P.A. 1945 as amended by Act 194, P.A. 1952  

Budget  
Total 1952 Budget: $12,000; budget contributed by counties on basis of simple agreement; individual percentage contributions vary from 1% to 20%  

Staff  
1 full-time person; Director devotes his time to securing proper legislation, public relations, coordination, etc.  

Position in Governmental Structure  
Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports directly to respective County Boards of Supervisors and City Councils or Managers; Director works directly with Federal, State and local agencies involved
Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; this agency has power to plan, construct, maintain, own and operate bridges, tunnels, airports and terminal facilities; it is an authority; in addition it has all the powers of a "normal" planning agency - land use, development plans, zoning, etc.

Units Served

The City of St. Louis and the Counties of St. Louis, St. Charles and Jefferson in Missouri, and the Counties of Madison, St. Clair and Monroe in Illinois

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 10 members - 5 appointed by Governor of Illinois, 5 appointed by Governor of Missouri; all commissioners must live in Bi-State District

Legal Status

Official; created by "Compact Between Missouri and Illinois creating the Bi-State Development Agency and the Bi-State Metropolitan District"

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $28,000; budget contributed on basis of simple agreement; 50% State of Illinois, 50% State of Missouri

Staff

2 full-time persons; Director and Clerk; all technical work done by consultants

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports directly to the respective state legislatures
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION OF CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
City Hall, Las Vegas, Nevada

Director: William R. Walker
Population: 48,289

Est: 1941

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, city streets and traffic, arterials, rural roadside control, subdivision control

Units Served

City of Las Vegas, City of North Las Vegas and Clark County

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commissions totals 9 members - 3 appointed by City Commission of Las Vegas, 3 appointed by City Council of North Las Vegas, 3 appointed by Clark County Board of County Commissioners

Legal Status

Official; see Nevada Compiled Laws, Supplement 1931 and 1941, Volume 1, Sections 5063 to 5063.35 as amended

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $23,000; budget contributed on basis of simple agreement, Las Vegas 7/15, Clark County 7/15 and City of North Las Vegas 1/15

Staff

3 full-time persons; Director, Senior Planner, Junior Planner, 1 part-time Clerk

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports directly to the respective appointing authorities; Director may work directly with parties requesting services
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION OF RENO, SPARKS AND WASHOE COUNTY
Box 1286, Reno, Nevada

Director: Raymond M. Smith        Est: 1946
Population: 50,205

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, city streets and traffic, arterials, rural roadside control, urban and rural zoning legislation, subdivision control, fringe development, general (master) plan, building code, smoke control and resubdivision

Units Served

City of Reno, City of Sparks and Washoe County

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 13 members - 6 members appointed from City of Reno, 6 appointed from Washoe County, 1 Reno City Councilman serves ex-officio; agency serving as consultant to City of Sparks at this time; in the past the commission has consisted of 9 members - 3 appointed from each participating unit

Legal Status

Official; see Nevada Complied Laws, Supplement 1931 and 1941, Volume 1, Sections 5063 to 5063.35 as amended

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $18,000; budget originally contributed on basis of respective assessed valuations within units but is now based on simple agreement, Reno 45%, Washoe County 45% and City of Sparks 10%

Staff

3 full-time persons; Director, Assistant Director and 1 Draftsman

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports directly to local governing bodies
Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include rural land use, arterials, rural roadside control, rural zoning legislation, economic development, subdivision control, soil productivity, school district studies

Units Served

Monroe County (exclusive of the City of Rochester) and 19 towns and 10 villages included therein

Cooperation Agreement

Mutual Representation Agreement; County Commission totals 13 members - 1 member appointed from Rochester, 1 "at large" member appointed from suburbs of Rochester, 1 member appointed from each of the five townships participating; all members appointed by County Managers; 6 ex-officio members - County Manager, Rochester City Manager, County Legal Counsel, City Commissioner of Public Works, County Director of Public Works and 1 member of the Rochester City Planning Commission

Legal Status

Official; see Consolidated Laws of New York Annotated, Book 23, Article 12-B, Sections 239b to 239f

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $42,500; budget contributed entirely by Monroe County

Staff

5 full-time persons; Director, 4 Draftsmen

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to County Commission; commission reports directly to the County Manager and the County Board of Supervisors
PLANNING FEDERATION OF ONONDAGA COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES
State Tower Building, Syracuse, New York

Director: Sergei Grimm
Population: 341,719

Est: 1946

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; Federation does no planning itself; it is a discussion group devoted to common planning problems, to promotion of community and inter-community planning, to collection and distribution of information on planning and cooperation with state and local agencies in matters affecting the County Master Plan.

Units Served

Membership in the Federation is open to any town, city or village in Onondaga County. Due to its extremely loose-knit nature, the number of communities participating during any one year will fluctuate greatly.

Cooperation Agreement

Gentlemen's Agreement; Federation Board of Trustees consists of one trustee from each of the towns in Onondaga County, one from each of the incorporated villages of the County and three from the City of Syracuse (Mayor, President of Common Council, and Chairman of the City Planning Commission) - exact number of members will vary; there are 37 at present; each of the participating units may or may not have their own planning commission.

Legal Status

Official; see New York State General Municipal Law, Article 12b, Sections 239e and 239f

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: less than $100; budget derived from membership dues - $5 per year for each participating unit

Staff

The Federation has no staff; technical services are provided by staff of Syracuse City Planning Commission as per request

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Federation members are responsible to their respective local governing bodies
Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, housing, city streets and traffic, arterials, urban and rural zoning legislation, subdivision control, fringe development and annexation, and capital improvement programs.

Units Served

City of Winston-Salem, Forsyth County

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 9 members - 7 members appointed by governing bodies of City and County acting jointly; 2 members ex-officio - Mayor and Chairman of County Board of Commissioners.

Legal Status

Official; see State of North Carolina, Session Laws, 1947, Chapter 677, Section 17.

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: not specified; the City bears the entire cost of agency operations and submits a bill for one-half of this cost to the County at the end of the fiscal year.

Staff

6 full-time persons; no staff breakdown given; consultant was retained in 1946-48 to prepare master plan and recommend planning program; this agency is the result of that program.

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission but for "housekeeping" purposes works closely with local officials; joint commission reports directly to local governing bodies.
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
415 The Arcade, Cleveland 14, Ohio

Director: Proctor Noyes

Population: 1,389,500

Est. 1947

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, city streets and traffic, arterials, urban and rural zoning legislation, Subdivision control, fringe development, metropolitan planning.

Units Served

Cuyahoga County and 41 cities and villages therein; the City of Cleveland is represented on the Commission but this agency does not operate within the City except in cooperation with the City Planning Commission.

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 48 members - 1 member appointed from each of the participating units as appointed by the respective city planning commissions, 5 citizen members from the County as appointed by the County Board of Commissioners - total of 43 appointed members; 5 ex-officio members - 3 County Commissioners, County Engineer and County Administrator.

Legal Status

Official; see Ohio General Code, Sections 4366-13 to 19

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $148,500; basic budget contributed 52% by County, 6.9% by participating municipalities; remainder is paid on a per diem basis by municipalities and County for work performed.

Staff

7 full-time persons; staff is divided into two divisions - "Regional" division and Community division with a Senior Planner in charge of each division; rest of staff consists of Director, Draftsmen and Clerks

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports to planning commission of member municipalities; the Regional Commission is the County Planning Commission.
FRANKLIN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
514 South High Street, Columbus 15, Ohio

Director: Grover F. Clemente  Est: 1950
Population: 503,400

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include rural land use, arterials, rural zoning legislation, subdivision control, fringe development, general (master) plan and metropolitan planning

Units Served

Franklin County and 13 cities, towns and villages therein; City of Columbus is represented on Commission but this agency does not operate within the City except in cooperation with the City Planning Commission

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 32 members - 1 member from each participating municipal unit as appointed by the respective city planning commissions, 3 citizens of the City of Columbus and 6 citizens of the County as appointed by the County Board of Commissioners - total of 26 appointed members; 6 ex-officio members - 3 County Commissioners and 3 members appointed from the Columbus City Planning Commission

Legal Status

Official; see Ohio General Code, Sections 4366-13 to 19

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $76,970; basic budget is contributed by all units on basis of 5¢ per capita population; remainder of budget is provided by equal payments by City of Columbus and Franklin County - these equal payments must be at least $30,000 each per year

Staff

8 full-time persons; Director, Chief Planner, Planner, Junior Planner, Statistician, 2 Draftsmen, Clerk; staff may or may not do technical work for member units depending upon whether or not these units have their own staffs

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports to respective planning commissions of member units
TOLEDO - LUCAS COUNTY PLAN COMMISSIONS
322 Ontario Street, Toledo, Ohio

Est: 1932

Director: Robert F. Foeller
Population: 375,000

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, city streets and traffic, farm to market roads, arterials, urban and rural zoning legislation, capital improvements and budgeting, subdivision control, sewers and water drainage, airports, port development, general (master) plan and metropolitan planning

Units Served
City of Toledo and Lucas County (unincorporated areas)

Cooperation Agreement

Mutual Representation Agreement; each participating unit has its own planning commission; City Plan Commission totals 5 members; County Planning Commission totals 11 members, 3 of whom are members of the City Plan Commission; commissions always meet jointly and it has become the practice to elect the same persons to the posts of Chairman and Vice Chairman of the two commissions - thus the city members are always the officers

Legal Status

Official; both commissions are official - their agreement to meet jointly and support a joint staff is voluntary; see Ohio Code annotated (1948 Revision), Volume 2, Chapter 8, Sections 4366-1 to 4366-19

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $96,000; Budget contributed on basis of simple agreement - 50% by City, 50% by County

Staff

Provision for 14 full-time persons; private consultants have recently completed a two and one-half year master plan study

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to the respective commissions; commissions report to the City Council and the County Board of Commissioners
Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, city streets and traffic, arterials, urban and rural zoning legislation, official map, capital improvements and budgeting, subdivision control, fringe developments, general (master) plan and metropolitan planning

Units Served

Lane County, cities of Eugene, Springfield, Junction City, Eugene School District #4, Springfield School District #19, Eugene Water and Electricity Board and the Willamalane Park District

Cooperation Agreement

Gentlemen's Agreement; commission is a voluntary organization composed of one representative from each of the contributing political subdivisions; each of these units has its own planning body and the Central Lane Commission is merely a coordinating body - it does not make any planning decisions

Legal Status

The Central Lane County Planning Commission is a voluntary representative group - there is no provision in Oregon Law for an official joint commission; participating planning bodies are official; see Oregon Compiled Laws Annotated, Volume 6, Chapter 23 and 537 (1947 Laws) and Chapter 137 and 441 (1949 Laws)

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $19,300; contributed by simple agreement; Lane County 29%, Eugene 29%, Springfield 6%, Junction City 1%, Willamalane Park District 2%, Water Board 13% and School Districts 20%

Staff

Technical staff of Lane County Planning Commission performs all services for participants; 3 full-time persons

Positions in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director works with all participating units; members of Central Lane County Planning Commission are responsible to their respective planning commissions or bodies
SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Borough Hall, Bridgeport, Pennsylvania

Director: David B. Longmaid
Est: 1952
Population: 900,000

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities
Physical and land use planning; this agency is very new (active operation begun in July 1952) and to date most of its efforts have been expended upon establishing a program of study and research

Units Served
Bucks, Delaware and Montgomery Counties - these three counties comprise the metropolitan district of Philadelphia in the State of Pennsylvania

Cooperation Agreement
Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 9 members - 3 appointed from each of the three participating County Planning Commissions

Legal Status
Official; see Pennsylvania Statutes Annotated, including 1950 Supplement, Title 16, Article 6, Sections 507.2 to 507.4

Budget
Total 1952 Budget: $30,900; budget contributed by simple agreement - Bucks County 25%, Delaware County 24% and Montgomery County 51%

Staff
4 full-time persons; Executive Secretary, Land Planner, Planning Analyst, Secretary; State Planning Board has done some technical work for this agency ($35,000 in technical services in 1952)

Position in Governmental Structure
Semi-Independent; Director is responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports to respective County Planning Commissions
PENNNSYLVANIA, SHARON

SHENANGO VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
72 Vine Street, Sharon, Pennsylvania

Director: Robert J. Bartels

Population: 65,000

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; this agency is very new (active operations begun in the spring of 1953) and as yet there are no completed studies

Units Served

Cities of Sharon and Farrell, Boroughs of Sharpsville, Wheatland and West Middlesex, townships of Hickory and South Pymatuning

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 18 members; 7 appointed from City of Sharon, 4 appointed from City of Farrell, 2 each appointed from the Borough of Sharpsville and the Township of Hickory, 1 each appointed from the Boroughs of Wheatland and West Middlesex and the Township of South Pymatuning

Legal Status

Official; see Pennsylvania Statutes Annotated, including 1950 Supplement, Title 16, Article 6, Sections 507.2 to 507.4

Budget

Total 1953 Budget: $17,000; budget contributed on basis of 25¢ per capita (approximate); Sharon 50%, Farrell 25% and the other participating units 25%

Staff

3 full-time persons; Director, Chief Planner, Secretary; this staff does the planning for all the participating units

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports directly to the governing bodies of the participating units
CHATTANOOGA-HAMILTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Room 18, Court House, Chattanooga, Tennessee

Director: R.S. Lillard
Population: 208,000

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural zoning legislation, city streets and traffic, farm to market roads, arterials, subdivision control and general (master) plan

Units Served

City of Chattanooga and Hamilton County (unincorporated areas)

Cooperation Agreement

Joint Commission Agreement; commission totals 10 members - 7 members are appointed by the Mayor and the County Judge acting jointly; these members are affirmed by the City Commission and the County Council and are finally approved by the State Planning Commission; 3 ex-officio members - Mayor and Commissioner of City Streets and Sewers and the County Judge

Legal Status

Official; see State of Tennessee Public Acts of 1935, Chapter 43, Section 9 and Chapter 34, Section 1

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $10,000; budget contributed on basis of simple agreement - 50% by City, 50% by County

Staff

2 full-time persons; Director and Draftsman Secretary

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director responsible to joint commission; joint commission reports to Mayor and Board of Commissioners for the City and to the Judge and Members of County Council for the County
CITY OF NASHVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION, and
COUNTY OF DAVIDSON PLANNING COMMISSION
301 City-County Building, Nashville, Tennessee

Director: William A. Pitts

Population: 322,000

Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies in urban and rural land use, city streets and traffic, farm to market roads, urban and rural zoning legislation, capital improvements and budgeting, subdivision control, general (master) plan, and metropolitan planning

Units Served

City of Nashville and County of Davidson

Cooperation Agreement

Mutual Representation Agreement; each participating unit has its own planning commission; City Planning Commission as 4 members appointed by the Mayor with the Mayor serving ex-officio; County Planning Commission has 4 citizen members appointed by the State Planning Board plus the 4 City Planning Commission members plus the County Highway Engineer serving ex-officio

Legal Status

Official; see Tennessee Public Acts of 1935, Chapter 43, Section 9, and Chapter 34, Section 1

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $60,000; budget contributed by simple agreement - 46% by City, 54% by County

Staff

Staff is split into two divisions - City Division and County Division; staff personnel are paid according to the division they are in; 1 Director served both staffs and is known as the Director-Secretary for the City and the Engineer-Secretary for the County - the Director is paid jointly by City and County; combined staffs total 11 full-time persons - 6 for the County and 4 for the City

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director responsible to both commissions; commissions report to their respective local governing bodies

TENNESSEE, NASHVILLE
Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban land use, city streets and traffic, farm to market roads, arterials, urban and rural zoning legislation, capital improvements, economic development, subdivision control and general (master) plan, agency also does some land and water conservation planning including some studies in agricultural drainage.

Units Served

Davis County, 7 Cities, 10 Towns and a School District included therein.

Cooperation Agreement

Gentlemen's Agreement; there is no joint commission or federation; participating city and county commissions voluntarily agree to support a County Planning Commission technical staff.

Legal Status

The County Planning Commission and the participating City Planning Commissions are official; see Utah Code Annotated (1943), including 1949 Supplement, Volume 1, Title 15, Chapter 13, Sections 15-13-1 to 15-13-12.

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: not specified; budget contributed on the basis of a simple agreement with all participating units contributing to the support of the joint technical staff.

Staff

2 full-time persons; Director and Secretary.

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director works directly with participating municipal and County Planning Commissions.
Purpose and Scope of Planning Activities

Physical and land use planning; studies include urban and rural land use, city streets and traffic, farm to market roads, arterials, urban and rural zoning legislation, subdivision control, economic development, fringe development and general (master) plan.

Units Served

Utah County and 15 towns and cities therein (including Provo) and three school districts.

Cooperation Agreement

Gentlemen's Agreement; there is no joint commission or federation; 8 of the participating municipalities have their own official commissions as does the County; the County Commission acts as the planning commission for the other participating municipalities; participating commissions voluntarily agree to support joint technical staff under the direction of the County Planning Commission.

Legal Status

The County and City Planning Commissions are official; see Utah Code Annotated (1943), including 1949 Supplement, Volume 1, Title 15, Chapter 13, Sections 15-13-1 to 15-13-12.

Budget

Total 1952 Budget: $10,500; Utah County sets up a minimum budget for staff operating expenses; all work done for cities and school districts is on a per diem basis; work of general county-wide benefit is paid by the County; basic studies in a city are paid 50% by County and 50% by City.

Staff

2 full-time persons; Director and Secretary.

Position in Governmental Structure

Semi-Independent; Director works directly with participating municipal, school and County Planning Commissions.