

Urban Studies

<http://usj.sagepub.com/>

Prospects for Expanding Regional Planning Efforts in Michigan

Elisabeth R. Gerber and Carolyn G. Loh

Urban Stud published online 25 November 2010

DOI: 10.1177/0042098010380959

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://usj.sagepub.com/content/early/2010/11/24/0042098010380959>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:

Urban Studies Journal Limited

Additional services and information for *Urban Studies* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://usj.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://usj.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Prospects for Expanding Regional Planning Efforts in Michigan

Elisabeth R. Gerber and Carolyn G. Loh

[*Paper first received, November 2009; in final form, June 2010*]

Abstract

This article assesses the potential for expanding regional planning by asking local government officials their perspectives on the potential for increasing regionalism in their communities, and the most promising approaches to achieving greater regionalism. The study involves analysing data from a recent survey of local government officials in Michigan. It is found that support for regional planning declines amongst local officials who are already heavily involved in regional efforts and increases amongst those who perceive greater fiscal challenges. However, local government officials who support expanding regional planning are less supportive of working through existing regional institutions; they prefer to create new regional entities to pursue additional co-operation. Those with experience with regional planning efforts are more supportive of working through existing institutions.

Introduction

For at least the past three decades, researchers, planners, and policy advocates have promoted regional approaches to some government functions, including land use planning, on the grounds of efficiency (Friedmann and Weaver, 1980; Benjamin and Nathan, 2001; Norris, 2001a), equity (Downs, 1994; Jackson, 2000; Powell, 2000; Rusk, 2000) and global economic competitiveness (Norris, 2001a; Mohamed, 2008). At the same time, a lack of regional planning has been implicated in the extensive exurban development seen in the US

and elsewhere, which alarms many planners and environmentalists (Burnley and Murphy, 1995; Lewis, 1996; Norton, 2005). Some of the calls to arms for more regional planning are quite forceful. Peter Calthorpe and William Fulton, for example, assert that

Metropolitan regions that promote and manage growth, educate their populations, and maintain the quality of life will succeed. Those mired in conflict and inaction will fail (Calthorpe and Fulton, 2001, p. xv).

Elisabeth R. Gerber is in the Ford School of Public Policy, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA. E-mail: ergerber@umich.edu.

Carolyn G. Loh is in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, USA. E-mail: cm9329@wayne.edu.

Yet, in the United States, meaningful regional planning efforts have been few and far between, in large part due to the political strength of local governments and their desire for economic and political autonomy (Norris, 2001b; Basolo, 2003). Local control of planning is firmly entrenched in the American political structure and culture, particularly in many eastern and Midwestern states that operate under home rule and/or township forms of government.¹ Local officials often face strong political pressures to resist regional control over planning and other land use decisions, and must balance these political costs against the potential benefits of more efficient and potentially more effective regional planning efforts (Gerber and Gibson, 2009).

Despite the wide popularity of the concept of regional planning, there is some debate over whether regionalism is a desirable goal. The strength and fragmentation of local governments in the US provide strong evidence for Tiebout's hypothesis of a 'market' for localities, where individuals choose among communities with different levels of service provision (Tiebout, 1956). In fact, this fragmentation has been theorised to be "more in keeping with the basic constitutional principles of limited government and separation of powers" (Howell-Moroney, 2008, p. 100).

Beyond the question of whether localities can and should move towards more regional approaches to land use planning and policy, there is also a practical question of how such efforts might be organised. The pervasive pattern of local control, combined with the absence of strong and effective regional governance institutions, creates a serious governance problem for regional planning efforts. Two obvious possibilities exist: create new regional institutions or expand the role of existing regional institutions.² There are advantages and disadvantages to both approaches. Creating new regional institutions allows participants in regional planning efforts to start with a clean slate and

design institutions that are well tailored to the task at hand. At the same time, however, creating new regional institutions may require substantial resources and strong leadership, and involves creating a new layer of bureaucracy. Adapting existing regional institutions may require fewer initial resources, but may result in governance institutions that are less well suited to undertaking the immediate activities required for effective regional planning.

Our research seeks to assess the potential for expanding regional governance in the US by asking local government officials their perspectives on the two sets of questions raised earlier. Our study involves analysing data from a specially designed survey of Michigan local government officials collected in spring 2009 by the University of Michigan, Center for Local, State and Urban Policy's 'Michigan Public Policy Survey' (MPPS). MPPS surveys the top administrative official in a large sample of Michigan counties, cities, villages and townships on a variety of topics, including regional planning. Given the availability of this unique dataset, we limit our analysis to local governments in the state of Michigan. In some respects, Michigan offers a particularly challenging setting for regional planning, since it maintains a strong home rule culture; vests planning authority and service delivery in fragmented local governments and townships;³ offers few state mandates, incentives or resources for regional planning; and enforces several statutes that impede strong regional planning efforts. Despite these barriers, we do see regional planning efforts throughout the state (Gerber *et al.*, 2005). Given that the study focuses on Michigan, we cannot assert with certainty that the results generalise to all US regions, but the results may be similar for contexts that share a similar form of local government and legal structure, in which fragmented local governments control planning and zoning and most regional activities are voluntary.

We are first interested in understanding how involved local governments are in regional planning efforts and whether they themselves perceive value (and if so, what sorts of value) in an expanded role. We ask local political officials to characterise their jurisdiction's involvement in regional planning efforts. We then ask whether they believe that role is too much, just right or not enough. The combination of responses to these two questions tells us a lot about prospects for expanding regional planning activities. If jurisdictions across the board believe there is too little regional planning at present, then efforts to expand these activities are likely to be met with a basic acceptance across jurisdictions. If only those communities with low levels of current involvement say that more regional planning is warranted, there may be natural limits to the capacity for expanding regional efforts. If most communities say that their current involvement is too much, especially those with minimal involvement already, this implies even greater limits on the ability to expand regional planning efforts.

Secondly, we are interested in whether local governments that seek an expanded regional role prefer to achieve regional planning outcomes via new institutions or whether they believe they can achieve their regional planning objectives via existing institutions. To the extent that participants are comfortable working through existing regional institutions, the barriers to expanding regional planning may be lower and fewer resources may be required to initiate new regional planning efforts. When new institutions are required, participants must not only solve the immediate collective action problems inherent in any regional endeavour (Gerber and Gibson, 2009), they must also mobilise additional resources and create the institutions within which their co-operative efforts will take place.

In the analyses that follow, we find widespread support for further regional planning

activities at the local level and moderate support for pursuing those activities through existing regional institutions, even in a strong home rule state with extremely fragmented local governments. We also find strong evidence that troubled local fiscal conditions increase support for regional land use planning, an issue around which there has been a lack of clarity in previous studies. We believe these results are helpful in identifying specific circumstances that are ripe for beginning or expanding regional land use planning involvement. Such efforts may be especially important in today's global economy that requires regions to compete and work proactively to gain a competitive economic advantage.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. In the next section, we briefly review several existing literatures that consider when and why local governments are likely to engage in regional planning. Those literatures form the basis for a series of empirically testable hypotheses. We present our hypotheses and describe the data and empirical models we use to test them. We then present the results of our empirical analyses and end with a discussion of the implications of our research for prospects for expanding regional planning.

Why Co-operate?

Numerous scholars have sought to identify the conditions that increase the probability that a locality will engage in regional co-operation in general and regional planning in particular. Existing research has focused on characteristics of policy problems, communities, local government decision-makers and the public to explain involvement in regional co-operation.

Policy Problems

American local governments provide a wide range of services to their constituents. Researchers have found it useful to differentiate

between service-related or ‘systems maintenance’ functions, such as police, fire and water and sewer, and ‘lifestyle’ functions, such as land use planning, social services and traffic management. Systems maintenance functions tend not to involve ‘spillover’ governance problems, where negative externalities from one community affect its neighbours, and so typically do not threaten local governments’ jurisdictional boundaries (Williams, 1967; Kanarek and Baldassare, 1996; Gainsborough, 2002; Howell-Moroney, 2008). Conversely, ‘lifestyle’ functions often do create such spillover effects, making co-operation around them more difficult (Gainsborough, 2002; Howell-Moroney, 2008). Furthermore, garnering political support for regional collaboration around issues which involve winners and losers (let alone those that involve outright redistribution of resources) is more difficult than it is for those where all parties expect to save money (Nunn and Rosentraub, 1997). It is therefore perhaps not surprising that regional efforts that focus on systems maintenance functions tend to be the most successful in the US (Carr *et al.*, 2009). Regional efforts that do emerge around systems maintenance issues often take the form of single-purpose regional governments, which have been criticised as “shadow regionalism”—that is, an “imperfect and faint representation” of real, comprehensive regionalism, with serious limitations for facilitating meaningful, large-area regional co-operation (Bollens, 1997, p. 119).

Despite the scarcity of regional governments and formal regional governance efforts, co-operative service provision agreements between two or more local units of government are quite common (Thurmaier and Wood, 2002), possibly because of their flexibility and potential impermanence (Leroux and Carr, 2007, p. 345). These efforts may be seen as new forms of governance that attempt to respond to larger processes (such as globalisation) (McCarthy, 2003, p. 141). However, small-area interlocal agreements have been criticised as not really “governing” in the sense of controlling

behaviour (Norris, 2001b, p. 535). Others emphasise that, while collaboration implies true interdependence around a problem, co-operation just means “working jointly with others”, which may be less meaningful (McGuire, 2006, p. 678). Co-operation can also be seen as simply the exercise of localities’ self-interest, without an overarching regional purpose (Axelrod, 1984, p. 6).⁴

Community Characteristics

Well-founded as these criticisms may be, the ubiquity of co-operative agreements and other small-area regional efforts, including those organised around land use planning, makes it worthwhile to explain who participates in these efforts and why. In their recent study of interlocal agreements, Leroux and Carr (2007) find that larger communities and those experiencing higher growth are more likely to engage in interlocal agreements. Neighbouring jurisdictions with similar demographic profiles and political and social preferences are more likely to engage in collaboration, with local officials reporting higher levels of trust that other participants will not renege on agreements (Feiock, 2007, pp. 52, 54). Factors that seem to most strongly influence support for regional economic development efforts include a tradition of regionalism amongst local government officials (such as involvement in another regional strategy), need (limited resources or problems such as high unemployment) and economic similarity among governments (Olberding, 2002, pp. 481–482).

One factor whose role has largely confounded researchers is that of local fiscal capacity (Leroux and Carr, 2007). Several studies find significant effects. Fiscal concerns seem to drive co-operation more often on services where the government has little choice about the quality or quantity of provision, such as water supply (Leroux and Carr, 2007). Thurmaier and Wood (2002, p. 586) find that the most commonly cited reason for

participating in interlocal agreements is economic, especially when it reduces uncertainty (for example, around price or demand for a service). The provision of capital-intensive goods or services (for example, mass transit, water and sewer systems, buildings and equipment, etc.) is particularly likely to spur co-operation by small local governments, as they are better able to achieve economies of scale around such projects (Post, 2002). By contrast, other studies emphasise the importance of non-economic factors (Thurmaier and Wood, 2002).

Local Decision-maker Characteristics

At the level of local decision-makers, Baldassare and his colleagues find that planning directors in California who perceive regional governments as locally responsive and effective in problem solving are more likely to view regional government favourably (Baldassare *et al.*, 1996). In addition, those who favour specific roles for regional government in environmental protection and local growth regulations are more likely to support a multipurpose regional governing body (Baldassare *et al.*, 1996). However, city planners and mayors in California tend to support state involvement rather than regional involvement on lifestyle issues, possibly because they are already used to state involvement in environmental reviews and because regional involvement on such issues is seen as an unnecessary extra layer of government intervention (Kanarek and Baldassare, 1996, p. 100).

Regional efforts can be made or broken on the strength of the individuals involved in creating them, as trust and good personal relationships between local government staff are important for establishing successful interlocal agreements and co-operative planning efforts (Gerber, 2005; Thurmaier, 2006). Although a lack of knowledge about other participants' intentions initially presents a barrier to regional co-operation, once such

co-operation is established, the creation of social capital during the process "provides an incentive to keep people at the table" (Gruber, 1994, p. 3). Pre-existing relationships reduce uncertainty, thereby reducing the transaction costs of co-operation (Feiock, 2007, p. 56). Regional norms around co-operation and collaboration also strongly affect the likelihood of the formation of regional governance structures (Olberding, 2002).

Constituent Characteristics

At the level of individual citizens, one study finds that liberals, Whites, those who think sprawl is a problem and those who are satisfied with local services are more likely to report support for regional land use policies in public opinion surveys (Mohamed, 2008). Another study confirms that those who find sprawl to be a local problem are more likely to support regional planning efforts and also finds that African Americans, Latinos and college graduates tend to be more supportive of such efforts (Wassmer and Lascher, 2006).

Hypotheses

Our research questions and review of the literature lead to the following empirically testable hypotheses. The first relates to the potential value of small-area interlocal agreements in cultivating support for regional planning efforts

- H₁: Communities that participate in interlocal agreements are more likely to support co-operation on land use planning.

We hypothesise that small-area interlocal agreements may set the stage for more far-reaching regional efforts, either in terms of area or scope. Participation in interlocal agreements may provide opportunities for local actors to develop familiarity and trust with potential planning partners, factors that

several of the researchers already discussed find to be critical in initiating co-operation on land use matters. However, existing evidence for this hypothesis is inconclusive (Leroux and Carr, 2007; Howell-Moroney, 2008). Howell-Moroney insists that

those who advocate regional governance, or new regionalism, have ... erroneously mistaken the extensive co-operation around service problems as evidence that there is potential for co-operation around spillovers (Howell-Moroney, 2008, p. 105).

However, he and others suggest that growth management may in fact be the one 'lifestyle' issue for which enough widespread support exists to drive regional efforts (Orfield, 1997; Feiock 2007, p. 55; Howell-Moroney, 2008, p. 105). Our analysis allows us to test this hypothesis against the null hypothesis of no effect and the alternative of a negative relationship between participation in interlocal agreements and support for regional planning.

Our second hypothesis concerns the potential relationship between current levels of regional planning and support for additional regional efforts

— H₂: Communities that already participate in some regional land use planning efforts will support additional regional planning efforts.

This hypothesis parallels H₁. Involvement in small-area regional planning efforts (such as joint planning commissions or sub-county councils of governments) has the potential to increase familiarity and trust amongst potential partners and lay the groundwork for expanded regional efforts. Conversely, the opposite may be true: there may be a low natural 'threshold' of regional planning activity that local participants quickly meet, or involvement in regional planning efforts may produce animosity or reveal hidden costs of co-operation (Gruber, 1994, p. 10),

thereby resulting in less support for additional regional planning efforts.

Hypothesis 3 picks up on the focus in the literature on fiscal conditions and applies it to support for regional planning

— H₃: Communities experiencing or anticipating fiscal stress are more likely to be interested in co-operation on land use planning.

Although communities often cite economic concerns as motivation for co-operation, the evidence from the literature is again inconclusive as to exactly what effects fiscal stress may have on willingness to join regional efforts (Nunn and Rosentraub, 1997; Thurmaier and Wood, 2002; Leroux and Carr, 2007). The literature does not directly address whether fiscal stress can make collaboration on lifestyle (as opposed to systems maintenance) issues more attractive. Although capital-intensive projects tend to attract more collaboration because of obvious economies of scale, it is not clear where processes (rather than products), such as planning, where communities pay for expertise, fit into this picture. Certainly, some economies of scale would be possible from regional planning efforts—for example, in producing maps and conducting public participation processes.

Our final hypothesis concerns support for existing versus new institutions as a way of pursuing additional regional planning efforts

— H₄: Communities currently involved in regional planning efforts are more likely to want to work through existing institutions in future regional planning efforts.

We expect that, both because of the establishment of regional norms around collaboration (Olberding, 2002) and because of issues of trust (Gruber, 1994; Gerber, 2005; Thurmaier, 2006) and inertia (Abbott, 2005), communities that already participate in some regional efforts are more likely to want to use the

institutions with which they have existing relationships in any future regional planning efforts. As with our earlier discussion of H₂, we recognise that the opposite may also occur: involvement in regional planning efforts may sour participants towards the institutions in which they work and lead them to support new institutions as the basis of expanded regional planning efforts.

Data and Methods

We test these hypotheses with data from a unique survey of local government officials in Michigan. The data were collected as part of the 'Michigan Public Policy Survey' or MPPS, a semi-annual web-based survey of local elected and appointed officials in Michigan's cities, villages, townships and counties. The MPPS is conducted by the University of Michigan's Center for Local, State and Urban Policy, in collaboration with the Michigan Municipal League, Michigan Township Association and

Michigan Association of Counties, and is partially funded by the Kellogg Foundation.

The data for this study were collected during the spring 2009 wave of the MPPS. An e-mail was sent to the top elected official in each of the 1859 general-purpose governments, as well as the top appointed official in each jurisdiction that has one.⁵ The e-mail invited officials to participate in the survey and provided a link to a web-based version of the survey instrument.⁶ Those units for whom a current e-mail address was not obtained received an invitation by U.S. mail and all respondents were given the opportunity to request a hard copy of the survey. Officials received two follow-up e-mails; targeted phone calls were also made to ensure adequate sub-sample sizes across regions, jurisdiction type and size. The final sample includes useable responses from 1591 respondents in a total of 1204 unique jurisdictions for an overall response rate of 65 per cent (for jurisdictions) and 45 per cent (for respondents). Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the sample.

Table 1. Summary statistics, MPPS survey, Michigan local governments, spring 2009

Variable	N	Mean	S.D.	Minimum	Maximum
City	1591	0.18	0.38	0	1
Village	1591	0.084	0.28	0	1
County	1591	0.038	0.19	0	1
Township	1591	0.60	0.49	0	1
Median income/1000	1591	43.48	14.20	17.47	170.79
Part-time employees	1591	29.89	47.87	0	640
Southeast MI	1591	0.20	0.40	0	1
Support for more RP	1025	0.42	0.53	-1	1
Interlocal: total	994	4.81	1.89	0	7
Interlocal: systems	1101	3.048	1.062	0	4
Interlocal: lifestyle	1071	1.82	1.056	0	3
Joint planning	1481	0.30	0.46	0	1
County COG	1481	0.24	0.43	0	1
County-led RP	1481	0.29	0.46	0	1
Multicounty COG	1481	0.13	0.34	0	1
Regional planning	1481	0.97	1.072	0	4
Support for existing institutions	959	0.72	0.45	0	1
Bad fiscal outlook	1260	0.68	0.47	0	1
Trust in local government	1442	2.73	0.74	0	4
Republican	1591	0.41	0.49	0	1
Male	1427	0.59	0.49	0	1
Tenure	1418	8.97	8.70	1	46

Our analysis proceeds in several steps. First, we explore our four hypotheses by conducting multivariate regression-type analyses on each of the four hypothesised relationships, controlling for a variety of potentially intervening factors. We then specify and estimate a multi-equation model that links several of the individual relationships. This more complex causal structure allows us to estimate the separate direct and indirect influences of our independent variables on our two main outcomes of interest: support for higher levels of regional planning and support for working through existing institutions.

Empirical Models, Variables and Methods

To test hypothesis 1, we estimate a multivariate regression-type model in which the dependent variable is whether the respondent believes the level of regional planning in his/her community is not enough, just right, or too much, and the main independent variable is the number of interlocal agreements currently in force in the respondent's community, based on his/her survey responses. This dependent variable is named *More plan* in the tables. Since *More plan* contains three discrete but ordered values (not enough, just right, and too much), we employ an ordered probit analysis that appropriately captures the assumed underlying probability model.⁷

The main independent variable in our test of hypothesis 1 is the number of interlocal agreements currently in effect in the respondent's community (*Interlocal: total*). The MPPS survey asked respondents to indicate whether their jurisdiction was very involved, somewhat involved, or not at all involved in intergovernmental or regional efforts in eight policy areas: land use planning, transport/public transit, police services, fire services, utilities/water/waste, parks/recreation/libraries/culture, economic development, and emergency preparedness. We construct a

variable that counts the number of policy areas, excluding land use planning, in which a particular jurisdiction is either somewhat involved or very involved. The resulting variable ranges from 0 to 7, with a mean value of 4.81 across respondents. According to hypothesis 1, we expect the coefficient on *Interlocal: total* to be positively signed. To account for possible differences in interlocal agreements formed to manage systems maintenance versus lifestyle services, we also construct two separate variables from these data: *Interlocal: systems* (which includes police, fire, utilities/water/waste, and emergency preparedness) and *Interlocal: lifestyle* (which includes transport/public transit, parks/recreation/libraries/culture, and economic development).

Our tests of hypotheses 2 and 3 utilise the same dependent variable (support for more regional planning or *More plan*) in separate ordered probit regressions; each includes a different main independent variable. To test hypothesis 2, the main independent variable is the number of regional planning efforts in which a jurisdiction is currently involved. MPPS respondents were asked to indicate which of the following their jurisdiction is currently involved in: partnerships or joint planning efforts with one or more neighbouring communities; council of governments within their county; county-led planning efforts; and multicounty council of governments. The resulting variable (*Regional planning*) ranges from 0 to 4, with a sample mean of 0.97.

To test hypothesis 3, the main independent variable is a measure of the respondent's expectation of future fiscal conditions. The variable is based on a question in MPPS which asked whether the respondent thinks that, during the next 12 months, his/her community will have good times financially, bad times financially, or neither. The variable is coded 'one' if the respondent reported 'bad times' and is coded 'zero' if he/she reported 'good times' or 'neither'. Perhaps not surprisingly, given

Michigan's fiscal conditions during spring 2009, 68 per cent of respondents reported 'bad times'.

To control for other factors that might also affect a respondent's support for additional regional planning, we include a number of variables measuring community characteristics, including dummy variables for cities, villages, and counties (with townships as the omitted category); median household income; percentage White; natural log of population; percentage under 18; percentage over 65; percentage with bachelor's degree; percentage with graduate degree; median property tax; number of full-time employees; number of part-time employees; and percentage of county voting for the Democratic presidential candidate in 2008.⁸

Our test of hypothesis 4 requires a different dependent variable: support for existing regional institutions (*Existing*). MPPS respondents were presented with the following question: 'If your jurisdiction were to engage in a new regional land use planning effort, do you believe that existing organizations in your region—such as the county government, a metropolitan planning organization, a regional council, or a joint planning commission—have the capacity to engage in those efforts, or do you think a new organization would be required?' Responses that indicated 'existing organization(s) have the capacity' were coded 'one,' while those that indicated 'a new regional planning organization would be needed' were coded 'zero'. Given this binary dependent variable, we utilise a simple probit regression model.

The independent variables to test hypothesis 4 include measures of current regional planning activities. In one specification, we include binary measures of each of the four current regional planning efforts described earlier in the context of hypothesis 2. In an alternative specification, we include the same summary variable of the number of current regional planning efforts identified.

We also include the variable *More plan* to capture whether the respondent feels that his/her community ought to engage in more regional planning; control variables indicating whether the jurisdiction is a city, village or county (again, with township as the omitted/comparison category); and whether the jurisdiction is located in southeast Michigan.⁹

Results

Table 2 reports our estimates of the relationships described in H₁, H₂ and H₃. Each column corresponds to the results from a separate ordered probit regression in which the dependent variable is our measure of support for more regional planning (*More plan*), and the main independent variables measure participation in interlocal service agreements, involvement in regional planning efforts and perceived fiscal stress, respectively.¹⁰

Columns 2 and 3 report the estimates of our test of H₁. The results show no support for H₁. The estimated effect of participation in collaborative service delivery is negative, contrary to our hypothesis, and is not significant.¹¹ In other words, localities that report higher levels of participation in interlocal agreements are less supportive of additional regional planning efforts; however, our confidence in these estimates is low and we cannot confidently differentiate these small negative effects from zero. In column 3, we see that neither of the separate interlocal variables (for systems maintenance and lifestyle services) is significant. Interestingly, the coefficient on *Interlocal: lifestyle* is negative, suggesting that experience with those arrangements (which are the most similar to regional planning) make jurisdictions less supportive of additional regional planning. The coefficient on *Interlocal: systems* is positive, with those arrangements making jurisdictions more supportive of additional regional planning. However, neither of those separate interlocal coefficients is significant.

Table 2. Support for regional planning: ordered probit regression estimates, Michigan local governments, spring 2009

<i>Variable</i>	<i>H</i> ₁ (n = 761)	<i>H</i> ₁ (n = 761)	<i>H</i> ₂ (n = 1025)	<i>H</i> ₃ (n = 911)	<i>Combined</i> (n = 681)
Interlocal: total	−0.014 (0.026)				0.014 (0.029)
Interlocal: systems		0.044 (0.053)			
Interlocal: lifestyle		−0.074 (0.055)			
Regional planning			−0.19*** (0.035)		−0.16*** (0.046)
Bad fiscal outlook				0.22** (0.086)	0.28** (0.10)
City	0.43*** (0.11)	0.45*** (0.11)	0.44*** (0.10)	0.39*** (0.11)	0.46*** (0.12)
Village	0.37** (0.15)	0.38** (0.16)	0.33** (0.14)	0.33** (0.14)	0.44** (0.17)
County	−0.020 (0.24)	0.011 (0.24)	0.15 (0.22)	0.032 (0.22)	0.065 (0.25)
Median HH income	−0.0065** (0.0033)	−0.0066** (0.0033)	−0.0051* (0.0029)	−0.0056* (0.0030)	−0.0053 (0.0034)
Part-time employees	0.0020* (0.0011)	0.0019* (0.0011)	0.0021** (0.00093)	0.0016* (0.0009)	0.0017 (0.0011)
Cut 1	−2.36*** (0.22)	−2.30*** (0.23)	−2.38*** (0.17)	−2.01*** (0.18)	−2.21*** (0.24)
Cut 2	−0.039 (0.19)	0.02 (0.20)	−0.096 (0.14)	0.23 (0.16)	0.14 (0.22)

Notes: standard errors in parentheses. * p < 0.10; ** p < 0.05; *** p < 0.01; two-tailed test.

By contrast, several of the control variables are significant: cities and villages report more support for regional planning relative to townships. Jurisdictions with higher median income are less supportive, while those with more part-time employees are more supportive. None of the other control variables is significant in these or any of the other regressions and they are dropped from the analyses.

The ordered probit results reported in column 4 show our test of H₂. The dependent variable is again support for increasing regional planning; the primary independent variable is a count of the jurisdiction's current regional planning efforts. Control variables are the same as in the previous model. The results in column 4 show that participation in

regional planning efforts is negatively related to support for additional regional planning. In other words, officials in jurisdictions that are already heavily involved in regional planning are less likely to report that their level of involvement is 'not enough' and are more likely to report that their involvement is 'just right' or 'too much'. This is contrary to H₂; rather than creating demand for expanded regional planning activities, it appears that once local governments become active participants in regional planning efforts, they are less likely to see the need for still more such regional planning. Local units that are not currently involved are the ones who welcome more regional planning. Of course, there are several possible explanations for this effect.

One possibility is that current participants have had negative experiences with regional planning. A second possibility is that they have had positive experiences but simply feel they are already receiving whatever benefits might accrue from co-operation. From the existing data, we cannot distinguish between these two possibilities. The effects of jurisdiction type, income and staff size are significant and similar to the previous regressions.

Column 5 reports the results of our test of H_3 . The independent variable of interest is our measure of the respondent's expectations of next year's fiscal conditions. As explained earlier, this variable is created from a survey question which asks whether the respondent expects the community to experience good times, bad times or neither during the next 12 months. The variable is a dummy variable scored one if the respondent said 'bad times' and scored zero if he/she said 'good times' or 'neither'. This effect is positive and significant, indicating that officials in local units who expect fiscal stress are more willing to turn to regional planning, presumably to achieve cost savings and economic efficiencies, than those who are more optimistic about their fiscal situation.

In column 6, we include all of the independent variables from the previous regressions to test the marginal effect of each of our hypothesised relationships, controlling for the effects of the other relationships. As in the individual regressions, we find little support for H_1 , evidence contrary to H_2 and confirming support for H_3 .

Table 3 reports the results of our test of H_4 . The dependent variable measures support for working through existing regional planning institutions, created from the survey question described earlier. Column 2 reports probit estimates for the full model, including four separate indicator variables for whether the jurisdiction currently participates in various regional planning efforts. Column 3 substitutes those four indicator variables with a count of

current regional planning efforts. Since many existing regional planning efforts in Michigan are led or dominated by county governments, columns 4 and 5 omit responses from county officials and restricts the sample to cities, villages and townships.

The results in column 2 show that participation in some forms of regional planning is positively and significantly related to support for existing institutions. Specifically, respondents from jurisdictions that are engaged in county-led planning efforts and those conducted within multicounty councils of governments are more likely to report support for existing institutions, while those who report working in joint planning efforts with one or more neighbouring communities or in single-county councils of governments are not significantly different from their counterparts who do not participate.¹² These results are consistent with H_4 . When responses to these four participation questions are combined into a count variable in column 3, the effect is positive and significant, indicating that higher levels of participation in regional planning efforts are associated with greater support for existing institutions.

The results in columns 2 and 3 also show that support for more regional planning is associated with lower support for existing regional institutions. In other words, those who report that the level of regional planning in their communities is not enough are less likely to see existing institutions as having the capacity to take on additional regional planning activities. We also find that respondents who report higher levels of trust in local government are more likely to support existing institutions.¹³ Together, these results imply that a lack of confidence in the capacity of existing institutions and a lack of trust in the local governments who participate in those institutions may be major barriers preventing the expansion of regional planning efforts. Finally, cities are less supportive of existing institutions, while respondents from

Table 3. Support for existing regional institutions: probit regression estimates, Michigan local governments, spring 2009

Variable	<i>H</i> ₄			
	All jurisdictions (n = 801)	All jurisdictions (n = 801)	No counties (n = 761)	No counties (n = 761)
Joint planning	0.082 (0.11)	—	0.061 (0.11)	—
County COG	-0.036 (0.11)	—	-0.021 (0.12)	—
County-led regional effort	0.38*** (0.11)	—	0.40** (0.11)	—
Multicounty COG	0.29** (0.15)	—	0.25* (0.16)	—
Regional planning - total	— (0.048)	0.16** (0.048)	— (0.050)	0.16** (0.050)
Support for more planning	-0.59*** (0.099)	-0.59*** (0.098)	-0.59*** (0.10)	-0.59*** (0.10)
Local government trust	0.14* (0.071)	0.13* (0.070)	0.15** (0.072)	0.14* (0.072)
City	-0.23* (0.12)	-0.23* (0.12)	-0.23* (0.12)	-0.23* (0.12)
Village	0.13 (0.19)	0.14 (0.19)	0.14 (0.19)	0.14 (0.19)
County	-0.063 (0.24)	-0.022 (0.23)	— (0.23)	— (0.23)
Southeast Michigan	0.19 (0.13)	0.21* (0.13)	0.21* (0.13)	0.23* (0.13)
Constant	0.36* (0.22)	0.38* (0.22)	0.33 (0.22)	0.36 (0.22)

Notes: standard errors in parentheses. * p < 0.10; ** p < 0.05; *** p < 0.01; two-tailed test.

jurisdictions in the more densely populated southeast region of the state (which contains the Detroit metropolitan area) are more supportive. We speculate that support for existing institutions amongst southeast Michigan respondents may result, at least in part, from the prevalence and diversity of existing institutions in that region. Interestingly, numerous observers note that the metro Detroit region poses vexing challenges due to its severe and persistent racial segregation and lack of regional leadership (Rossman-McKinney, 2007). The results reported here present some reason for optimism.

The results in columns 4 and 5, which omit counties and are limited to cities,

villages and townships, mirror the results in columns 2 and 3. Respondents whose cities/villages/townships are involved in county-led planning efforts, and to a lesser degree multicounty council of governments' planning efforts, are more supportive of existing institutions. Those who believe that the current level of planning is not enough are less supportive, while those who report higher levels of trust in local governments are more supportive of existing institutions.

The results in Tables 2 and 3 show a great deal of overlap. Several of the same factors—particularly jurisdiction type and the number of regional planning efforts—are posited as independent variables in both

sets of equations and one factor—support for more regional planning activities—is conceived as both a dependent variable in some of the estimations and as an independent variable in others. One serious concern with this initial analysis is that it is unclear how the numerous factors fit together. Does support for expanded regional planning efforts affect support for existing institutions directly, as implied in our model specifications in Tables 2 and 3, or are the factors which determine support for more regionalism (i.e. jurisdiction type, experience with regional planning, fiscal stress and population characteristics) really driving support for existing institutions through their indirect effects? We investigate this possibility by combining our two equations and estimating them as a hierarchical system of equations, treating support for more regional planning as an included endogenous variable (Gelbach, 2009). Since support for existing institutions is coded as a binary outcome variable, we use the instrumental variables probit command (ivprobit) in Stata 9.3 to estimate our model.

Instrumental variables probit estimates two related equations using maximum likelihood. It estimates a reduced form equation for the included endogenous variable (in our case, *More plan*) which includes all of the independent variables in both equations. The predicted value from that estimation represents an estimate of *More plan* ‘purged’ of the effects of the independent variables. That predicted value is used as an independent variable in the structural estimation of the equation for *Existing*. The coefficient on this predicted value for *More plan* is interpreted as the effect of support for more planning on support for existing institutions, purged of any effects of the independent variables on *More plan*.¹⁴ Results are reported in Table 4.

The second column of Table 4 reports the reduced form estimates for *More plan*. It includes the independent variables from Table 2, as well as a number of personal characteristics of the respondents (including partisanship, gender and tenure in office). While these personal characteristics are not to be interpreted as necessarily affecting a jurisdiction’s support for additional regional

Table 4. Support for existing regional institutions: instrumental variables probit estimates (MLE), Michigan local governments, spring 2009 ($N = 542$)

Variable	Support for regional planning (reduced form estimation)	Support for existing institutions (structural estimation)
Support for more planning	—	-0.70 (0.73)
Regional planning	-0.058** (0.021)	0.18** (0.080)
Local government trust	-0.055* (0.033)	0.12 (0.10)
City	0.21*** (0.054)	-0.21 (0.22)
Village	0.21** (0.076)	0.14 (0.26)
County	0.11 (0.092)	0.12 (0.28)
Southeast Michigan	-0.078 (0.052)	0.26* (0.15)
Interlocal: total	-0.0074 (0.014)	—
Bad fiscal outlook	0.11** (0.046)	—
Republican	-0.067** (0.045)	—
Male	-0.068 (0.052)	—
Tenure	-0.0061** (0.0029)	—
Constant	0.59*** (0.14)	0.38 (0.55)
Wald test		$\chi^2(1) = 0.04$

Notes: standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$; two-tailed test.

planning, they are included to improve the fit (and hence the validity of the predicted value) of the reduced form equation.

The third column shows our probit estimates for support for existing institutions (*Existing*). The independent variables are the subset of significant independent variables from Table 3, except for *More plan*, which is instead the predicted value from the reduced form equation reported in column 2. We see that, after accounting for the indirect effects of the independent variables on *More plan*, it no longer has a significant effect on support for existing institutions. In other words, jurisdictions that favour more regional planning are no more or less supportive of existing institutions. Rather, the important factor is whether they are currently engaged in regional planning efforts. Examining the other coefficients in column 3, trust in local governments remains positive but is now insignificant. Differences between jurisdiction types become insignificant, while respondents from southeast Michigan remain somewhat more likely to support existing institutions.

Discussion

What factors determine support for regional planning and existing regional planning institutions, and how do those factors inter-relate? Our analysis of survey responses from local government officials in Michigan suggest that there is ample room for expansion, but that officials differ in their views of the best way to pursue new regional planning initiatives. Over 43 per cent of local officials surveyed report that their jurisdiction's involvement in regional planning is 'not enough', while only 2 per cent report that their involvement is 'too much' (the remainder report 'just right'). Officials who are currently less involved in regional planning and who perceive greater fiscal stress are more likely to favour expanded regional planning. Demographic characteristics appear to be less relevant. Officials

from cities and villages are more supportive of regional planning than respondents from townships. This is not surprising, given that counties and townships, originated as "arbitrarily designed administrative units", provide limited services and tend to embody a culture of limited government, whereas cities and villages "formed when people came together to organize a governmental entity to provide a higher level of services" (Citizens Research Council, 1999, p. 5). Thus one can expect the greatest support for regional planning to come from communities with greater fiscal need and fewer existing regional opportunities.

How they go about expanding their regional planning activities, though, is a matter for debate. Of respondents, 72 per cent report support for existing institutions, while 28 per cent believe that new institutions are necessary to expand regional planning efforts. This may be good news for advocates of regional planning, since the costs of expanding the scope of existing institutions may be lower, in terms of time, money and political capital, than creating new institutions. However, those communities that support existing institutions are likely already to be involved in regional planning activities and to be from southeast Michigan, where numerous regional planning efforts already exist. Those who are most supportive of expanded regional planning activities—jurisdictions that are not already involved in regional planning efforts and that are located outside the Detroit metro area—may require new institutions to engage them in the regional planning process.

Conclusion

The 'new regionalism' called for in the 1990s and early 2000s, with its emphasis on regional co-operation and holistic governance around economic, environmental and social issues (Calthorpe and Fulton, 2001; Wheeler, 2002, p. 270) has not yet come to pass, except in a

few notable locations (Norris, 2001b; Basolo, 2003). Large-area regional governance and planning has, thus far, failed to catch on, even among communities that would seem to have every incentive to support it (such as central cities and ageing inner-ring suburbs) (Orfield, 1997). In this study, we turned our attention first to more incremental interlocal and small regional efforts, because we originally suspected that these efforts might eventually be the 'gateway' to expanded forms of regional governance. Although we did not find evidence to support this particular idea—it turned out that participation in interlocal agreements appeared unrelated to interest in regional land use planning and that officials in communities that already participate in regional planning efforts are not terribly interested in expanding that participation—we did find some patterns that raise interesting and positive possibilities for future regional planning efforts.

One issue of particular salience right now is that officials in communities that are experiencing fiscal stress tend to be more supportive of participation in regional land use planning, presumably on efficiency grounds. As many local governments find themselves under strain due to eroding tax-base, opportunities may arise for co-operation that would not have been possible in better economic times. Another important finding is that officials in communities that are already participating in regional planning efforts tend to be satisfied both with their involvement and with the institutions leading the process. In other words, there may be a 'if you try it, you like it' effect going on (although the causal direction is not entirely clear here). These results suggest that, if local government officials are enticed into regional planning efforts by economic circumstances, those regional relationships and structures may endure after the crisis has passed, changing institutional norms for the long term. Finally, officials from communities that are 'regionally underserved' in terms of

institutions and/or planning efforts, express interest in expanding their involvement in regional land use planning.

Future research in this area should focus both on what factors influence officials to take the first step in regional planning involvement (for example, is it a relationship with another official, a specific economic event or budget process, citizen interest, etc.) and barriers to participation in regional planning.

Notes

1. In states with home rule and/or township government, land use authority is devolved to many small, decentralised local governments.
2. Other, more informal efforts, such as grassroots task forces, may accompany the formal regional planning efforts that are the focus of this research study.
3. Townships are unincorporated county subdivisions, found in many Midwestern states. They have fewer service provision requirements than do cities. In Michigan and several other home rule states, townships are empowered to conduct their own planning and zoning activities.
4. McGuire (2006) discusses the wide range of intergovernmental interactions, from co-ordination to co-operation to collaboration to consolidation. Each form of interaction involves a different level of commitment, action, formality and institutionalisation.
5. Many townships have no permanent staff; elected officials are responsible for the unit's on-going administrative and governmental functions.
6. Detailed information on the survey is available at: <http://closup.umich.edu/research/projects/mpps/mpps.php>.
7. Specifically, ordered probit assumes that the underlying probability model is normal and that the outcome values are ordered but not necessarily measured as equal intervals. The ordered probit command in Stata 9.3 estimates a single set of probit coefficient estimates and two cut-points that segment the underlying probability space.
8. Demographic variables are from American FactFinder, US Census, 2000.

9. The seven-county metro Detroit region contains approximately 40 per cent of the state's 10 million residents and 239 of its 1859 local governments. Perhaps most relevant to the current analysis, it has been the focus of numerous high-profile regional governance and regional planning efforts.
10. We obtain similar results, in terms of sign and statistical significance, when we estimate the model using ordinary least squares.
11. In separate analyses, we included each of the seven service delivery areas as separate indicator variables. Six of the seven effects were insignificant; the coefficient on police was positive and significant at $p < 0.10$.
12. Interestingly, the four forms of regional planning are all positively correlated, but none of the correlations between any two forms of participation exceeds 0.23. All are negatively correlated with *More plan*.
13. The *Local government trust* variable is created from an MPPS survey question which asked 'How much of the time do you think you can trust other local governments to do what is right?'. Responses are scored 4 (nearly always); 3 (most of the time); 2 (some of the time); 1 (seldom); and 0 (almost never). The variable takes on a mean value of 2.73 in the sample.
14. IV Probit assumes one binary dependent variable and one continuous dependent variable. Although *More plan* takes on only three values, we treat it as a continuous variable in this estimation. We find that the signs and levels of significance from this estimation are roughly the same as the ordered probit estimates reported in Table 2.

References

- Abbott, J. (2005) Understanding and managing the unknown: the nature of uncertainty in planning, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24, pp. 237–251.
- Axelrod, R. (1984) *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Baldassare, M., Hassol, J., Hoffman, W. and Kanarek, A. (1996) Possible planning roles for regional government: a survey of city planning directors in California, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 62(1), pp. 17–29.
- Basolo, V. (2003) US regionalism and rationality, *Urban Studies*, 40(3), pp. 447–462.
- Benjamin, G. and Nathan, R. P. (2001) *Regionalism and Realism: A Study of Governments in the New York Metropolitan Area*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Bollens, S. A. (1997) Fragments of regionalism: the limits of southern California governance, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 19(1), pp. 105–122.
- Burnley, I. and Murphy, P. (1995) Exurban development in Australia and the United States: through a glass darkly, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 14, pp. 245–254.
- Calthorpe, P. and Fulton, W. (2001) *The Regional City: Planning for the End of Sprawl*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Carr, J. B., Gerber, E. R. and Lipher, E. W. (2009) Explaining horizontal and vertical cooperation in Michigan, in: R. W. Jelier and G. Sands (Eds) *Sustaining Michigan*, pp. 207–236. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Citizens Research Council (1999) *A bird's eye view of Michigan local government at the end of the twentieth century*. Report No. 326, Citizens Research Council of Michigan.
- Downs, A. (1994) *New Visions for Metropolitan America*. Harrisonburg, VA: R. R. Donnelly.
- Feiock, R. C. (2007) Rational choice and regional governance, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 29(1), pp. 47–63.
- Friedmann, J. and Weaver, C. (1980) *Territory and Function: The Evolution of Regional Planning*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gainsborough, J. (2002) Slow growth and urban sprawl: support for a new regional agenda, *Urban Affairs Review*, 37(5), pp. 728–744.
- Gelbach, J. B. (2009) PROBITIV: Stata module to perform instrumental variables probit (<http://ideas.repec.org/c/boc/bocode/s371401.html#provider>; accessed 9 November 2009).
- Gerber, E. R., Bates, E., Ivacko, T. and Woolery, M. (2005) *Regional planning in Michigan: challenges and opportunities of intergovernmental cooperation*. Policy Report No. 3, CLOSUP, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, May (<http://closup.umich.edu/files/pr-3-reg-gov.pdf>).
- Gerber, E. R. and Gibson, C. C. (2009) Balancing regionalism and localism: how institutions and incentives shape American transportation

- policy, *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(3), pp. 633–648.
- Gruber, J. (1994) *Coordinating growth management through consensus-building: incentives and the generation of social, intellectual, and political capital*. Working Paper No. 617, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California at Berkeley.
- Howell-Moroney, M. (2008) The Tiebout hypothesis 50 years later: lessons and lingering challenges for metropolitan governance in the 21st century, *Public Administration Review*, 68(1), pp. 97–109.
- Jackson, K. T. (2000) Gentleman's agreement: discrimination in metropolitan America, in: B. Katz (Ed.) *Reflections on Regionalism*, pp. 185–217. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Kanarek, A. and Baldassare, M. (1996) Preferences for state and regional planning efforts among California mayors and city planning directors, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 16, pp. 93–102.
- Leroux, K. and Carr, J. (2007) Explaining local government cooperation on public works: evidence from Michigan, *Public Works Management and Policy*, 12(1), pp. 344–358.
- Lewis, P. G. (1996) *Shaping Suburbia: How Political Institutions Organize Urban Development*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- McCarthy, L. (2003) The good of the many outweighs the good of the one: regional cooperation instead of individual competition in the United States and western Europe?, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 23, pp. 140–152.
- McGuire, M. (2006) Intergovernmental management: a view from the bottom, *Public Administration Review*, 66(5), pp. 677–679.
- Mohamed, R. (2008) Who would pay for rural open space preservation and inner-city redevelopment? Identifying support for policies that can contribute to regional land use governance, *Urban Studies*, 45(13), pp. 2783–2803.
- Norris, D. F. (2001a) Prospects for regional governance under the new regionalism: economic imperatives versus political impediments, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 23(5), pp. 557–571.
- Norris, D. F. (2001b) Whither metropolitan governance?, *Urban Affairs Review*, 36, pp. 532–550.
- Norton, R. K. (2005) Striking the balance between environment and economy in coastal North Carolina, *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 48(2), pp. 177–207.
- Nunn, S. and Rosentraub, M. S. (1997) Dimensions of interjurisdictional cooperation, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63(2), pp. 205–219.
- Olberding, J. C. (2002) Does regionalism beget regionalism? The relationship between norms and regional partnerships for economic development, *Public Administration Review*, 62(4), pp. 480–491.
- Orfield, M. (1997) *Metropolitics: A Regional Agenda for Community and Stability*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution and the Lincoln Land Institute.
- Post, S. S. (2002) *Local government cooperation: the relationship between metropolitan area government geography and service provision*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA, September.
- Powell, J. A. (2000) Addressing regional dilemmas for minority communities, in: B. Katz (Ed.) *Reflections on Regionalism*, pp. 218–246. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Rossmann-McKinney, K. (2007) *Voters cite lack of political leadership as greatest barrier to regional cooperation* (<http://www.rossmangroup.com>).
- Rusk, D. (2000) Growth management: the core regional issue, in: B. Katz (Ed.) *Reflections on Regionalism*, pp. 78–106. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Thurmaier, K. (2006) High-intensity interlocal collaboration in three Iowa cities, *Public Administration Review*, 66, pp. 144–146.
- Thurmaier, K. and Wood, C. (2002) Interlocal agreements as overlapping social networks: picket-fence regionalism in metropolitan Kansas City, *Public Administration Review*, 62(5), pp. 585–598.
- Tiebout, C. (1956) A pure theory of local expenditures, *The Journal of Political Economy*, 64(5), pp. 416–424.
- Wassmer, R. W. and Lascher, E. L. (2006) Who supports local growth and regional planning to deal with its consequences, *Urban Affairs Review*, 41(5), pp. 621–645.
- Wheeler, S. M. (2002) The new regionalism: key characteristics of an emerging movement, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 68(3), pp. 267–278.
- Williams, O. P. (1967) Life-style values and political decentralization in metropolitan areas, *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, 48, pp. 300–310.