

APPENDIX A

CONTRIBUTORS TO THE DELPHI SURVEY (In Alphabetical Order)

Kristen A. Andersen, AICP, Director, Santa Rosa County Community Planning, Zoning and Development Division.

Talal Benothmant, City of Palm-Beach Gardens.

Paul H. Chipok, Partner at Gray, Harris & Robinson Office, P.A., Orlando.

Celeste Deardorff, AICP, Principal Planner, Lakeland Community Development Department.

Carolyn A. Dekle, Executive Director, the South Florida Regional Planning Council.

Gerson M. Garcia, AICP, City Planner, City of Sunrise Planning and Development Department.

Lowell Garrett, Regional Planning Council of North Central Florida.

Charles Gauthier, Department of Community Affairs (DCA)

Sandra Glenn, Executive Director, East Central Florida Regional Planning Council.

Nancy Linnan, Shareholder, Carlton Fields P.A.

Robert Magee, Transportation Manager, Office of Policy Planning, Florida Department of Transportation.

Mike McDaniel, Growth Management Administrator, Department of Community Affairs.

M. Lynn Pappas, Senior Partner, Pappas Metcalf Jenks & Miller, P.A.

Steve Pfeiffer, Attorney, Theriaque & Pfeiffer, Tallahassee.

Carol Stricklin, Orange County.

Kevin R. Tyjeski, AICP, Chief Planner, Growth Management Division, City of Orlando.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRES OF THE DELPHI ROUNDS

Round #1

Determining the Degree of Local Power over Decision-Making for Comprehensive Planning in Florida

This research is oriented at a local planning department (a staff function). I recognize appointed planning commissions/planning agencies and their involvement in planning processes. However, they are not the focus of this research. In future research, I will study these commissions/agencies.

In addition, by a “municipal planning agency,” I mean a “local planning agency (a staff function) at the municipal level.” Planning agencies at the county, regional, and state levels are considered upper level planning agencies. Furthermore, by “local planning officials,” I mean “staff working at the local planning department of a municipality.”

Instructions:

- 1) Review the following concepts of the dimensions of local power over decision-making for comprehensive planning.
- 2) Within each dimension, identify measures for determining the degree of each dimension at the municipal level in Florida.

First Dimension: The Legal Authority of a Local Planning Agency to Make Planning Decisions (*e.g., (1) the scope/range of decisions and actions over which a local planning agency has authority and (2) the degree or strength of devolved/delegated authority to a local planning agency by the state/country constitution or law or a local charter to undertake tasks of comprehensive planning and regulate and designate the use of lands*).

Q1. What should be used as measures to determine the degree of the legal authority of a municipal planning agency to undertake planning decisions?

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)

Second Dimension: The Relative Autonomy of a Local Planning Agency over Decision-Making (*e.g., the extent of freedom of local planning officials to: seek out strategies allowing them to act on local interests without substantial interference or oversight from upper level planning agencies and avoid subjection of local plans to regional or national development plans. The relative autonomy of a local planning agency can be expressed by the ability of a higher government to veto a local decision, the need of a local planning agency to get the approval of a higher level of government to local decisions, and sources of funding a local planning agency*).

Q2. What should be used as measures to determine the degree of the relative autonomy of a municipal planning agency over decision-making for comprehensive planning?

- 1)
 - 2)
 - 3)
-

Third Dimension: The Control of a Local Planning Agency over Planning Actions. (*e.g. the localization of processes of economic decision-making and the extent to which a local planning agency exercises control or influence over the day-to-day planning decisions and over plan implementation in general*).

Q3. What should be used as measures to determine the degree of municipal agency control over planning actions?

- 1)
 - 2)
 - 3)
-

Fourth Dimension: The Capacity of a Local Planning Agency to Make Planning Decisions.

4.1 Technical Capacity of a Local Planning Agency *can be determined by many factors such as the capability of a local planning agency to analyze scenarios and draft a comprehensive plan, build a technically sound and citizen-supported plan, conduct effective planning linked to implementation and future outcomes of land use decisions, and the number of staff with adequate skills to perform planning tasks.*

Q4.1 What should be used as measures to determine the degree of technical capacity of a municipal planning agency?

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)

4.2 Fiscal Capacity of a Local Planning Agency *implies the adequacy of resources a local planning agency has to perform planning tasks and the capability of an agency to produce revenues/income independent of the national/state government.*

Q4.2 What should be used as measures to determine the degree of fiscal capacity of a municipal planning agency?

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)

4.3 Institutional Capacity of a Local Planning Agency *implies the ability of a local planning agency to: 1) create an effective internal environment, 2) forge effective links with other planning agencies in the local and upper levels of government, 3) facilitate the participation of citizen groups, 4) link with interested groups/institutions with an agenda in the area such as business groups and non-governmental agencies, and 5) involving community leaders in setting planning agenda and decision-making to guarantee the stability of political orientation/viewpoints to support the implementation of comprehensive plans.*

Q4.3 What should be used as measures to determine the degree of institutional capacity of a local planning agency?

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)

4.4 Enforcement Capacity of a Local Planning Agency for laws and regulation of comprehensive planning.

Q4.4 What should be used as measures to determine the degree of enforcement capacity a municipal agency has for laws and regulation of comprehensive planning?

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Round #2
Determining the Degree of Local Power over
Decision-Making for
Comprehensive Planning in Florida

This survey is directed to local planning agencies at the municipal level (see chapter 163.3174 of Florida Statutes). It seeks to identify measures of municipal planning agency power over decision-making for comprehensive planning in Florida. Major dimensions of power over decision-making are:

- 1) The legal authority of a municipal planning agency to make planning decisions.
- 2) The relative autonomy of a municipal planning agency over decision-making.
- 3) The control of a municipal planning agency over planning actions.
- 4) The capacity of a municipal planning agency to make planning decisions, which includes:
 - 4.1 Technical capacity.
 - 4.2 Fiscal capacity.
 - 4.3 Institutional capacity.
 - 4.4 Enforcement capacity.

Definitions of the above dimensions of municipal planning agency power over decision-making can be found at the end of this questionnaire.

Instructions:

Please indicate whether you agree/disagree with each measure of dimensions of municipal planning agency power over decision-making by writing an "X" in front of Yes, No, or Don't know. You may add any other measures.

Q1. Are the following items measures of legal authority?

- a. Is the scope of authority given to the agency by Florida statutes, special acts, and charters to revise a comprehensive plan a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
- b. Is the scope of authority given to the agency by Florida statutes, special acts, and charters to propose revisions to land development regulations a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
- c. Is the exercise of a municipal planning agency of final authority over important planning decisions a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
- d. Please suggest other possible measures:

Q2. Are the following items measures of relative autonomy?

- a. Is the absence of oversight agencies able to veto municipal planning agency decisions a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
 - b. Is the absence of decisions requiring approval from a higher level of government prior to local government adoption of a plan or plan amendments a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
 - c. Is the inability of a higher level of government to withhold funds (sanctions) in cases of inconsistency a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
 - d. Please suggest other possible measures:
-

Q3. Are the following items measures of control?

- a. Is the absence of internal operating procedure requirements imposed by any other unit of government a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
 - b. Is the absence of issues of state significance (i.e., as required by 2001 legislation) in the municipality a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
 - c. Is the ability of the municipal planning agency to approve/deny applications for development without direction from the municipal governing body a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
 - d. Please suggest other possible measures:
-

Q4.1 Are the following items measures of capacity?

- a. Is the percentage of professional planning staff having a degree in planning a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
- b. Is the availability of continuing planner education and training in evolving technologies a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.

c. Please suggest other possible measures:

Q4.2 Are the following items measures of fiscal capacity?

a. Is the percentage of total agency revenues from fees on planning services and land development regulations a measure?

Yes. No. Don't know.

b. Is the adequacy of funds to hire consulting services a measure?

Yes. No. Don't know.

c. Is the adequacy of the agency budget to support planning functions a measure?

Yes. No. Don't know.

d. Is the rate of professional planner turnover a measure?

Yes. No. Don't know.

e. Please suggest other possible measures:

Q 4.3 Are the following items measures of institutional capacity?

a. Is the number of other governmental agencies with whom municipal planning agency interacted last year a measure?

Yes. No. Don't know.

b. Is the number of current inter-local agreements specifically related to planning a measure?

Yes. No. Don't know.

c. Is the frequency of planning staff participation in regional planning activities last year a measure?

Yes. No. Don't know.

d. Is the frequency of planning staff participation in meetings with local special interest groups last year a measure?

Yes. No. Don't know.

e. Is the number of public hearings held by the municipal planning agency last year a measure?

Yes. No. Don't know.

f. Is the number of community meetings held by the municipal planning agency last year a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.

g. Please suggest other possible measures:

Q4.4 Are the following items measures of enforcement capacity?

a. Is the ability of a municipal planning agency to approve/deny development projects for consistency with the comprehensive plan a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.

b. Is the adequacy of resources provided for enforcement actions a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.

c. Is the ability to impose fines for violation for planning regulations a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.

d. Is the percentage of planning staff recommendations related to enforcement which were overturned last year a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.

e. Is the existence of multiple enforcement mechanisms a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.

f. Please suggest other possible measures:

END OF THE QUESTIONS

Definitions of
Major Dimensions of Municipal Planning Agency Power over
Decision-Making for Comprehensive Planning

1st Dimension: The Legal Authority of a Municipal Planning Agency to Make Planning Decisions (i.e., the degree or strength of delegated authority to the agency by state laws and/or county charters to undertake tasks of comprehensive planning and the scope/range of decisions and actions over which the agency has authority).

2nd Dimension: The Relative Autonomy of a Municipal Planning Agency over Decision-Making (e.g., the freedom of planning staff/members to seek out strategies on municipal interests without substantial oversight from higher level planning agencies and subjection of municipal plans to regional plans. Low degree of autonomy can be expressed by the ability of a higher level of government to veto a municipal decision, the need of the municipal planning agency to get approval of other governmental agencies to its decisions, and reliance on federal/state funds).

3rd Dimension: The Control of a Municipal Planning Agency over Planning Actions (e.g., the localization of processes of economic decision-making and the extent to which a municipal planning agency exercises control over Day-To-Day planning decisions).

4th Dimension: The Capacity of a Municipal Planning Agency to Make Planning Decisions:

4.1 Technical Capacity of a Municipal Planning Agency (i.e., the adequate number of planning staff with skills to analyze scenarios and draft a comprehensive plan, build a technically sound and citizen-supported plan, conduct effective planning linked to implementation and future outcomes of land use decisions).

4.2 Fiscal Capacity of a Municipal Planning Agency implies the adequacy of financial resources the agency has to perform planning tasks and its capability to produce revenues independent of the federal/state government.

4.3 Institutional Capacity of a Municipal Planning Agency (i.e., the ability of the agency to 1) forge effective links with other planning agencies, 2) facilitate participation of citizen groups, 3) link with interested groups/institutions with local agendas, and 4) involve community leaders in setting planning agenda and decision-making).

4.4 Enforcement Capacity of a Municipal Planning Agency means the ability to monitor the impact of planning policies and compliance with land use regulations.

Round #3
Determining the Degree of Local Power over
Decision-Making for
Comprehensive Planning in Florida

As with rounds one and two, round three is directed to local planning agencies at the municipal level (see chapter 163.3174 of Florida Statutes). It seeks to identify measures of municipal planning agency power over decision-making for comprehensive planning in Florida. Major dimensions of power over decision-making are:

- 1) The legal authority of a municipal planning agency to make planning decisions.
- 2) The relative autonomy of a municipal planning agency over decision-making.
- 3) The degree of administrative control of a municipal planning agency over planning actions.
- 4) The capacity of a municipal planning agency to make planning decisions, which includes:
 - 4.1 Technical capacity.
 - 4.2 Fiscal capacity.
 - 4.3 Institutional capacity.
 - 4.4 Enforcement capacity.

Instructions:

Please indicate whether you agree/disagree with each measure of dimensions of municipal planning agency power over decision-making by writing an “X” in front of Yes, No, or Don’t know. You may add any other measures.

1st Dimension: Omitted from Round Three Survey.

2nd Dimension: Omitted from Round Three Survey.

3rd Dimension: The Degree of Administrative Control of a Municipal Planning Agency over Planning Actions (e.g., the localization of processes of economic decision-making, and the freedom of a municipal planning agency to exercise control over Day-To-Day planning decisions without any intervention from elected officials, administrative heads, or other municipal agencies).

Q. Are the following items measures of the degree of municipal administrative control?

- a. Is the absence of intervention by elected officials, administrative heads, or other municipal agencies in the internal operation of the municipal planning agency a measure?
 Yes. No. Don’t know.

- b. Is the absence of issues of compelling state interest in the municipality a measure?
 Yes. No. Don’t know.

- c. Is the ability of the municipal planning agency to approve/deny applications for development without direction from the municipal governing body a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
- d. Is the frequency of the local board agreeing with/upholding recommendations of planning staff on zoning/land use proposals a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
-

4.1 Technical Capacity of a Municipal Planning Agency (e.g., the adequate number of planning staff with skills to analyze scenarios and draft a comprehensive plan, build a technically sound and citizen-supported plan, conduct effective planning linked to implementation and future outcomes of land use decisions).

Q Are the following items measures of technical capacity?

- a. Is the percentage of professional planning staff having a degree in planning a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
- b. Is the availability of continuing planner education and training in evolving technologies a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
- c. Is the percentage of professional planning staff having AICP certification a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
- d. Is the number of years of the experience of planning staff a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
- e. Is the ability to use technical software such as GIS, database, and statistical packages a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.
- f. Is the salary range of planning staff a measure?
 Yes. No. Don't know.

4.2 Fiscal capacity: Omitted from Round Three Survey.

4.3 Institutional capacity: Omitted from Round Three Survey.

4.4 Enforcement capacity: Omitted from Round Three Survey.

END OF THE QUESTIONS

APPENDIX C

MUNICIPALITIES PARTICIPATING IN THE SURVEY

Municipality	Population 2000	Municipality	Population 2000	Municipality	Population 2000
Atlantic Beach	13,368	Lake Mary	11,458	Panama City	36,417
Auburndale	11,032	Lake Worth	35,133	Parkland	13,835
Aventura	25,267	Largo	69,371	Pembroke Pines	137,427
Bartow	15,340	Lauderdale Lakes	31,705	Pensacola	56,255
Belle Glade	14,906	Lauderhill	57,585	Pinecrest	19,055
Boynton Beach	60,389	Lighthouse Point	10,767	Pinellas Park	45,658
Bradenton	49,504	Longwood	13,745	Plantation	82,934
Callaway	14,233	Lynn Haven	12,451	Plant City	29,915
Cape Coral	102,286	Maitland	12,019	Pompano Beach	78,191
Cocoa Beach	12,482	Marathon	10,255	Port St. Lucie	88,769
Cooper City	27,939	Marco Island	14,879	Punta Gorda	14,344
Coral Gables	42,249	Melbourne	71,382	Royal Palm Beach	21,523
Coral Springs	117,549	Miami	362,470	Safety Harbor	17,203
Crestview	14,766	Miami Shores	10,380	St. Cloud	20,074
Daytona Beach	64,112	Miramar	72,739	St. Petersburg	248,232
DeBary	15,559	Naples	20,976	Sarasota	52,715
Deerfield Beach	64,583	New Port Richey	16,117	Sebastian	16,181
De Land	20,904	New Smyrna Beach	20,048	South Daytona	13,177
Destin	11,119	Niceville	11,684	South Miami	10,741
Dunedin	35,691	North Miami	59,880	Sunny Isles Beach	15,315
Eustis	15,106	North Miami Beach	40,786	Sweetwater	14,226
Fort Lauderdale	152,397	North Palm Beach	12,064	Tamarac	55,588
Fort Myers	48,208	North Port	22,797	Tarpon Springs	21,003
Fort Walton Beach	19,973	Oakland Park	30,966	Temple Terrace	20,918
Greenacres	27,569	Ocoee	24,391	Titusville	40,670
Gulfport	12,527	Oldsmar	11,910	Venice	17,764
Hallandale	34,282	Opa-locka	14,951	Vero Beach	17,705
Hialeah Gardens	226,419	Ormond Beach	36,301	Wellington	38,216
Holly Hill	12,119	Oviedo	26,316	Weston	49,286
Hollywood	139,357	Palatka	10,033	Wilton Manors	12,697
Homestead	31,909	Palm Beach	10,468	Winter Garden	14,351
Jacksonville Beach	20,990	Palm Coast	32,732	Winter Haven	26,487
Jupiter	39,328	Palm Springs	11,699	Winter Springs	31,666
Key Biscayne	10,507	Palmetto	12,571	Zephyrhills	10,833

Source: http://www2.census.gov/census_2000/datasets/demographic_profile/Florida/2kh12.pdf

APPENDIX D

HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE APPROVAL LETTER

Florida State UNIVERSITY

Office of the Vice President
for Research
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2763
(850) 644-8672. FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

from the Human Subjects Committee

Date: December 20, 2001

From: David Quadagno, Chair

To: Amal K. Ali
342 Pennell Circle, Apt. #5
Tallahassee, FL 32310

Dept.: Urban & Regional Planning

Re: Use of Human subjects in Research
Project entitled: Local Power Over Decision-Making For
Comprehensive Planning in Florida

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be exempt per 45 CFR s 46.101(b)2 and has been approved by an accelerated review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risks to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals which may be required.

If the project has not been completed by December 19, 2002 you must requested renewed approval for continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must promptly report, in writing, any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Petra Doan
Application NO. 01.585

APPENDIX E

THE INFORMED CONSENT LETTER



The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2280

Department of Urban and Regional Planning
+1.850.644.4510 <http://www.fsu.edu/~durp>

Dear Planning Director,

This letter is to introduce one of our advanced doctoral students, Ms. Amal Ali. She is currently working on her Ph.D. dissertation on the subject of the locus of decision-making for comprehensive planning in Florida under the supervision of Dr. Petra L. Doan. As part of her research she would like your cooperation in ensuring that the attached questions about your agency are completed in a timely manner.

This research topic is likely to produce results of interest to both academic and planning practitioners in Florida and elsewhere in the United States. Florida's growth management and comprehensive planning legislation is widely considered to be an innovative example of planning practice. The practical details of how this legislation is implemented is therefore of great interest to a variety of people around the country. Your participation in this study will materially enhance the quality and validity of this research, enabling more widespread dissemination of the lessons to be learned from planning agencies involved in comprehensive planning in Florida.

Please be assured that your responses to this questionnaire will be confidential to the extent allowed by law and that your answers will be used for academic purposes only. Ms. Ali has taken careful steps to ensure that data concerning your agency will not be accessible to any third party.

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this survey. By returning the questionnaire, you are giving your consent to participate. If you are interested in obtaining the results of this survey please feel free to contact the department for details about the completion and distribution of this dissertation.

Sincerely,

Charles Connerly
Professor and Chair,
Department of Urban and Regional Planning

APPENDIX F

THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE (PRE-TEST)

(Erased words are stricken through and added words are in italic)

Amal K. Ali Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Florida State University	E-mail: aka6657@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Q-ID: (11)
---	---

LOCAL ~~MUNICIPAL~~-PLANNING AGENCY POWER OVER DECISION-MAKING FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING IN FLORIDA

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

This research project investigates decision-making for *local municipal* planning agencies in Florida. ~~The survey is directed to local planning agencies at the municipal level.~~ A local planning agency, as defined in section 163.3174 of the Florida Statutes, “may be a local planning commission, the planning department of the local government, or other instrumentality.”

Instructions:

Please fill out this questionnaire to the best of your knowledge. For each question, circle a, b, c, d, e, or f unless you are instructed differently.

-
- Does your municipality have a charter?
a. Yes. b. No. c. Don't Know.
 - Does your municipality have an inter-local agreement(s) for joint planning with other local governments?
a. Yes. b. No. c. Don't Know.

If yes: Please identify the names of these local governments.

.....
.....

20. Please indicate how many of the professional planning staff in your agency know how to use the following software programs.

Software programs	Number of planning staff <i>who</i> knows how to use the program.
GIS	
Statistical packages (e.g., SPSS/SAS)	
Spreadsheet	

21. In the last five years, did your agency hire consulting services?
 a. Yes. b. No. c. Don't know.

If no: Why didn't your agency hire consulting services? (Circle all that apply).

- a. Insufficient funding.
- b. Opposition of elected local officials.
- c. Technical assistance is provided by other governmental agencies.
- d. No need to do so, planning staff is able to perform planning activities.
- e. Other (specify.)

.....
 f. Don't Know.

22. How many other local governmental agencies did your ~~municipal~~ municipal planning agency contact at least once a month last year?
 a. None. b. 1-3 c. 4-6. d. 7 or more. e. Don't Know.

23. How many public hearings were held by your ~~municipal~~ municipal planning agency last year?
 a. None. b. 1-12. c. 13-52. d. 53 or more. e. Don't Know.

24. How many meetings with citizen groups or special interest groups were held by your ~~municipal~~ municipal planning agency last year?
 a. None. b. 1-12. c. 13-52. d. 53 or more. e. Don't Know.

25. Does the agency responsible for transportation facilities consider the comprehensive plan when making its decisions?
 a. Yes. b. No. c. Don't know.

26. Are there *other* ~~municipal~~ municipal agencies with the authority to veto ~~municipal~~ your planning agency decisions?
 a. Yes. b. No. c. Don't know.

If yes: Which of the following agencies has the authority to veto municipal planning agency decisions? (*Circle all that apply*).

- a. The Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA).
- b. The regional planning council.
- c. The county planning agency.
- d. Other (specify.)
- e. Don't Know.

27. The Florida Statutes establish consistency requirements for local comprehensive plans. Are there any additional requirements for consistency made by local special acts or charters?

- a. Yes.
- b. No.
- c. Don't know.

If yes: What are these additional requirements for consistency?

.....
.....

28. ~~How frequently~~ *Does the Florida Department of Community Affairs frequently approve plan amendments recommended by the municipal planning agency the local government?*

- a. Always.
- b. ~~Sometimes~~ *Frequently.*
- c. Rarely.
- d. Never.
- e. Don't Know.

29. How frequently does the municipal board/council agree with recommendations of planning staff on zoning/land use proposals?

- a. Always.
- b. ~~Sometimes~~ *Frequently.*
- c. Rarely.
- d. Never.
- e. Don't Know.

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please use the enclosed self stamped envelope to return the questionnaire to:

*Amal K. Ali
342 Pennell Circle, Apt. #5
Tallahassee, Florida 32310*

E-mail: aka6657@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

Phone Number: (850) 575-4969

APPENDIX G

THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Amal K. Ali
E-mail: aka6657@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

Department of Urban and Regional Planning
Florida State University

INFORMATION INCLUDED IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS FOR
ACADEMIC USE ONLY

**Local Planning Agency Power over Decision-Making
for Comprehensive Planning in Florida**

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Please Return by Friday January 04, 2001

This research project investigates decision-making for local planning agencies in Florida. A local planning agency, as defined in section 163.3174 of the Florida Statutes, "may be a local planning commission, the planning department of the local government, or other instrumentality."

Instructions:

Please fill out this questionnaire to the best of your knowledge. For each question, circle a, b, c, d, e, or f unless you are instructed differently.

-
1. Does your municipality have a charter?
a. Yes. b. No. c. Don't Know.
 2. Does your municipality have an inter-local agreement(s) for joint planning with other local governments?
a. Yes. b. No. c. Don't Know.

If yes: Please identify the names of these local governments.

.....
.....

3. In your municipality, planning functions are performed by: *(Circle all that apply)*.
- a. A planning department.
 - b. Consultants.
 - c. A regional planning council.
 - d. Other (specify.)
 - e. Don't Know.

4. Authorities given to local planning agencies by state law are: preparing a comprehensive plan, adopting and amending a comprehensive plan, and proposing changes to land development regulations.

What other authorities are given to your planning agency by ordinance, agreements, special acts or charters?

.....

5. Does your planning agency review and recommend annexation requests?
- a. Yes.
 - b. No.
 - c. Don't Know.

6. Is your planning agency responsible for approving or denying applications for development?
- a. Yes.
 - b. No.
 - c. Don't know.

If yes: How frequently is the municipal governing body involved in the approval process?

- a. Always.
- b. Frequently.
- c. Rarely.
- d. Never.
- e. Don't Know.

If no: Who approves or denies applications for development? *(Circle all that apply.)*

- a. Elected officials.
- b. Administrative head.
- c. Growth Management or similar agency.
- d. Other (specify.)
- e. Don't Know.

7. If your planning agency has enforced power, are the fiscal resources provided for enforcement actions sufficient?
- a. Yes.
 - b. No.
 - c. Don't Know.

8. Is your planning agency responsible for imposing fines for violation of development regulations?
- a. Yes.
 - b. No.
 - c. Don't know.

If no: Who is responsible for imposing fines for violation of municipal development regulations?

.....

20. Please indicate how many of the professional planning staff in your agency know how to use the following software programs.

Software programs	Number of planning staff who knows how to use the program.
GIS	
Statistical packages (e.g., SPSS/SAS)	
Spreadsheet	

21. In the last five years, did your agency hire consulting services?
 a. Yes. b. No. c. Don't know.

If no: Why didn't your agency hire consulting services? (Circle all that apply).

- a. Insufficient funding.
- b. Opposition of elected local officials.
- c. Technical assistance is provided by other governmental agencies.
- d. No need to do so, planning staff is able to perform planning activities.
- e. Other (specify.)
- f. Don't Know.

22. How many other local governmental agencies did your planning agency contact at least once a month last year?
 a. None. b. 1- 3 c. 4- 6. d. 7 or more. e. Don't Know.

23. How many public hearings were held by your planning agency last year?
 a. None. b. 1- 12. c. 13- 52. d. 53 or more. e. Don't Know.

24. How many meetings with citizen groups or special interest groups were held by your planning agency last year?
 a. None. b.1- 12. c. 13- 52. d. 53 or more. e. Don't Know.

25. Does the agency responsible for transportation facilities consider the comprehensive plan when making its decisions?
 a. Yes. b. No. c. Don't know.

26. Other than the Florida Department of Community Affairs, are there other agencies with the authority to veto your planning agency decisions?
 a. Yes. b. No. c. Don't know.

If yes: Please specify

27. The Florida Statutes establish consistency requirements for local comprehensive plans. Are there any additional requirements for consistency made by local special acts or charters?

- a. Yes.
- b. No.
- c. Don't know.

If yes: What are these additional requirements for consistency?

.....
.....

28. Does the Florida Department of Community Affairs frequently approve plan amendments recommended by the local government?

- a. Always.
- b. Frequently.
- c. Rarely.
- d. Never.
- e. Don't Know.

29. How frequently does the municipal board/council agree with recommendations of planning staff on zoning/land use proposals?

- a. Always.
- b. Frequently.
- c. Rarely.
- d. Never.
- e. Don't Know.

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please use the enclosed self stamped envelope to return the questionnaire to:

Amal K. Ali
342 Pennell Circle, Apt. #5
Tallahassee, Florida 32310

E-mail: aka6657@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

Phone Number: (850) 575-4969

(Code No.)