

REPORT ON SITE SELECTION IN THAILAND
FOR THE OFFICE OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT'S
LAND USE PROGRAMMING IN AN
INTERMEDIATE-SIZED CITY PROJECT

Report of the Field Survey Team:

Eric Chetwynd, Jr.

Jerome P. Goss

Alan B. Jacobs

May 22, 1975

Office of Urban Development
Bureau for Technical Assistance
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
U.S. Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20523

Foreword

Following a research study into the feasibility of land use programming in small- and intermediate-sized cities in developing countries, which Rivkin/Carson, Inc., conducted under contract, the Office of Urban Development in the Bureau for Technical Assistance (TA/UD) in the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID/W) designed a project to demonstrate the application of the conclusions of the research study report.

Potential sites were selected initially with the cooperation of the regional bureaus in AID/W, and the field missions were consulted. On the basis of the nomination of site cities by the host countries and the field missions, an AID/W field survey team was organized for each of three regions -- Latin America, East Asia, and Africa. The teams visited the countries and the prospective site cities, and in cooperation with local host government and AID officials selected a site city in each region.

The initial descriptions of the TA/UD land use programming project were broadly drawn and a considerable degree of flexibility was provided for in order to permit the specific project design to account adequately for and reflect local conditions in prospective host countries. However, several broad criteria were considered necessary for the successful implementation of the project. Criteria at the national level included interest in decentralized development, interest in developing local planning and implementation capacity, political climate favorable for same, and investment programs geared to development of intermediate-sized cities. At the local level criteria included rapid growth and modernization and a central role in an agricultural region, good potential for future growth and development, and readiness for decentralized development and land use programming.

The field survey team for East Asia was led by Eric Chetwynd, Jr., Urban Development Advisor, TA/UD, and included Jerry G. Goss, an urban planning expert, and Alan B. Jacobs, Urban, Environmental, and Aviation Affairs Officer, Office of Capital and Commercial Development Bureau for East Asia.

The team went to the Philippines and Thailand. Herewith is a report of the team's visit to Thailand,

The triad of Chonburi, Panatnikom, and Sriracha, municipalities in Chonburi Province southeast of Bangkok, was chosen as the Asia site for TA/UD's Land Use Programming project. Details of the selection process, the urban-regional setting, and the key components of the project are set forth in the following pages.

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	
INTRODUCTION	1
Choice of Location	
DECENTRALIZATION CONTEXT	6
ORGANIZATION FOR LOCAL PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING IN THAILAND	8
The Organization for Planning National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB) Department of Town and Country Planning (DT&CP) Department of Local Administration (DOLA) The Governor's Office and Local Administration	
THE SETTING IN CHONBURI	18
The Main Problems Policy, Planning, and Development Land Expansion Financing Municipal Land Control	
THE PROPOSED PROJECT SETTING	23
Key Project Components	
Appendices	
A. The Land Use Programming Process	
B. Persons Consulted by the Field Survey Team (A Partial List)	

REPORT ON SITE SELECTION IN THAILAND
FOR THE OFFICE OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT'S
LAND USE PROGRAMMING IN AN
INTERMEDIATE-SIZED CITY PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

Historically Thailand has been among the most centralized of nations. That Bangkok is more than thirty times the size of Thailand's next largest city, contains 56% of the nation's urban population, holds more than 70% of all commercial bank deposits and absorbs 65% of annual investment in construction bears simple testimony to this fact. ¹ Nonetheless, the country has been making considerable economic progress by conventional indicators. The GNP growth rate averaged 6.4% from 1968-73 and foreign exchange reserves have reached an impressive \$1.8 billion. It is almost trite to say that the problem is the unbalanced distribution and occurrence of this wealth.

The government is well aware of regional income disparities and of the critical need to break existing patterns and push decentralization and dispersion of development. It is precisely this problem that stimulated government interest in the TA/UD Land Use Programming for Intermediate-Sized Cities project. The project has as its broad goal the strengthening of urban and regional planning and development capacity at the local level. The government is pursuing similar objectives in its current five-year plan and sees the project as tying

^{1/} Jeff Romm, Urbanization in Thailand. An International Urbanization Survey Report to the Ford Foundation (New York: Ford Foundation, 1972), pp. 7-9

in directly with this effort. It is the juxtaposition of grossly overcentralized development with government determination to alter this historic pattern in response to regional political pressures and economic realities that makes Thailand a highly challenging country with which to cooperate in implementing the TA/UD project.

Choice of Location

In preliminary meetings with Thailand's National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB), the national planning authority, the AID/W team explored the regional configuration of Thailand. NESDB utilizes four basic planning regions -- the North, Northeast, Central, and South -- in each of which it has designated regional growth centers, which might qualify as sites for the TA/UD project. However, a process of elimination led the team to focus the survey activities on Chonburi Province in the Central Region.

The North already has been the subject of a large UNDP-IBRD regional planning study. The growth point in the North is Chiang Mai which already is receiving considerable planning and development assistance from the UNDP and other international agencies. It is an historically interesting and physically charming city which has become in some respects the Thai glamour city outside of Bangkok for international development agencies. The survey team concluded that the TA/UD project would have little identity as a demonstration or catalyst in that setting.

The Northeast has been surveyed as a region by Louis Berger, Inc., in a regional planning effort supported by USAID. The region has four designated growth points, but due to the withdrawal of U.S. military from the region there will be considerable shifting of urbanization patterns stemming from those rather unnatural circumstances. As a demonstration area then, the Northeast becomes less attractive. Moreover, the political unrest in the region could lead to complications that would make project implementation very difficult and hazardous.

The South of Thailand is a long-neglected region, although it seems to have a strength and vitality of its own. This region has been covered recently by a British-sponsored regional planning and development group, Hunting Technical Services, Limited. The Hunting report has been well received by the Thais, and is regarded as a quality piece of work. NESDB did not recommend additional planning and development work in this region pending further development based on the Hunting report which included in its analysis the growth points of the region.

This led the survey team back to the NESDB's first choice, the City of Chonburi in Chonburi Province. The province forms the eastern seaboard of the Central Region of which Bangkok is the focal point. However, the Province of Chonburi has an economic base and identify its own and

in some planning contexts (e.g., in agriculture) is central to what is called the eastern region*, which takes in the area between the eastern seacoast and the Cambodian border. Chonburi City is the regional center for this area -- an area so far neglected by both Thais and international development agencies in terms of broad regional planning studies.

This city of about 70,000 is growing rapidly in population, business and commercial activities, density, and overall importance in the region. It is seen as the countermagnet to Bangkok in the central region, in that while Bangkok is now the gateway to and outlet for the Northeast, plans call for the elevation of Chonburi to a similar status, thus relieving at least some of the pressure on Bangkok. This will require a subtle shift in economic flows in geographic terms but a significant alteration of function, institutional, and commercial patterns. The plans could pose a major test of Thai capacity to alter deliberately the traditional spatial order of things. In any event, if the Northeast should begin to develop a more prosperous and productive economic base, Chonburi will have to undergo considerable physical and institutional transformation if it is to play its intended role.

The eastern regional hinterland and the Northeast do not represent the only stresses building on Chonburi. In addition to these principally agricultural pressures, Chonburi is in the path of what could become in the long term Thailand's major industrial corridor, stretching from

*While NESDB divides the country into four basic regions, other Ministries have different criteria, and for their purposes the country can be divided into as many as eight regions.

Bangkok along the eastern seaboard to the deepwater port of Sattahip. This is far in the future, to be sure, but the environmental pressures of industrialization around Bangkok and along this corridor already are beginning to impact on Chonburi Province. This twofold agricultural and industrial pressure on Chonburi makes it an especially valid choice in Thailand as a site for the Land Use Programming project.

Having selected Chonburi in this manner, the team focused its efforts on examining the national, regional, and local context in which a demonstration project at Chonburi might take place. (For the balance of this report the project will be referred to as a "catalyst" rather than a "demonstration." It is preferred by the Thais because of the condescension and unrealistic concentration of effort inferred in the term "demonstration project.") This involved a series of interviews in Bangkok and in Chonburi Province with Mayors, their staffs, and the Provincial Governor's office, followed by a project design meeting presided over by Dr. Snoh, Secretary-General of NESDB, in Bangkok at which all relevant parties were represented. The findings will be reported in the balance of this report.

DECENTRALIZATION CONTEXT

That Thai authorities recognize the need for decentralization of development in Thailand has already been noted. As one official put it, "Only 7% of municipal revenue comes from outside of Bangkok. We have no choice but to decentralize." The intention to respond to this need is articulated in the current Five-Year Plan, 1972-1976 -- namely, in terms of basic objectives: "to raise income and living standard of rural people and spread more evenly the fruits of development to people in all parts of the country;" through industrial diffusion: "Industry will be encouraged in the rural areas so as to increase rural income;" through regional development: "the main target of regional development is to narrow the gap in income and living standard of the people by implementation of various regional development programs;" through development of local authority capacity: "the local authority development is planned to be carried out in all four categories of local administration, namely, Provincial Administrative Authority, Municipality, Sanitary District, and Tombol Administrative Authority, with the objectives of promoting further local development planning;" and through development outside the Metropolitan Area: "to solve the problems caused by unplanned and uncontrolled town expansion, shortage of provincial water supply, shortage of village potable water supply systems, and shortage of transportation systems."

Some progress towards implementation is evident. Three of the four major regions have undergone already large-scale regional planning studies: the Northeast, North, and South, NESDB has established regional offices in the North and Northeast and plans to establish a third one in the South. The Ministry of Interior is about to start Provincial (Changwat) Planning Offices in eleven of the 70 changwats on a pilot basis; Chonburi is one of these. Many investments are planned for outlying areas; for example, a petro-chemical plant, an atomic power plant, and a new deepwater port are planned for Chonburi Province. The Ministry of Finance has announced a five billion bat (about \$250 m.) program for investments in rural areas. On the private sector side ten investment zones in the provinces have been established to be fostered by specific inducements and tax allotment. Nonetheless, for all of this activity and with every department of government committed to decentralization, the way is torturous. Decentralization progresses against all of the psychic, cultural, political, and economic centripetal forces that have predominated in Thailand since long before Columbus ever thought about America. Some of these difficulties are elaborated in the following section on organization for local planning and programming in Thailand.

ORGANIZATION FOR PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING IN THAILAND*

Discussion of the organizational framework for planning and programming in Thailand must be viewed in terms of the strong role of the central government. Thailand's highly centralized form of government stems from the country's long history of allegiance to the Monarchy and the resulting tradition of administrative controls emanating from Bangkok. These controls tend to pervade decision-making at all governmental levels.

The same pattern applies also to planning. For example, physical planning is the duty of the Ministry of Interior's Department of Town and Country Planning whose staff has responsibility for preparing the long-range physical plans for 70 Changwats (Provinces), 120 municipalities, 4,900 Tombols (an area covering 4 or 5 villages and its hinterland), and 42,000 Mubans (villages).

As Thailand has grown (there are now over 40 million Thais) and the country has continued to industrialize, the task of the central government to provide needed services, such as planning and programming, has grown

*The Thai government is in the process of revising its organizational and administrative system. A report is due by September 1975; proposals will go to the Prime Minister and Council for review, after which a draft law will then go to the House of Representatives for authorization. The USAID team was unable to determine what these proposals are; in event they are adopted, it is highly likely that the organizational system described here will be obsolete.

more difficult. As a result, there is now more willingness to develop technical skills at the local level to alleviate some of the pressures on the central planning staff. This is becoming increasingly important as the planners realize the difficulties of administering and providing technical services to all local governments.

The Organization for Planning

Any major planning decision from the local level must filter through the Governor's office (on the provincial level) to the Ministry of Interior, and in many instances through other functional Ministries as well and on up to the Cabinet. National policy, on the other hand, which the Governors are charged with implementing, is set by the five-year social and economic development plan, which is prepared under the auspices of the National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB). In effect, NESDB becomes the policy setting body (with final decisions made by the Cabinet) while the Ministry of Interior is the principal implementing agency.

This arrangement sounds simple in theory, but in actual operation it is extremely complex. In any major planning decision, the Office of the Prime Minister and the Cabinet, the Ministry of Interior, the National Economic and Social Development Board, the Office of the Budget, the Department of Town and Country Planning, the Department of Local Administration, the appointed Governor, the elected Mayor, and municipal councils -- all may be involved.

Dr. Siguard Grava, a United Nations consultant to the Thailand Government, studied the organizational set-up for planning in some detail in early 1974. An organizational chart reproduced from Dr. Grava's report (see the next page) shows the major ministries and departments involved in the planning process. This chart indicates that the Ministry of Interior is responsible for coordinating activities for all local governmental units and sub-units. This is administratively handled through the Division of Local Government of the Department of Local Administration (DOLA). The Office of the Governor is administrative head of the provincial government (Changwat) and smaller administrative districts (Amphoe, Tombol and Muban). The National Economic and Social Development Board and the Office of the Budget attached to the Office of the Prime Minister and Cabinet are also part of the policy and administrative procedures. The responsibilities and duties of these various bodies are discussed in the following sections.

National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB)

The National Economic and Social Development Board, created in 1959 and attached to the Office of the Prime Minister, has two major responsibilities: to serve as an advisory body to the Prime Minister and the Cabinet on economic and social development policy for the country, and to prepare the national five-year social and economic development plan. The NESDB, along with the Office of the Budget, is charged with directing the country's overall "policy and management" strategy.

NESDB is charged with defining national policy concerning planning and development through the five-year social and economic development plan. Goals and policies set by this body are then implemented by the various governmental ministries with advice from the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Planning is complicated by the fact that physical planning is carried out by the Ministry of Interior's Department of Town and Country Planning. Thus, the planning function is divided between two government agencies.

In order to help eliminate many of these problems of scale and coordination, NESDB recently has started analyzing national objectives in a regional context. The country has been divided into four major planning regions with long-range development plans prepared for two of the four, and other regional 'baseline' studies completed. This step towards decentralization will permit NESDB to respond more effectively to the goals of each region, and will provide more concrete guidelines for the Department of Town and Country Planning in its preparation of the physical plans.

NESDB hopes to continue its work in the future by determining the kind and type of land use controls needed in each region within the next five-year period and the type of infrastructure requirements needed region by region. After these needs are determined, a more detailed and responsive five-year national economic and social development plan can

be developed, and the planning process decentralized to the regions and away from the current strong central planning operation.

Department of Town and Country Planning (DT&CP)

The role of the Department of Town and Country Planning (DT&CP) in the past has been focused on the preparation of long-range physical master plans for the various municipalities. At present the work of the Department is fairly circumscribed, partly due to a lack of sufficient staff to complete its enormous task and partly because of the limitation to deal with only the physical aspects of planning. Its formal mission, however, is more broadly defined. It is charged with:

1. preparing regional and physical planning programs as a part of the National Social and Economic Development Plan;
2. preparing regional plans and master plans for cities throughout the country, in agreement with national policy, and to approve master plans submitted by the provinces;
3. preparing special project plans requested by governmental units, to review and approve projects planned by other units and requests for the alteration of municipal boundaries;
4. planning and developing cities according to approved master plans and special project plans;
5. amending regional and master plans at suitable periods;
6. following up, evaluating, and solving problems of implementation;
7. advising governmental units on city planning matters.

With a professional staff of fewer than 100 persons to cover a country of some 200,000 square miles and a population of over 40 million persons, this is a herculean task. Until just this year the lack of specific legislation or regulations to exercise control over private development has frustrated development and implementation of effective long-range physical plans. The City Planning bill, pending for over ten years, has just been passed, and should add some strength to the physical planning process.

In an operational sense the Department of Town and Country Planning has six major divisions that are concerned with the planning function. These include: the Survey Division, responsible for mapping and surveying of the towns and municipalities (this division has covered more than 45 towns); the Research and Analysis Division, responsible to assemble the data base for master planning (inventories of facts and statistics, demographic and some forecast data); the Engineering Division, which provides to the DT&CP the technical competence to prepare conceptual and detailed plans for various utility systems and public works elements; the Comprehensive Planning Division, responsible for producing the municipal comprehensive plans (the planning methodology in this Division follows the classical "general plan" pattern, is oriented heavily towards the physical aspects of the communities, and includes a land use plan covering a 20- to 30-year period); the Project Planning Division, whose activity is

directed primarily towards special projects which deal mainly with fire-damaged areas; the Programming Division, whose functions are to analyze projects initiated by other governmental units and keep track of their progress, and to prepare total cost estimates and organize capital budget programs which are transmitted to the respective local governmental units; the Planning Control Division, which acts on all Departmental tasks where legal expertise or assistance is required; and the Regional Planning Division, which is responsible for planning regional infrastructure networks and physical development patterns. The Regional Planning Division was established in 1972 and continues to function as a very small unit. Some uncertainty exists on its role and specific responsibilities, especially in view of NESDB's role in regional planning.

Department of Local Administration (DOLA)

Within the Department of Local Administration, which is in the Ministry of Interior, the Division of Local Government serves as a key link between the central and local governmental structures. This Division has specific authority over the municipalities and sanitary districts in the country, and has certain responsibilities through the Governor to the other governmental sub-units (the Changwat, Amphoe, Tombo and Muban).

Coordination between this Department and the Department of Town and Country Planning must be maintained closely to insure that there will be no duplication of work. This is difficult because each Department also has its own responsibility to define the manner in which it will address the national plan objectives. As Dr. Grava stated in his report:

While this may be a relatively straight forward process in some areas, it is not always an easy task where local development planning is involved, particularly in a tight resource situation and in the absence of effective control devices.

This is especially relevant when it is recognized that planning at the levels below the Department of Town and Country Planning and the Department of Local Administration has not been institutionalized in Thailand; thus, it becomes the responsibility of these two Departments to advise, develop, implement, and administer plan formulation and implementation for the entire country.

The Governor's Office and Local Administration

As in many other areas of implementing the national development plan, and especially in planning and programming, the key link between the central government and the local administration is the Governor of the Changwat (Province). This officer, appointed by the Prime Minister, is directly responsible to the Office of the Undersecretary in the

Ministry of Interior, Although the Governor is responsible to the Department of Local Administration, he is directly responsible to the Office of Undersecretary.

The Governor has jurisdiction over the Province (Changwat), including the Municipality, the Amphoe, the Tombol, and the Muban. All mayors, elected councils, and the District Officers are responsible to the Governor. As can be seen in the organizational chart (above), there is no direct line of responsibility between the mayor's office on the municipal level and the Department of Town and Country Planning. All planning activities, therefore, must be organized either through (and with the approval of) the Governor through the Department of Local Administration, However, with direct access to the Office of the Undersecretary, the Governor can bypass effectively the DOLA if the need arises.

THE SETTING IN CHONBURI

Chonburi is an old city which always has played a central role in the so-called Eastern Region. Traditionally its industries have been fishing, processing of agricultural goods such as tapioca, rice, and sugar cane, and trading. More recently it has developed some non-Agricultural industry and commerce as well, although it remains the regional center in an area keyed to agriculture.

The main problems of the town appear to be the boundary limitations which inhibit urban-rural development, a lack of professional planning, lack of adequate finance for development, and the set of problems associated with rapid growth and urbanization -- e.g., high densities (75,000 people for 4.6 sq. km.), pollution, congestion, inadequate sanitary and other services, poor living conditions, difficult coordination, etc. The city already is overspilling municipal boundaries and in the complex Thai political-governmental structure the mayor is greatly constrained in dealing with problems that go beyond these ancient boundaries.

Policy, planning, and development in the city revolve around the Mayor (previously appointed by the Governor but under current Thai law to be elected); his cabinet, which includes a finance liaison officer responsible for securing funds locally; and a planning staff, which is responsible for implementing cabinet-level decisions that have been

finally approved by the full line of government authorities. This line includes the Local Government Board (a municipal citizen's representative body which varies in size with population; in the case of Chonburi City it consists of 17 people), the Governor, and the Ministry of Interior. Typically, a program is presented first by the Mayor to the Local Government Board. If approved it is sent to the Governor who may forward it directly with his endorsement to the Ministry of Interior in Bangkok for final approval, or send it back to the Local Government Board for revision. If the Board proves intransigent, the Governor still must send the package to the Ministry of Interior for approval, but may add his reservations or dissenting opinions.

The small project or planning staff is a valuable core group for the proposed project. It consists of an architect, an engineer, and a technician. However, it does not have an overall planning capacity and the city is growing for all practical purposes without a plan. (Local authorities have not accepted as a basis for action the plan prepared in 1964 by the Ministry of Interior's Department of Town and Country Planning.) This staff group has helped to develop a scheme for reclamation of seafront area as one of the few means available for municipal development and expansion within existing boundaries.

Land Expansion. Chonburi has expanded westward historically through a process started by extending walkways into the sea. Houses are built on stilts along these walkways and ultimately the space beneath them silts in naturally due to special current and silting conditions typical of the waters of this region. The present plan is to accelerate this land creation process by building (already partly constructed) a road into the sea and aiding the natural silting and filling process by barging in earth and sand from other regions. This will produce an area of some 400 rei (160 acres) at a cost of about 20 million bat (\$1,000,000). On this new land, to be circumscribed by a ring road, the municipality plans to construct a fisheries center and a new central market, and to foster other commercial and economic activity. Other proposed projects being entertained by the municipality include a public park and recreation area and a sewer system. As seen by the Mayor, the principal problems in carrying out these programs are human resources and financing.

Financing was stressed at all points, including the USAID, as a critical problem for Thai municipalities. It is clear that any successful land use programming effort there will have to have a strong municipal finance component. Under the current system municipal taxes include vehicle registration, a small property and business tax, a small security tax, and taxes on entertainment and alcoholic beverages.

In the case of Chonburi, this nets revenues of 14 million bat (\$700,000). Such municipal revenues are sent to the central government -- Ministry of Interior -- and reallocated to the municipalities in part, at least, for administration and for development projects that meet with Ministry of Interior approval. The proportion of collected revenues reallocated to each municipality appears to vary on a case-by-case basis. This system is not popular at the municipality level although the AID/W team was led to understand that the Thai government is seeking ways to improve municipal finance. In this sense an early focus on problems of municipal finance in the land use programming project would be both appropriate and timely.

Municipal land control also is highly centralized in the current Thai context. For example, while the municipality can create new land as Chonburi is doing in its seafront project, it cannot buy and sell land at its own discretion. All such transactions must be approved by the Ministry of Interior and ultimately by the Cabinet. Similarly the Ministry of Interior is the ultimate arbiter in all moves to alter municipal boundaries. (Chonburi currently has a boundary extension case before the Ministry that would increase that city's tax base.)

Local means of land control are few but they provide a precedent. All building construction is licensed by the municipality, and business activity (such as the opening of a new commercial establishment) is registered through the municipality and the Governor. While these are potential vehicles for land use control, they lose much of their significance without local planning and development programming as a framework. Moreover, it was not clear to what extent these legalities are observed in practice.

These local controls would seem to be elevated in importance by the new city planning bill (February 1975) which contains a strong provision for local zoning ordinances based on the traditional British town and country planning laws. This legislation has been a long time in coming, having been under consideration for more than eight years. While to the team's knowledge an English translation is not yet available, the legislation's relevance for Thailand under current conditions of rapid urban growth and Asian (integrated vs. western segregated) patterns of urban land use has been questioned by other experts, e.g., Grava and Friedmann. This new law should be studied carefully during the course of implementing the land use programming project in Chonburi.

THE PROPOSED PROJECT SETTING

The prospects of hosting the Land Use Programming project was welcomed in Chonburi City where the concept of strengthening local planning and development capacity and responsibility fits the local perception of how best to achieve urban and regional development. However, during project design discussions in Chonburi City the concept was broadened during discussions in Chonburi City of project design to include the other two smaller municipalities in Chonburi Province -- namely, Phanatnikom (20,000 population) and Sriracha (18,000 population). While Chonburi City is a regional center, the two smaller cities are essentially rural market towns or service centers; both are quite strong in the role. Farmers in the region go to Chonburi for many of their needs but prefer the smaller towns, such as Phanatnikom and Sriracha, for their agricultural marketing and purchase of agricultural inputs. At this level in the urban hierarchy they reportedly are assured of access to good localized technical advice from the merchants from whom they purchase their farm implements, seeds, fertilizers and other requirements.

Given the regional focus of the project -- i.e., on a regional center and two nearby market towns, forming a triangular area with about 25 km. on a side -- it was concluded that the logical home for the project would be the newly established provincial planning office

Key Project Components

The project would have the following key components:

1. The "Working Group" -- executive and operations.
2. The services of a qualified U.S. contractor -- selected jointly by USAID and the Thai parties involved -- who would provide at least one urban-regional development expert for from one to two years as necessary and additional short-term experts as required from time to time by the Working Group.
3. Training courses, on-the-job and at a Thai-based training institution, e.g., Chulalongkorn University or the Asian Institute of Technology, for members of the operations working group.
4. Seminars and workshops for the executive and operations working groups.
5. Special equipment as needed but tailored to local conditions and needs, with an emphasis on practicality.
6. Sub-contracts locally for special surveys, studies, technical consultations, etc., as necessary.
7. Office space and furniture in the provincial government building and adequate to carry out the project.

8. Supporting local secretarial and technical personnel.
9. Technical support as appropriate and necessary from NESDB and the Department of Town and Country Planning.
10. A full-time planner assigned temporarily to Chonburi from the Department of Town and Country Planning until such time as the Provincial Government is able to fill this position locally.
11. Local budget support to assist with project activities.

APPENDICES

- A. The Land Use Programming Process
- B. Persons Consulted by the Field Survey Team (A Partial List)

APPENDIX A

THE LAND USE PROGRAMMING PROCESS

Land use programming, as the term is used by USAID TA/UD, is quite different from the more usual approaches to planning for urban development. The end-product of the process should be a portfolio of implementable projects which are supported by government at the national and local level and also by the community-at-large. The end-product should not be a traditional master plan report, although it may be necessary to document various aspects of the programming process. Broadly speaking, land use programming has two major objectives:

1. To provide a realistic and implementable action program which is of a scale and time frame needed to keep pace with population growth and other development.
2. To consolidate the known techniques for controlling the use of land so as to achieve a desired pattern of urban growth.

It is clear from these objectives that the process of land use programming must have certain characteristics if development is to occur at the right scales, at the right time and in the right place. First, the process must be oriented to the needs of implementing agencies; it, therefore, must be oriented also to creating financeable development projects. Second, the process must be flexible enough to respond to changes in policies and programs, to differences between projected and actual needs, to stimuli generated by urban growth and change. Finally, the process must be a relatively fast one, so that cycles of programming and implementation can occur at a pace which will meet the needs of rapid population growth and other developments.

Following is a brief discussion of the elements which together comprise the land use programming process. Although they are set forth in what seems to be serial fashion, there is in fact no established procedure for getting the programming process in motion. The order in which these items are addressed must be determined by the local situations. Two or more items, for example, may be the subject of immediate effort at the same time. Above all the process should seek "targets of opportunity" that will provide maximum payoff and further impetus to meeting overall urban development objectives.

1. Goal Setting: objectives as they may be set by national and local government (political leaders and the civil service) and from representatives of the community.
2. Implementation Structure: identification of implementing agencies at the national, regional and local levels; identification of urban development programs, and potential resource levels that are available to municipalities.
3. Guide Planning: Generalized planning to establish a "main framework" for urban development. The "main framework" should consist of major transportation corridors, major elements of water supply and sewerage, open space systems and public land, existing employment centers, both industrial and commercial. Ultimately, individual residential projects will be fitted to the main framework and other main framework elements will be developed as needed, within the guide plan time frame.
4. Land assembly: An active program of acquiring land directly or of acquiring development rights to land which is needed to accommodate urban development projects. The location of this land is in part determined by items 1 & 2 above, although any developable land available should be considered a target of opportunity for possible public action.
5. Project Packaging: To include identification of most appropriate implementing entity (in either the public or private sector); detailed development program (e.g., number of housing units, type of housing, densities, land implications, supporting community development progress); project budgets and schedules; financing and operating statements (income, expenses, capitalized values, cash flow, equity requirements).
6. Control Mechanism: Identification of the most appropriate techniques to limit and channel the impact of spontaneous growth. Should include statement as to cost of control and potential effectiveness (e.g., the installation of infrastructure in a particular location to encourage growth in that location instead of the use of police to ward off invasions of public and private land).

7. Evaluation and Feedback: This is a two-way process (a) from the guide planning exercise into project formulation so that projects are more closely tailored to objectives of the overall plan (b) from the process of project packaging and implementation into the guide planning exercise so that the effect of development bottlenecks and notable successes can be accounted for in planning. Baselines should be established at appropriate phases of the process and evaluation methodology structured into the system so that the various approaches and techniques of land use programming can be assessed and adjusted as necessary.

APPENDIX B

PERSONS CONSULTED BY THE FIELD SURVEY TEAM

(A Partial List)

Dr. Snoh Unakul
Secretary-General
National Economic and
Social Development Board
(NESDB)

Dr. Phisit Pakkasem
Chief
Regional Planning Division
NESDB

Dr. Thira Puntumvanit
Chief
Environment Division
NESDB

Mr. Vithya Siripong
Director
Economic Project Division
NESDB

Mr. Utis Kaothien
Regional Planning Division
NESDB

Mr. Charun Burapararat
Economic Project Division
NESDB

Mr. Nit Hinchiranun
Director
Planning Division
Department of Town and
Country Planning

Mr. Arthorn Suphapodok
Department of Town and
Country Planning
Ministry of the Interior

Mr. Tong Kum Banchaen
Provincial Undersecretary
Chonburi Province

Mr. Thira Thirasarn
Municipal Undersecretary
Chonburi Province

Mr. Apirat Prasertvit
Lord Mayor
Cholburi Municipality
Cholburi District

Mr. Chareauw Boriboon
Lord Mayor
Sriracha Municipality
Sriracha District

Mr. Manus Chaum
Lord Mayor
Sriracha Municipality
Sriracha District

Mr. Sompong Promsiri
Councillor
Phanatnikom Municipality
Phanatnikom District

Mr. Chumpol Surinthraboorn
Chief
Town and Country Planning Sector
Faculty of Architecture
Chulalongkorn University