Tourism planning is like no other planning. In fact, tourism is an abstraction—it does not truly exist. No one has it under his control; knows how big it is or should be; what it should encompass; nor what it should cost. Furthermore, tourism planning is a binomial term that is contradictory. The human behavior of tourism is the antithesis of controlled behavior. Therefore, it is contrary to planning. If these statements are true, the subject of tourism planning technique becomes more theoretical than practical.

But, tourism planning, in a very narrow sense, takes place every day—but in a bits-and-pieces fashion. Every decision by a highway department, an airline, or a hotel corporation in some way relates to tourism and tourism planning. Tourism demands much broader social and physical planning, especially if it is to provide satisfactions to users, rewards to owners and yet protect environmental assets.
The many functional elements of tourism demand a multi-disciplinary approach to planning. The behavior of people at leisure is complicated and capricious. Therefore, in terms of ability and training, much is demanded of the tourism planner. Personally, I have had to add elements of sociology, psychology, economics, public land policy and business management to my basic training as a professional landscape architect. I commend the planners of this seminar for their recognition of the breadth and scope of tourism planning.

Let me describe two models of tourism planning: the way it is today and the way I believe it could be. Although most of my work has not been in Canada, I hope that some of the following observations and concepts will prove useful in this magnificent tourist land.

All tourism developer-investors can be classified into three categories: governments, private enterprise and non-profit organizations. Each group follows generally the same steps of setting objectives, selecting sites, designing sites and structures, developing land and building structures, and engaging in operational management. This obvious truth has a less-obvious result. Seldom do the three sectors communicate with each other and seldom is there collaboration within each sector, especially at the most critical stage—land planning. This produces problems—problems of land resource depredation,
reduced visitor satisfactions and reduced rewards to owners-managers.

Wherever one travels, he can observe the results of poor planning for tourism. Some examples:

* We post "Do Not Litter" signs and yet allow the worst kind of esthetic littering with our cluttered land use and poor design of tourist facilities.

* Without regional planning, we allow site concentrations and conflicts that are not only displeasing to the users but erode valuable land resources.

* Without regional planning, individual sites must support unusual pressures at peak times while others go unused.

* Without sensitivity to landscape esthetics, businesses often create unfavorable images of their own tourism products and services.

* Without sensitivity to the mood of history, many historic sites provide nothing more than seas of tourists looking for history.

* Natural resource assets are often violated in an attempt to provide attractions and services for tourists.

* Governments, agencies and private enterprise often develop counterproductively on adjacent sites because coordination is lacking.

* Tourists are often left to their own initiative and therefore lack understanding of things they are visiting or viewing.
* Slippage in information and guidance prevents a great amount of enjoyment and enrichment from tourist travel.
* Poor locations of attractions frequently gain poor response from the vacationing public.

After researching the basis for the present hodgepodge of development for tourism, I came to many conclusions but the following four seemed to be most important:

1. Attractions—all the way from national parks to commercial theme parks—are the first power of tourism.
2. An important trend is toward larger attraction complexes, rather than isolated single attraction features.
3. Both cities and transportation are far more critical in the tourism system than resource-orientation has led us to believe.
4. Distance—especially travel time—distance from home to attractions—is a very critical element of tourism.

If these conclusions are correct, they carry many implications for tourism planning. If these conclusions are to be recognized in overall planning and if we are to eliminate some of the ills of poor planning, what steps should be taken? The following suggestions will be effective only if we change our narrow and polarized goals. Overall planning must foster the accomplishment of several goals at the same time: (1) rewards to owners—private enterprise must make profits and governments
must reach their social rewards for investment and management;

(2) better user satisfactions—participants, travelers and recreationists must gain personal satisfactions from their experiences and plans must provide for them and (3) environmental balance—protection of basic resource assets must take place at the same time that better utilization of resources is made for tourism development. The following ten steps can provide the sequence of overall planning if adequate motivation, collaboration and skills are provided along every step of the way.

1. The study and design team needs to obtain an overall understanding of both natural (climate, vegetation, topography, soils, geology, water, waterlife) and cultural (esthetics, history, ethnicity, development) resource characteristics. This demands a specialized approach in order to derive the meaning of these resources to tourism development—either change or expansion. The results can be summarized on a composite map that identifies zones of strong and weak resource strengths.

2. Equally important are studies of markets (present and potential users) and transportation. Knowledge of population characteristics—their interests, ability to participate and their mobility—is important to regional planning. Time-distance information and transportation options are also
important, not just quantitatively but for site allocation and site design.

3. The next step is to reconstitute these many findings into meaningful statements and maps showing areas of greatest importance. The geographic distribution of strong resources, travel flows, relationship to access are basic to further planning. These three steps comprise a research stage.

4. The next step, confirmation of boundaries, introduces the creative and innovative stage. Although rough boundaries may have been set for analysis purposes, it is now necessary to confirm or deny these initial assumptions. Regional identity has much to do with success of implementation—congruency with an administrative entity is necessary.

5. At this point, the entire region can be conceptualized as composed of three elements: (1) community-attraction complexes—attraction potential and linkage to communities for services; (2) circulation corridors, providing linkage with population sources and (3) a non-attraction hinterland—the balance of land. Points of circulation penetration are especially important in the design of entrances to the region.

6. Beginning with key communities, the area circumscribed by a radius of influence can be analyzed in greater detail. This is the location for detailed study of natural and cultural assets and limitations.
7. This can lead to an identification of potential attraction complexes—locations with greatest opportunity. This is essential to both resource protection and utilization. The paradox of tourism is the high demand for the areas of greatest rarity. There is no escape from this planning fundamental.

8. The next stage begins by reviewing the total potential and assigning priorities for further feasibility. Readjustment or new development on a regional scale takes years to accomplish. Individual feasibilities of specific attractions—vacation home complexes, scenic areas, parks, nature centers, and others—now need to be identified.

9. Equally important for feasibility preparation are transportation changes and the creation of new (or adjustment of older) facilities and services.

10. From this process, those charged with implementation—owners, managers—have a sound basis for making decisions. Rather than using traditional practices or whim, decisions can be based upon both factual and professional foundations. Although we do not yet possess all the research, analysis and creativity we need today I believe that this process can give us some direction when properly used.

All of this, of course, demands a high degree of collaboration at the planning stage—much more than is now practiced. If
environments are to function for the users (the participants), it must be planned that way at the start. I argue that we can maintain the integrity of individual decision-making and individual development at the same time we recognize the limits and characteristics of the environment.

About ten years ago, I had the opportunity of testing this theory of regional planning in Michigan's Upper Peninsula. The team consisted of Michigan State University staff, local citizens and a site planning firm. We utilized the process outlined above, enlisting local inputs all along the way. In fact, the project report was delayed for over a year because the project leaders were so heavily involved with local implementation.

From our study, we concluded that the region contained areas with potential for development and areas that needed protection from development. Over one-hundred attraction clusters were recommended for nine development zones. The central portion of the region fell outside this development area and was identified as a conservation zone. Also included were six specific feasibility projects—prospects for attraction development.

Last summer, I visited the area for the first time since the study took place. From Mr. Ray Gummerson, a resource development leader of the region and one who has been guiding most of the
implementation, I obtained a list of accomplishments. The slides I am showing illustrate examples of development that has resulted either directly or indirectly from the project recommendations.

At Bond Falls, for example, the Upper Peninsula Power Company has installed well-designed foot access and overlooks. No charge is made for this popular attraction.

The U.S. Forest Service has established Sylvania, a new recreation area. Included are several thousand acres of forest and lakes for camping, fishing, canoeing and hiking. An educational interpretation center is open to the public.

Several million dollars of private investment have gone into winter sports areas, including new vacation homes, new lodges and new lifts. A new ski-fly development, the only one of its kind in this hemisphere, has been established in Gogebic County.

Based upon our recommendations, the old Quincy copper mine is being redeveloped as a tourist attraction. This includes renovation of the largest steam hoist in the world.

Our report made much of the early explorations of the region by Jesuit missionaries and recommended that this fact should be developed for tourists. Now visitors can view a large bronze statue to Father Baraga and obtain interpretive information on his work.
Several older hotels have been restored rather than demolished in the face of new competition.

Even remote areas, such as Big Bay, the locale of the best-seller, *The Anatomy of a Murder*, are showing signs of renovation.

During the planning of this region, members of the team were engaged in studying the feasibility of a national seashore along the Pictured Rocks on the south side of Lake Superior. This is now established and is in the beginning stages of development.

Throughout the Upper Peninsula I saw many tourist and recreational innovations and a new concern for the environment. There are now many more nature foot trails and interpretive drive-throughs than ever before.

Two things have happened on Mackinac Island. The Mackinac Island Park Commission was able to float bonds to make major restoration and expansion of the fort. But, in addition, private interests have spent millions of dollars to restore old hotels, restaurants, shops, homes and the harbor. This area is far more attractive and serviceable with modern facilities than in its heyday of the early 1900s.

In our planning of this region, we believed in the ingenuity of the people of the region as well as our own professional
ability. For example, even though we had not conceived of an historic-interpretive tower at Sault Ste. Marie, we had told the city that its future appeared to depend upon how well it expanded its historic background for tourists. It was a priest who came to us, seeking advice on building this interpretive sightseeing tower overlooking the entire city and the famous locks. We did not think of going to the churches—they came to us.

In addition to these highlights, we had recommended:

Refinancing of the Mackinac Bridge (this has been done);
Establishing new information centers (two have been built);
Establishing expressways (plans are now laid);
Gateway development (contracts were let last fall);
Establish road side controls (state and federal legislation);
Establish a major event (not yet done).

Through my research and teaching I am continually trying to improve our methods of evaluating the land resource base for tourism development. I am confident that we can find ways of doing this much less laboriously.

By now I am sure that you can see my interest and faith in regional planning for tourism. But, it is neither easy nor quick. Developers and investors must be involved; the resource-market interface must be understood and a great amount of time
for implementation must be expected. In conclusion, in my opinion, now we need not only much more research and development of new and better techniques but more and more collaboration at the planning stage.