REGIONAL VISIONING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

BEST PRACTICES

Prepared for
Sustainable Pittsburgh

By:
Robert H. Lurcott, FAICP

January 2005

_____

REGIONAL VISIONING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – BEST PRACTICES

Regional visioning is going on across the country and around the world. In response to concerns about global competitiveness, sustainability and quality of life, major metropolitan regions, smaller regions, and even rural areas have undertaken public participation visioning processes. An Internet search under regional visioning and public participation in the visioning process found thousands of entries. Those included comprehensive visioning initiatives, as well as efforts related to transportation planning. Clearly, a lot is happening in regional visioning.

Given the magnitude of this activity, this research effort, while thorough, is not an exhaustive study. Selected current practices in visioning with public participation have been reviewed, primarily through Internet source material and interviews with key participants. Those programs selected here for review have successfully engaged the public, and have innovative features and characteristics, which may be usefully applicable to Pittsburgh.

REGIONAL VISIONING is characterized as an effort to resolve key economic, social, environmental and growth issues in a manner that represents the values of the region's residents and stakeholders. Regions across this country and around the world are undertaking such efforts in order to remain competitive in today's global economy. To remain economically competitive, a region needs to have an integrated economic development strategy tied to sound land use management and targeted infrastructure investment. To acquire and retain a trained workforce, which is a key element in an effective economic development strategy, a region needs to address social access and environmental quality issues. A regional visioning process provides an opportunity to address these issues and develop a strategy in a coordinated and inclusive manner.

The Vision Statement, the privately generated product of the **Knoxville** process (**APPENDIX B-6**) did not have the authority of public law or policy. Instead, its authors described its impact as, "an <u>exhortation </u>to the citizens and the leadership to recognize and protect the values and assets of the region".

The examples of visioning processes that were examined, addressed a fairly consistent set of issues or themes, including: **economic development; social equity and access; environmental protection and quality of life; efficient infrastructure, particularly transportation; and responsive governance.**

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION has been a key part of all of the broad visioning processes examined in this review. The approaches and the magnitude of commitment have varied, but, in general, the level of participation and the creativity of the means of encouraging it have been high.

_____

Examples of the Visioning Public Participation Process

Some twenty visioning processes, undertaken by regions in this country and Europe, in the last five years, were screened preliminarily. The list includes the most important regions in this country, some whose size and characteristics are comparable to Pittsburgh, and others with uniquely designed processes. See the "National / European Examples" list, **APPENDIX A**. Nine of the examples were examined in more depth, based primarily on the nature of the public participation processes. See "Regional Examples" summaries, **APPENDIX B, 1 –9**

A summary of the characteristics of the two European examples is provided in **APPENDIX C.**

Tools

The visioning processes reviewed, employed a wide range of participation tools to carry out the public involvement process, and maximize participation. The tools utilized included: various types of sub-regional stakeholders meetings (based on geography, or interests), GIS computer simulations for developing alternative scenarios, newspapers and media for broad dissemination of information, and interactive websites to permit voting and feedback. For a listing of some of those tools, see "Tools – Partial Array" **APPENDIX D.**

Consultant Assistance

In most of the processes reviewed, consultants were utilized to help design the participation process and/or facilitate public discussion. From discussions with the sponsoring agencies, a list of consulting groups and resource entities was developed.

See "Consultants / Facilitators / Resource Organizations" list, **APPENDIX E**. Two consulting firms, one in the east, one in the west have contributed to about a dozen processes on the examples list. In addition, there are a number of resource organizations that provide research and training support.

Some of the organizations specialize in the design and facilitation of formats for direct participation by citizens such as workshops or brainstorming sessions. Others are specialists in citizen use of GIS mapping and land use modeling. Still others develop and carry out surveys or provide media support.

The Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission, before starting its visioning process, or selecting a consultant, was able to gather a number of representatives of the consulting firms for a discussion of alternative approaches to public participation.

Several of those who have designed and managed visioning and public participation processes, made comments about the nature of those processes:

Gianni Longo, a New York visioning consultant who worked on the processes in Birmingham, Baltimore and the World Trade Center, stressed that a visioning public participation process, "cannot be top down, it shouldn't be bottom up, but, rather, center out."

Ronald Thomas, former consultant, author of a book on regional visioning, and presently managing a process in Chicago, as head of the Northeast Illinois Planning Commission, **(APPENDIX B-3)** observed that, "with all our experience, we still do not have a model that we are confident works consistently; we are still designing it and modifying it for each situation."

John Parr, founder of the Alliance for Regional Stewardship, and who managed the Blueprint Denver process **(APPENDIX B-4)**, said at the 2004 University of Pittsburgh, Chancellor's Retreat for Elected Officials, that "the process should create a platform for participation."

Costs

Comparable costs for the participation processes were not readily available. They varied widely, from $150,000 for a 4-month consultant/facilitator contract in the Boston process, to a $3.75 million overall budget for the 3-year Chicago program. In many cases, the costs between technical analysis and public participation were not broken down. For instance, the $2 million budget for the Denver Land Use and Transportation Plan, includes all costs, technical and participation, consultant and staff. The NIPC program in Chicago, estimates that the $3.75 million budget breaks down to: 1/3 data gathering, analysis and modeling; 1/3 public events management; 1/3 media and publications (including website). In general, the private grant figures were available, but the larger government-funded budgets were not.

Involvement of Young Professionals

Pittsburgh's higher than average loss of the young professional demographic suggests that any vision developed should address that issue, as well as, issues important to that group. Some of those issues, including: environmental protection, open land conservation, access to natural resources and recreation, diversity and social equity, a strong education system, a range of cultural and entertainment activities and vibrant downtowns, are areas addressed in many of the recent regional visioning processes studied around the country. Explicit involvement of that group in the processes, however, was not consistently evident.

To ensure that young professional issues are fully addressed, the process needs to ensure the inclusion and full participation by that demographic. Young knowledge workers, or "creative class" as characterized by Richard Florida, anticipate involvement in any discussion of the issues that impact them. Florida organized a summit of young professionals in Memphis to discuss the issues that mattered to them in the future of their

cities. The statement of conclusions from the summit is known as the <u>Memphis Manifesto</u>.

It summarizes the kinds of issues important to the group. That the summit was held demonstrates that young professionals care about the future of their region. For a summary, see **APPENDIX F**.

A number of governments have instituted programs to address the problem of losing young professionals and have used the approach and the language of the Creative Class and the Manifesto.

> **Michigan** Governor Jennifer Granholm established the "Cool Cities" initiative, which gives grants to cities with innovative programs or projects to attract young people.

> **Baltimore** Mayor Martin O'Malley appointed a special assistant for creativity, and two regional agencies have undertaken creativity projects.

> **Cleveland,** working with Yale and Colgate universities, sponsors an internship program where interns stay with host families to acquire a taste of the city.

> **Philadelphia** has registered a slight gain in 25 to 43 age growth, but has begun a program to convince college students to stay after graduation.

CONCLUSIONS

A number of key ideas appeared and reappeared in researching regional visioning efforts in other areas, and in speaking with those who organized them:

- The process needs to provide for full stakeholder collaboration
- Incorporate community opinions/interests routinely, clearly and consistently in the planning process
- The participation process needs to be seen as a place with no walls, where anyone who wants to partake, can do so
- The door to participation always needs to be seen as open
- Barriers to participation need to be addressed early
- Engage the development community actively
- Seek the involvement of local universities
- Develop means to engage persons who typically have limited voice in public policy: youth, poor, minorities, etc.
- Young knowledge workers anticipate a process of involvement
- Seek to educate elected leaders, public officials, and the public about smart growth and sustainability
- Use workshop and charrette formats to engage knowledgeable people actively
- Use newspapers, media and internet techniques to reach a broader public

- Use interactive techniques for feedback
- Use modeling and GIS techniques to generate alternative future scenarios
- A product of the effort should be an easy and convenient way to reach decision-makers on a regular basis
- Place regionalism in a globalization context
- Consistently, in the processes reviewed, when the participants were asked to vote on alternative scenarios, they overwhelmingly voted for the most restrictive, compact, smart growth development alternative, providing the minimum amount of land for development, the most for conservation.
- Processes were initiated by private organizations as well as regional planning agencies; most effective were those that evolved to a partnership of business, government and the civic community

The Salt Lake City area undertook a 10 county, regional visioning effort, including a broad public participation process: **Envision Utah (APPENDIX B-9),** that is highly-regarded for its inclusiveness and its innovative techniques.

The Salt Lake Tribune quotes **Chuck Chappell**, executive director of the Regional Council there, as characterizing the **Envision Utah** process as " … a shift in the way Utah's two largest MPO's do business… The way transportation planning has been done, historically – including the plans that are in place now – was like a patchwork quilt. It was a bunch of communities getting together and we somehow tried to merge all of the individual community views and perspectives into a common document, and we called it a regional plan." Envision Utah "…is a dialogue between regional transportation and local land use decisions… It's a broadening of our perspective"

Stephen Holbrook, the retiring Executive Director of the Coalition for Utah's Future, which created Envision Utah, while attending the recent National Forum on Regional Stewardship, in Salt Lake City, said, " It is really essential that BOTH the principal stakeholders and the public be included in the process, and that both are convinced of its value and fairness. The difficulty is that the means of involvement of each is so different."

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AN ESSENTIAL INGREDIENT

It is clear from this research that best practices in regional visioning include a substantial public participation component. The fact that all of the successful visioning efforts have made a substantial investment in time and money in such public involvement is a strong argument for inclusion of such a component in the visioning process. In as much as the visioning is intended to resolve social and economic issues in order to develop a shared vision that reflects the values of stakeholders, it stands to reason that the public must be involved fully in the discussion. As evidenced by the experience in other regions, it takes a considerable commitment to ensure a meaningful level of involvement by a substantial and representative segment of the public.

_____

NATIONAL / EUROPEAN EXAMPLES
APPENDIX A

Atlanta Vision 2020

Envision Central Texas (**Austin area**)

Baltimore Vision 2030 (Baltimore Metro Council)

Birmingham Regional Growth Alliance – Region 2020

Metro **Boston** Regional Visioning Project (MAPC)

Chicago Metropolis 2020 (Commercial Club of Chicago)

Greater **Cleveland** partnership

Blueprint **Denver**, MetroVisions 2020

The Citizens' Agenda for **Houston's** Future

(**Knoxville**) Nine Counties – One Vision

Southern California Compass (**Los Angeles** area) (SoCal Association of Governments)

(**Lyon, France**) Millenaire 3 (city government)

Phoenix Valley Vision 2025

Portland Metro 2040 Framework

SACOG (**Sacramento**) Blueprint Land Use and Transportation Study

Envision Utah (**Salt Lake City**)

Regional Comprehensive Plan (**San Diego** Association of Governments)

Bay Area (**San Francisco**) Smart Growth Strategy/Regional Livability Footprint (ABAG)

Greater **Tulsa** Regional Visioning Process 2025

(**Turin, Italy**) Turino Internazionale (city government)

_____

REGIONAL EXAMPLES
APPENDIX B - 1

Region: BIRMINGHAM
> This program was initiated and funded entirely in the private sector. Only in later stages was the public sector brought into the process. The extensive public process sustained itself into what is now a four-year implementation phase.

Name of organization/process: Region 2020 – private non-profit
Region 2020 – a citizen-driven, regional visioning process

Geographic area: 12 – county area
Population Central city: 243,000
         Region: 2 million

Process time period: 1997 – 1999: visioning; 2000 – present: implementation

Initiating action/ issue: Need, seen by private sector, for an integrated planning process to improve the quality of life.

Sponsoring organization(s):   Region 2020 initiated process
Regional Growth Alliance (Region 2020, Regional Planning Commission, Chamber of Commerce of Greater Birmingham

Funding source(s):   Visioning – local foundations
Implementation - corporations
Little government – at later stages
Budgets: 97-99 $310,000; 01-02 $194,000
Participants:
   Numbers: 5000+;   1300 volunteers

   Major groups/sectors: primarily private citizens, non-profit orgs., businesses, business orgs.

Process structure(s):   Visioning:
17 idea-gathering meetings – 1800 participants
7   goal-setting meetings (34 goals) – 800 participants
a vision fair – prioritizing goals 1300 participants
Implementation:
30 working groups organized around goals – developing action plans.
Regional roundtable – keeping elected officials informed

_____

APPENDIX B-1 continued

Tools employed: Brainstorming
                    Volunteer facilitators
                    Visioning consultants
                    Volunteer goal sifters

Outcomes/products: The Book on the Region – statement of goals and strategies
                    Action plans in each goal area

_____

REGIONAL EXAMPLES
APPENDIX B - 2

Region: BOSTON
This process, begun as a required update of the regional planning process, was expanded to a broad-based, citizen process, driven by collaboration

Name of organization/process: MAPC – Metropolitan Area Planning Council
(member of MPO; transportation oversight)
METRO FUTURE, Making a greater Boston Region
The Regional Vision and Growth Strategy Project

Geographic area: 101 municipalities; 1422 square miles
Population Central city: 589,000
Region: 3 million

Process time period: Design team planning - 2002
Early public participation – OCT 2003 - JUN 2004
21/2 year technical planning / participation process

Initiating action/ issue: Responsibility to monitor population/employment trends, create/update a regional plan. Desire to plan collaboratively for a more desirable future.

Sponsoring organization(s):   The Boston Foundation; UMass, Boston; Boston College Citizens Seminars; MIT Urban Studies

Funding source(s):   Federal, state, municipal funding
Private grants and contracts
Budget: $150,000 for 4-month public participation process

Participants:
Numbers: Initial visioning - 1000

Major groups/sectors: citizens, sub-regional organizations, municipalities

Process structure(s):

Technical: Participation:
Analysis of current trends   Design team working groups (JUL 02)
Developing alternatives   B.C. Citizens Seminar (OCT 03)
Integrating scenarios   Community forums in 8 sub-regions
Implementation strategies   preserve vs. change; visions
Create integrated scenarios
Public comment, vote on preferred scenario
Short term implementation strategies

_____

APPENDIX B – 2 continued

Tools employed: Virtual Regional data repository – website, on-line access
Tools Summit (JUL 04) – national experts helped select decision
support tools
Polling on major issues
Visioning Kit

Outcomes/products: Comprehensive Regional Plan: land use, transportation, economy,
Environment, growth trends
Legislative recommendations
Short-term implementation strategies

_____

REGIONAL EXAMPLES
APPENDIX B - 3

Region: CHICAGO
The regional planning commission which is charged with providing, on a regular basis, population and land use trends to the MPO, has decided to expand the process to a public participation visioning process.

Name of organization/process: Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission (NICP) Common Ground – A Blueprint for Regional Action (2030)

Geographic area: 6 counties; 272 municipalities
Population Central city: 2,290,000
            Region: 8 million

Process time period: Phase 1 2001 – 2003; Phase 2 2004 -

Initiating action/ issue: Requirement to provide population/land use trend information to MPO
Need for common vision

Sponsoring organization(s):   NICP, state departments, universities, non-profits

Funding source(s):   Area foundations, state transportation/community affairs departments
Budget: $3.75m; $1.25m event design/management

Participants:
    Numbers: 1800
    Major groups/sectors: community leadership, activists, citizens, youth, under-represented

Process structure(s):   Phase 1:
Leadership workshops (900 participants) FEB – MAR 01
Regional forum (850) OCT 01
Workshop meetings JAN – JUN 02
Youth forum APR 02
9 goal review workshops JAN – FEB 03
Phase 2:
12 cluster workshops FEB – JUN 04

    Tools employed: Phase 1: wireless keypads for polling, computers for capturing commentary, WebCouncil – online communication between groups, online survey for individual input on goals

_____

_____

Phase 2: GIS-based, interactive "Paint the Region" map.

APPENDIX B – 3 continued

Outcomes/products: Phase 1:
Visionary Goals: 5 core themes grew out of process,
endorsed by Commission: global competitiveness /
diversity / accessibility to jobs / alternative transportation
Phase 2:
Regional Land Use Framework Plan

_____

_____

REGIONAL EXAMPLES
APPENDIX B - 4

Region: DENVER
The unique aspect of the Denver experience is that a fairly traditional regional planning approach spawned local planning and visioning processes, which were committed to adhering to the growth boundary requirements, and in the City of Denver's case, provided for a broad public participation process.

Name of organization/process: Denver Regional Council of Governments (MPO)
MetroVision 2020 (regional plan)
Mile High Compact (5 counties, 31 local, 82% pop)
Blueprint Denver (city plan)

Geographic area: 9 counties; 42 local governments; 550 square miles
Population Central city: 555,000
       Region: 2 million

Process time period: MetroVision 2020   1995 - 97
Mile high Compact   2000
Blueprint Denver: Comp Plan 2000
                      Land Use/Transportation 2003

Initiating action/ issue: MetroVision: Traditional regional plan update spurred environmental pressure for growth boundaries
Blueprint Denver: local planning process spurred by commitment to adhere to regional plan

Sponsoring organization(s):   Regional agencies; local governments

Funding source(s):   Mostly government sources
Budget for Denver Land Use/Transp Plan process
$2 million: technical analysis/modeling/public process

Participants:
   Numbers: Several thousand participated in
2003 Land Use/Transportation Plan

Process Structure(s);   19 open houses (50-60 participants)
8 hands-on workshops – established "areas of stability/ areas of change"

Questionnaire mailed to participants and on website
Small area workshops – evaluated neighborhood level proposals
Design workshops- tested change area proposals

_____

APPENDIX B – 4 continued

Tools employed: Facilitated workshops
Questionnaires
Website
TV coverage

Outcomes/products: A comprehensive plan element that, with broad public support, links transportation and development issues, relating public transit and high density development, provides for growth boundaries, and differentiates between areas designated for stability and for change.

_____

REGIONAL EXAMPLES
APPENDIX B - 5

Region: HOUSTON
Houston's example is an entirely private, citizen-driven and focused on the City of Houston, which, due to its physical size and population, is particularly dominant in the region

Name of organization/process: Blueprint Houston – a Citizens' Agenda for Houston's Future

Population: 1,950,000 (4th ranked)

Process time period: JAN – JUN 2003

Initiating action/ issue: A citizen-initiated concern about mobility and quality of life issues

Sponsoring organization(s):   1000 Friends of Houston
Gulf Coast Institute

Funding source(s):   Houston Endowment - $350,000

Participants:
    Numbers: 2500

        Major groups/sectors: private citizens, non-profit leaders

Process structure(s) / tools: 2 steering committee meetings   (55 members)
2 leadership workshops   (250 participants)
5 public brainstorming meetings   (600 participants)
Telephone survey (1000 contacts)
Citizens' Congress (1040 participants) – revised goals developed in process, voted on priorities (electronic keypad voting)

Outcomes/products: City Council endorsement of Blueprint
Argument for comprehensive planning process
Houston Profile - demographic data and forecasts

_____

REGIONAL EXAMPLES
APPENDIX B - 6

Region: KNOXVILLE
> This is a totally private, citizen-driven undertaking. For the size of the region, the amount of participation is remarkable.

Name of organization/process:	9 Counties – One Vision non-profit organization / process
Geographic area:	9 counties (larger than MPO; smaller than state development district)
Population Central city:	174,000
Region:	750,000
Process time period:	1999-2004
Initiating action/ issue:	Citizen process seen as an antidote to traditional insider/backroom decision-making.
Funding source(s):	local foundations, corporations $270,000 annually for 5 years
Participants:	
Numbers:	3600
Major groups/sectors:	20% senior citizens; 250 high school students
Process structure(s):	20 public meetings idea gathering (8400 ideas) goal developing Vision Fair 1300 participants Action plan task forces
Tools employed:	Consultants 250 facilitators Simulcast by local TV stations
Outcomes/products:	Vision Statement The Big Book - demographic data State of the Region – what has changed in 5 years

REGIONAL EXAMPLES
APPENDIX B - 7

Region: LOS ANGELES
A process that began as a required, regular update of land use and population projections for the regional transportation plan was extended and expanded to be a full-blown visioning process with an extensive civic engagement program, using on-going connections with a sophisticated, technical analysis and modeling effort.

Name of organization/process: Southern California Associations of Governments (MPO)
Southern California Compass – charting a course for sustainable development

Geographic area: 6 counties
Population Central city: 3,694,000
            Region: 17 million

Process time period: FEB 2001 – JUN 2004

Initiating action/ issue: Required update of population trends to address transportation needs, against a projected growth of 10 million, expanded to a participatory visioning process that addressed smart growth and environmental issues.

Sponsoring organization(s):   SCAG (MPO)

Funding source(s):   CalDOT, USDOT (FHA/FTA) – Transportation Equity Act

Process structure(s):   Parallel technical analysis and public engagement processes

Technical:
Prepare GIS regional/sub-areas constraints maps; develop alternative growth scenarios, with impact analysis.

Public:
Sub-regional workshops – review of constraints maps (tables of 6-8 participants representing a cross section of interests); regional workshops – work with larger scale maps – results used to create alternative scenarios; single, major regional workshop – review alternatives – vote for preferred.

APPENDIX B – 7 continued

Tools employed: GIS – based mapping
Media advertising
Consultant design/management of process
Interactive website / electronic voting

Outcomes/products: Growth Vision Report   (JUN 04)
Printed report / pamphlet / poster / on-line summary

REGIONAL EXAMPLES
APPENDIX B - 8

Region: SACRAMENTO
      This is a city and region comparable in size to Pittsburgh. The regional planning agency partnered with a non-profit civic engagement / smart growth organization to turn a transportation / land use plan update into a participatory regional visioning process, using most of the current practice tools.

Name of organization/process: Sacramento Area Council of Governments (MPO)
      Valley Vision
      Blueprint Transportation & Land Use Study

Geographic area: 6 counties; 22 cities
Population Central city: 407,000
      Region: 1.9 million

Process time period: public process: JAN 2003 – OCT 2004

Initiating action/ issue: Required transportation plan update. In light of projected 1.7 million growth, needed review of transportation investments, land use patterns and air quality consistent with local values.

Sponsoring organization(s):   SACOG, Valley Vision

Funding source(s):   Greater Valley Center – foundation
      State transportation and community development departments
Participants:
    Numbers: 1700

    Major groups/sectors: citizens, local planners, elected officials

Process structure(s):   Base case regional futures and indicators study (OCT 02)
      Education in smart growth principles
      29 neighborhood level workshops
      County-level scenario development
      County-wide workshops – select county scenarios
      Regional scenario development
      Elected officials briefings
      Tall Order Regional Forum – preferred regional scenario
      Public opinion survey
      Elected officials summit

_____

APPENDIX B – 8 continued

Tools employed:	PLACE3S software – projects growth based development goals and transportation decisions Table breakout groups with computers and maps Internet interactive website Telephone attitude poll Newspaper public opinion survey, ads, and stories,
Outcomes/products:	2050 Transportation Plan $500 million set-aside for development projects meeting plan goals, but not fully market supportable.

REGIONAL EXAMPLES
APPENDIX B - 9

Region: SALT LAKE CITY
This is a privately-initiated effort which brought in public sector involvement. It has won awards for its high level of effort and success with public engagement.

Name of organization/process: Coalition for Utah's Future sponsored the Envision Utah Partnership, a public/private non-profit.
Envision Utah Process

Geographic area: Greater Wasatch Area; 10 counties; 88 cities
Population Central city: 182,000
            Region: 1.7 million

Process time period: 1997-2000

Initiating action/ issue: Concern, primarily in the private sector, about the quality of anticipated growth.

Sponsoring organization(s): Coalition for Utah's Future; Envision Utah

Funding source(s): Primarily private contributions from corporations, foundations, non-profits.
Later, with public funding: 81% private, 17% federal, 2% city
Participants:
    Numbers: Thousands

Process structure(s): In-depth values study
Baseline growth analysis
100 public workshops
Alternative scenario development
25 workshops to pick scenarios / create growth strategies
Public survey (17,000 respondents) on scenarios.

Outcomes/products: Quality Growth Strategy – proposing compact growth
(171 fewer square miles of development than baseline)
Spin-offs: Local general plans
            Community toolboxes
            Training workshops
            Model codes
            Design standards
            Transit-oriented development guidelines

EUROPEAN EXAMPLES
APPENDIX C

LYON, FRANCE
TURIN, ITALY

These two geographically-proximate European regional cities are both involved in focused programs aimed at economic transformation.

Delegations from Pittsburgh and Cleveland visited both in 2003 and 2004, through the German Marshall Fund of the U.S., to assess the applicability of the programs.

Both regions, **Lyon** with a population of 2.2 million, and **Turin** with 2.5 million, are roughly the same size as the Pittsburgh region. Both are old, industrial cities with historical and cultural assets. They are connected by a high-speed rail line, which adds to prospects for joint efforts.

The programs in each of the cities were initiated, and are driven by the mayors of the central cities. The mayors' positions provide sufficient influence to lead such regional efforts. Mayor Raymond Barre (former French Prime minister) of Lyon, organized a community-wide strategic planning and visioning process (Milleaire 3) that involved significant public input. Longtime Turin Mayor, Valentino Castellani, initiated a broad, public "re-imaging" and strategic planning process called Turino Internazionale.

The basic purpose of the programs in each city is clearly to recast their economies in order to remain competitive in the global economy. Both processes have included elements of the American experience with regional visioning. Beside the broad public involvement, these include: quality of life issues, urban improvement, environmental quality and social cohesion, and connecting land use management with targeted infrastructure investments. Both regions have regional forms of governance and service delivery.

TOOLS – PARTIAL ARRAY
APPENDIX D

- Goal setting

- Sub-regional community brainstorming sessions

- Interest group forums

- Leadership conferences (business, civic, government – elected/agency)

- Rental videos for background information

- Interactive website for teaching school kids ("Box City")

- Mapping workshops

- Computer simulations (scenarios, zoning codes, etc.)

- Alternative future scenario development

- Mapping workshops

- Functional/scenario analysis, modeling and testing

- Random telephone surveys

- Public/community access TV coverage/progress summaries

- On-line, interactive website – voting

- Newspaper insert for voting

- Regional congress (area-wide meeting) – electronic voting
        Electronic Town Meetings

- Mass mailing summary conclusions brochure

- Analysis and conclusions CD for: participants, selected leaders, request-ees

- Follow-up functional task forces for implementation, plan making and monitoring

- Ongoing process for updating public on progress and obtaining feedback

**CONSULTANTS/FACILITATORS – RESOURCE ORGANIZATIONS
APPENDIX E**

American Communities Partnership (ACP)
> Gianni Longo, New York
> Jamie Green, Columbus
>> Balt., Birm., Chatta., Knox., Houston, DC, KC, WTC

Fragonese Calthorpe Assocs.
> John Fragonese, Portland, OR
> Peter Calthorpe, Berkeley, CA
>> SoCal Compass, Austin, Chicago, Utah

Smart Mobility – Norwich, VT
> Chicago, Austin

Regional Excellence Consulting
> Bill Dodge

Alliance for Regional Stewardship
> John Parr, Denver

AmericaSpeaks
> Principles of a Healthy Democracy

Community Viz – VT
> Mary Means (Orton Family Foundation)

Justice and Sustainability Assocs. DC
> Don Edwards

National Smart Growth Leadership Institute
> Parris Glendening (former MD governor)

National Center for Smart Growth Research
> University of Maryland
> Garrit Knapp

California Center for Regional Leadership
> San Francisco (statewide non-profit)

Smart Growth Network

MEMPHIS MANIFESTO
APPENDIX F

In the spring of 2003, author Richard Florida and syndicated public radio host Carol Colletta, organized a summit of young professional workers in Memphis to discuss the future of their cities. The summit was sponsored by local corporations and foundations. The 100 participants, nominated from 48 cities across North America, issued a statement asserted that "creativity is fundamental to being human," and "that creative communities are vibrant, humanizing places, nurturing personal growth, sparking cultural and technological breakthroughs, producing jobs and wealth, and accepting a variety of life styles and culture." They adopted ten principles to help communities realize their full potential:

> Cultivate and reward creativity
> Invest in the creative ecosystem (arts, designers, lively neighborhoods, education and public spaces)
> Embrace diversity
> Nurture the creatives
> Value risk-taking
> Be authentic (maintain the community's unique character)
> Invest in and build on quality of place
> Remove barriers to creativity (intolerance, sprawl, bad schools)
> Take responsibility for change in your community
> Ensure that every person, especially children, has the right to creativity

They committed to return to their communities and press for these ideas to be incorporated into public policies.

Some of the views expressed by participants:

> *The challenge will be to inspire and design processes and projects which change a city's culture to one which values curiosity, learning, creativity, diversity and distributed leadership.*
> - Colin Jackson, Epcor Center for the Perfoming Arts, Calgary

> *People live in places where their views are validated*
> - Bill Bishop, Austin American-Statesman

REFERENCES /CONTACTS

Ames, Steven
        A Guide to Community Visioning
        Oregon Visions Project
        1998

Dodge, William R.
        Regional Excellence – Growing Together to Compete Globally and Flourish
        Locally
        National League of Cities
        1996

Lampe, David
        Toward a Vision of the Livable Community – monograph
        Alliance for Regional Stewardship
        2004

Parr, John, Kim Walesh, Chi Nguyen
        Principles of Regional Stewardship – monograph
        Alliance for Regional Stewardship
        2002

Thomas, Ronald
        Taking Charge – How Communities Are Developing Their Future
        ICMA
        1998

Interviews:

Karen Brean – Karen Brean, Associates
Paul Farmer – American Planning Association
Ann Florie – Leadership Birmingham
Lynn Fuget – Nine Counties – One Vision
Court Gould – Sustainable Pittsburgh
Stephen Holbrook – Coalition for Utah's Future
William Klein – American Planning Association
Gianni Longo – American Communities Partnership
Tammy Miller – Nine Counties – One Vision
John Parr – Alliance for Regional Stewardship
Ronald Thomas – Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission