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INTRODUCTION

Although the coastal community of 400 households built and donated the fire station to the fire district twenty years prior, the district was posed to sell the building and build an updated facility that could house larger fire trucks. Community members discussed buying the former fire station building and converting it into the town’s first and only community center. Yet, with only a volunteer watershed council and one paid staff person, the water and sanitation engineer, the unincorporated community was without the technical expertise and capacity to write grant applications, analyze costs, and get design or planning assistance.

On the other side of the Coastal mountain range, 500 university students and professors in over thirteen academic disciplines converged on a town of 50,000 to conduct 15-20 projects in sustainable architectural design, urban design, planning, cost-benefit analysis, economic development, legal and policy analysis, and community engagement.

America’s rural areas and urban clusters are at risk from large-scale changes in the national economy, population shifts, impact of telecommunications and mass merchandising, and changes in federal land policy. In the face of these forces, rural areas and urban clusters struggle to maintain their sense of identity and vitality. Planning and design solutions can often make the difference between community survival and decay.¹

Problem

Rural areas and urban clusters rarely have access to design or planning assistance.² Communities throughout Oregon lack professional expertise, staff and other resources to conduct community planning. Community planning expertise includes concepts of decentralization, planning, urban design, community needs assessment and prioritization, political structure, and grant writing.

² Ibid.
The State of Oregon, universities, non-profits, and professional associations offer technical planning and design assistance in Oregon. However, these services are largely concentrated in the urban areas. Rural areas and urban clusters have difficulty accessing these incredible opportunities to improve their communities.

**Goals & Objectives**

The strategic goal of this paper is to identify an approach to improve planning in rural areas and urban clusters in Oregon. The strategic objective is to characterize the available planning assistance; to identify improvements; and to create an approach for matching the professional assistance on long-range community planning with rural areas and urban clusters in Oregon.

In the following pages, the problem and programs available will be described and analyzed according to public administration frameworks and public policy lenses using contextual intelligence. Finally, this paper will discuss the leadership challenge of connecting together the dots and offer potential solutions within the discretion of public administrators and focusing on collaboration among programs.

**BACKGROUND**

**Definitions**

**Urban areas** are of 50,000 or more people. In Oregon, these areas include the Portland metro region, with over 1.5 Million residents. In order of population, other urban areas include Eugene and Springfield (200,000), Salem (142,940), Medford (68,080), Bend (62,900), and Corvallis (52,950).

**Urban clusters**, or **small communities**, are of at least 2,500 and less than 50,000 people. Sometimes these urban clusters are incorporated and are therefore are served by a town.

---

2. Ibid.
government. In other cases, these urban clusters are unincorporated and are therefore served by a county government or by special districts (e.g. water and sanitary districts, soil & water conservation districts, public utility districts, irrigation districts).

**Rural areas** encompass all population, housing, and territory not included within an urban area. Whatever is not urban is considered rural. In the 2010 Census 19.3% of the United State’s population was rural and over 95% of the land area is classified as rural.\(^5\)

**Oregon Land Use Laws**

“Land is foundational to how we live...It is important to identity, to economic well-being, to physical health, and more often than not to community meaning.”\(^6\) Francis addresses land use controversies between the broad interest categories of property rights and economic well-being versus that of community identity and meaning occurring on the national stage. Since the time of the constitution, the use of public and private land has been a constant controversy. The government is prohibited from taking property for public purposes without just compensation by the Fifth Amendment to the constitution and the fourteenth Amendment prohibits states from depriving citizens of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

Between 1963 and 2007, Oregon struggled to balance property rights and the economic impacts and community interests of land use regulation. This was publically debated by citizens, elected officials, and the judicial system. In 1963, the Oregon legislature established the Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zone and in 1969 adopted Senate Bill 10, which requires every city and county in the state to have a comprehensive land use plan that meets state standards. In 1973, Senate Bill 100 established one of the strictest land use laws in the country. Senate Bill 101 then furthered statewide protections for farmland.

\(^5\) Ibid.
Finally, the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development adopted the 19 Statewide Planning Goals which govern local comprehensive land use plans. These goals detail the State of Oregon policies on land use and related topics, such as citizen involvement, housing, and natural resources. Oregon’s statewide goals are achieved through local comprehensive planning, which must be consistent with the goals. State law requires each city and county to adopt a comprehensive plan and the zoning and land-division ordinances needed to put the plan into effect. These goals also apply to special districts and state agencies.7

Many of the requirements of the statewide planning goals would be easier to achieve with technical planning assistance.

For illustration, Goal 1 Citizen Involvement requires "the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process."8 Each city and county must have a citizen involvement program and a committee for citizen involvement to monitor and encourage public participation in planning.9

Goal 2 Land Use Planning describes the basic steps of Oregon’s statewide planning program. Land use decisions must be made in accordance of a comprehensive plan and subsequent policies must be adopted to implement the plan’s policies. Plans must be based on data and data analysis; coordinated with other jurisdictions; and that plans be reviewed and amended as needed.

Goal 3 Agricultural Lands, Goal 4 Forest Lands, and Goal 5 Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas and Natural Resources requires inventory of such lands and to "preserve and maintain" them through zoning, policies and ordinances. For significant Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas and Natural Resources, a local government has three policy choices: preserve the resource, allow proposed uses that conflict with it, or strike some sort of a balance between the resource and the uses that would conflict with it.

---

8 OAR 660-015-0000(1)
Many of the additional goals also require specific land use and transportation planning efforts to account for the diverse needs of Oregon communities, including Goals 6-8 and 10-14: Recreation Needs, Housing, Public Facilities and Services, Transportation, Energy, and Urbanization.

Goal 9 Economy of the State calls for diversification and improvement of the economy. It requires communities to inventory commercial and industrial lands, project future needs for such lands, and plan and zone enough land to meet those needs.

Other goals require communities "to conserve the long-term values, benefits, and natural resources"\(^{10}\) of particular lands, including the following goals 15-19: Willamette Greenway, Estuarine Resources, Coastal Shorelands, Beaches and Dunes, and Ocean Resources.\(^{11}\)

However, Oregon Land use laws dictate that planning be conducted in each town but did not provide a funding source to complete that work. The law was essentially an unfunded mandate. In 1993, the State of Oregon created the Transportation & Growth Management (TGM) programs, which offered grants to complete the required comprehensive land use plans and transportation system plans.\(^{12}\) However, local governments and districts must come up with funding and expertise for many other important planning functions.

---

\(^{10}\) OAR 660-015-0010(4)


\(^{12}\) Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Transportation Growth Management (TGM) programs, personal communication, June 5, 2013.
PROJECT PROCESS

Research Methods

Data Collection Design

The study’s data is meant to provide a snapshot of professional assistance on long-range community planning to rural communities in Oregon. Research was conducted by interviewing staff and analyzing program materials of fourteen planning and design assistance programs in Oregon.

Study Population and Setting

Respondents were reached in person, telephone, or email through website contact information or through pre-existing relationships.

Sampling Method - Design and Size of Informational Interviews

The sampling design was fourteen organizations. The cluster sampling method was employed in order to identify organizations which offer planning assistance. This is not a random sample design or a comprehensive study, but rather a representative sample of organizations that provide planning assistance in Oregon.

Interview Questions

1. Name of the organization.

2. Name of the program

3. Contact

4. Number of staff

5. Programs: What programs or planning/design/architecture/development technical assistance programs do you provide?
6. Geographic distribution: What is your geographic area? Which towns have recently
gotten technical assistance or grants?

7. Process: How was that decision made?

Programs

The following representative planning and design assistance programs that provide services in
Oregon were researched through the above methods. This is not meant to be an exhaustive list of all
of the institutions that provide planning and design assistance in Oregon.

1. American Institute of Architects (AIA) Initiative\(^\text{13}\)

2. American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) Annual Symposium Event\(^\text{14}\)

3. American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA), American Institute of Architects (AIA) &
American Planning Association (APA) Urban Design Panel\(^\text{15,16}\)

4. Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) & Oregon Department
of Transportation (ODOT) Transportation Growth Management (TGM) programs \(^\text{17,18}\)

5. National Endowment of the Arts (NEA) Mayors Institute on Design\(^\text{19}\)

6. National Endowment of the Arts (NEA) Your Town Design Workshops

7. Oregon Main Street

8. Portland State University (PSU) Master’s of Urban & Regional Planning (MURP) Workshop\(^\text{20}\)

---

\(^{13}\) Oregon, By Design, American Institute of Architects (AIA) Initiative, personal communication, June 4, 2013.

\(^{14}\) American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA), personal communication, June 5, 2013.

\(^{15}\) Ibid.

\(^{16}\) American Planning Association (APA), personal communication, June 5, 2013.

\(^{17}\) Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) Transportation Growth Management (TGM) programs, personal communication, June 5, 2013.

\(^{18}\) Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Transportation Growth Management (TGM) programs, personal communication, June 5, 2013.

\(^{19}\) National Endowment of the Arts (NEA) Mayors Institute on Design, personal communication, June 7, 2013.

\(^{20}\) Portland State University (PSU) Master’s of Urban & Regional Planning (MURP), personal communication, June 5, 2013.
9. Portland State University (PSU) Next Generation Initiative
21
10. Portland State University (PSU) Master’s of Urban & Regional Planning (MURP) Courses
22
11. University of Oregon (UO) Portland School of Architecture & Allied Arts Courses
23
12. University of Oregon (UO) Community Planning Workshop
13. University of Oregon (UO) Community Service Center (CSC) & Resource Assistance for Rural Environments (RARE) Program
24
14. University of Oregon (UO) Sustainable Community Initiative (SCI)

PROJECT OUTCOMES

Literature Review

“The role of planners in small community (urban cluster) and rural public management is critical to the survival of these communities.” 25 Planning for urban clusters and rural areas is necessary as “safety valves for the cities” 26 and as “important sources of renewal for the entire society.” 27 Planning for urban clusters and rural areas focus on the economy, greater self-reliance, and the special environmental, social, and cultural qualities of rurality to create communities worth living in. 28 29 The Commission on Agriculture and Rural Development Policy stated in its report Future Directions in Rural Development Policy (1990) a "concern for preservation of agriculture as the

21 Portland State University (PSU) Next Generation Initiative, personal communication, June 6, 2013.
22 Portland State University (PSU) Master’s of Urban & Regional Planning (MURP), personal communication, June 5, 2013.
23 University of Oregon (UO) Portland School of Architecture & Allied Arts Courses, personal communication, June 5, 2013.
24 University of Oregon (UO) Community Service Center (CSC) & Resource Assistance for Rural Environments (RARE) Program, personal communication, August 21, 2012.
economic base of rural areas, as much for the social as for economic reasons; for the lack of rural
political power; for the cultural bleakness of rural life; and for the overpowering allure of city life.”  
Yet, the public administration field has paid little attention to the unique needs and dilemmas of
urban clusters and rural areas. In public administration an “implied bias also exists that... the
smaller scale problems of rural areas and small towns (urban clusters) are theoretically and
practically trivial” in comparison to those of urban areas. This “neglect of the field by public
administrators” is perpetuated by the “scarcity of financial support..., the absence of a powerful
institutional sponsor, such as the Department of Agriculture,... (and the lack of) resources to support
professional assistance. They (rural areas) often resented such interference and maintained little
contact with academicians in public administration.” Furthermore, the planning field often neglects
and shows cultural bias to planning in urban clusters and rural areas due to a “cultural bias toward
things urban ... in American academic planning.”

Public administrative staff in urban clusters and rural areas is not often able to concentrate in
planning alone. In addition, rural planning requires specialized skills and is “not just urban
planning at a smaller scale or a slower pace.” Rural planners need political and interpersonal skills
that have been “sensitized to the rural values.”

In addition, the public needs of urban clusters and rural areas are “rapidly outstripping the capacity
of rural management to respond.” Rural public administrators face pressure to postpone planning

30 Ibid.
32 Ibid.
33 Ibid.
Journal of Planning Education and Research.
Journal of Planning Education and Research.
37 Ibid.
functions to conduct daily public management. “Rural and small town (urban cluster) planning is often overlooked or perceived by many residents and public leaders as an unnecessary frill, and thus, it is often given insufficient attention.”

Furthermore, acceptance of planning concepts differs between the urban clusters and rural areas in Oregon. Western Oregon has more actively planned and regulated land use than eastern Oregon. The wealthier counties and cities conduct land-use planning while the poorer areas reject it. Developed areas of the Oregon support controlled development and rural areas begrudge the constrictive nature of planning on the development of their communities.

Research Summary

Program Descriptions

Question: What programs or planning, design, architecture, and/or development technical assistance programs do you provide?

Summary

The State of Oregon, universities, non-profits, and professional associations offer technical planning and design assistance in Oregon. Examples of assistance include the broad categories of community planning, urban design, economic development and natural resource planning. These could include downtown master plans, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), municipal economic development plans, watershed assessments, and citizen involvement programs. Other planning projects include Transportation System Plans and integrated transportation and land use plans, that lead to more livable, economically vital, transportation-efficient, sustainable, pedestrian-friendly

39 Ibid.
40 Ibid.
communities. Planning outreach and education tools include workshops, lecture series, conferences and publications.

In the paragraphs below, each of the State of Oregon, university, and professional programs is described.

**State of Oregon**

**Transportation Growth Management (TGM)**

The State of Oregon provides local governments with funding for planning projects through the Oregon Transportation & Growth Management Program (TGM). Project may include Transportation System Plans and integrated transportation and land use plans, that lead to more livable, economically vital, transportation-efficient, sustainable, pedestrian-friendly communities, based on objective criteria. In addition, TGM offers outreach and education through workshops, lecture series, conferences and “how-to” publications.  

**Oregon Main Street**

The Business Oregon and the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department supported program, Oregon Main Street assists communities to achieve viable commercial districts. It offers training and technical assistance so that communities develop comprehensive, incremental revitalization strategies based on a community’s unique assets, character, and heritage.

The program focuses on four ways of creating a practical downtown management strategy for economic development: an organization of business and property owners, bankers, citizens, public officials, chambers of commerce, and other local economic development organizations; promotion (e.g. Street festivals, parades, retail events); design (e.g. Historic

---

building rehabilitation, street and alley clean-up, colorful banners, landscaping, and lighting); Economic Restructuring (e.g. recruiting new businesses, converting unused space, strengthening traditional merchants). 45

University Programs

Master’s of Urban & Regional Planning (MURP) Workshop

Portland State University (PSU) Master’s of Urban & Regional Planning (MURP) Workshop, students work in small groups to develop a project for a community client of their choice. Projects have included the development of watershed atlases, advocacy planning for homeless campers, neighborhood redevelopment plans, and strategic planning for a Native American community development corporation, and bicycle and pedestrian plans. 46

PSU Next Generation Initiative

The PSU Next Generation Initiative operates the Oregon Fellows Program, which places interns in public and non-profit organizations for 10-week summer internships, and the Hatfield Resident Fellows Program, which places interns for one year. Subject matters include public and non-profit administration, law, community health, natural resources and environmental studies, urban planning, public policy, applied economics, and business administration. 47, 48

Resource Assistance for Rural Environments (RARE)

Resource Assistance for Rural Environments (RARE) is an AmeriCorps program administered through the University of Oregon's Community Service Center (CSC) and is currently supported through federal, state and foundation grants. RARE AmeriCorps members have a variety of

backgrounds and bring to their communities a wide range of experiences. In addition, members receive training in areas such as citizen involvement, outreach and communication, land-use planning, grant writing, project management, and necessary computer skills. RARE AmeriCorps host communities receive a full-time RARE AmeriCorps member for 11 months, support from six planning/policy analysts; and regular community site visits and evaluation by RARE AmeriCorps staff. RARE AmeriCorps projects fall into the broad categories of community planning, economic development and natural resource planning. Volunteers in these categories facilitate downtown master plans, county-wide Geographic Information Systems, municipal economic development plans, watershed assessments, and citizen involvement programs for watershed councils. 49

**Sustainable Cities Initiative (SCI)**

Sustainable Cities Initiative (SCI) is a cross-disciplinary organization at the University of Oregon (UO) that synthesizes existing faculty research work under a single theme. The Sustainable City Year Program (SCYP) is a partnership between SCI and a city, county, special district, or partnership of governments in Oregon for an entire academic year. Partners propose a list of challenging sustainability projects, which are tackled by creative, passionate students and faculty across multiple disciplines. The program focuses a number of courses from across the University on assisting the partner with their sustainability goals and projects. In a typical year, over 400 students from 10-12 disciplines across 20-30 classes might work on 15-20 partner-directed projects, devoting over 40,000 hours of effort. 50

**Community Planning Workshop (CPW)**

The Community Planning Workshop (CPW) is an experiential program within the Department of Planning, Public Policy and Management at the University of Oregon. Students work in teams under the direction of faculty and Graduate Teaching Fellows to develop proposals, conduct research,

---

analyze and evaluate alternatives, and make recommendations for possible solutions to planning problems in Oregon communities.\footnote{Community Planning Workshop Program Information. (2013). Retrieved June 2013 from http://csc.uoregon.edu/cpw/}

**Coursework**

Portland State University Master's of Urban & Regional Planning (MURP) Courses and University of Oregon (UO) Portland School of Architecture & Allied Arts Courses often focus on current planning and design problems and projects in Oregon. Professors offer their students the opportunity to gain work experience and build their skills through planning or design assistance to an urban area or cluster. Depending on the course, students might community planning, urban design, economic development and natural resource planning.

**Professional Organizations**

**Mayors Institute on Design**

The Mayors’ Institute transforms communities through design by preparing mayors to be the chief urban designers of their cities. The program is sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts, the American Architectural Foundation and the United States Conference of Mayors. Mayors engage leading design experts and other mayors to find solutions to the most critical urban design challenges facing their urban area or urban cluster in a two and one-half day session. Mayors present a range of challenges, including waterfront redevelopment, downtown revitalization, transportation planning, and the design of new public buildings such as libraries and arts centers.\footnote{Mayor’s Institute on Design Program Information. (2013). Retrieved June 2013 from http://www.micd.org/}

**Your Town Design Workshops**

The National Endowment for the Arts sponsored program, Your Town: The Citizens’ Institute on Rural Design, responds to the design needs of urban clusters and rural areas, through a two-and-a-
half-day participatory design workshop. It addresses issues affecting community integrity and character such as out-migration, loss of employment opportunities, and rapid growth of the retirement community. 53

Urban Design Panel

The American Institute of Architects (AIA), American Planning Association (APA) and the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) Urban Design Panel joined to create a multidisciplinary team of local professionals who gather once a month for two hours to review projects, urban design, and policies related to our built environment. 54

Annual Symposium

Each year, the ASLA hosts the Annual Symposium in Portland. During the half-day design workshop, Landscape Architecture, Architecture and Planning professionals work together to improve construction practices, enhance environmental performance, and enrich the urban tapestry of the city. 55

Oregon, By Design

The American Institute of Architects sponsored program, Oregon, By Design, will become a statewide policy of design that promotes economic, environmental and social development. The statewide policy and implementation program will utilize the full suite of design disciplines to support economic, environmental, and social development; provide design policies, programs, and support

services for businesses; and coordinate statewide policy across Oregon design professions, education providers, and industries. This program is currently under development. 56

**Geographic Distribution**

*Questions: What is your geographic area? Which towns have recently gotten technical assistance or grants?*

**Summary**

The State of Oregon, universities, university extensions, and professional organizations provide most of their planning and design assistance to the Portland metro region and urban areas. Although the State of Oregon uses strict criteria to decide which projects in which urban areas and urban clusters will receive its assistance, many of the other programs offer assistance based on relationships and professional interest. Urban clusters and rural areas receive little to no planning or design assistance, except for State of Oregon publications.

The State of Oregon, university, and professional programs each serve different areas of Oregon. In the following paragraphs, the geographic distribution of each program's recent planning and design assistance is explored.

---

Table 1: Summary of Geographic Distribution of Planning Assistance Programs in Oregon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance</th>
<th>Portland metro region &amp; urban areas</th>
<th>Urban clusters</th>
<th>Rural areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of Oregon</td>
<td>TGM</td>
<td>TGM</td>
<td>TGM publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>UO courses</td>
<td>UO workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSU courses</td>
<td>PSU workshop (few)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University extensions</td>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Hatfield fellows (few)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hatfield fellows</td>
<td>RARE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional organizations</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State of Oregon**

**Transportation Growth Management (TGM)**

TGM services the entire State of Oregon and divides the grant funding into five regions of the state. TGM gave out planning assistance grants in each of the regions during 2009-2011:

- **Region one ($2.9M):** Clackamas County, Forest Grove, Gresham, Hillsboro, Hood River, Tigard, Portland, St. Helens, Vernonia, Washington County, Canby, Happy Valley, Metro, Oregon City, Wilsonville, & Wood Village.


- **Region three ($0.7M):** Ashland, Medford, Rogue Valley, Rogue Valley Transit District, Central Point, & Grants Pass.

- **Region four ($0.3M):** Bend Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), & Madras.
- Region five ($0.4M): Nyssa, Pendleton, Vale & La Grande.

TGM also distributed community assistance grants in each of the regions during 2009-2011:

- Region one ($0.3M): Canby, Clackamas County, Gaston, Hillsboro, Milwaukie, Molalla, Oregon City, Portland, Tigard, & Troutdale.

- Region two ($0.2M): Carlton, Dallas, Eugene, Land Transit District, Junction City, Lowell, Newport, Tillamook, & Veneta.

- Region three ($0.01M): Myrtle Point.

- Region four ($0.08M): Metolius & Sisters.

- Region five ($0.08M): Boardman, Nyssa & Ukiah.  

Figure 1: TGM Regions

---


58 Ibid.
Oregon Main Street

Main Street Programs exist in 72 communities throughout the State of Oregon. The program is divided into three levels of engagement: performing main street, transforming downtown, or exploring downtown. The 2012 National Main Street Program Accreditation at the Oregon Main Street Annual Conference includes Albany Downtown Association, Downtown Corvallis Association, McMinnville Downtown Association, and Main Street Oregon City. Performing Main Street is for those communities who were previously certified National Main Street cities and those communities with advanced downtown programs following the Main Street Approach. Performing Main Street Community Profiles include Albany, Baker City, Corvallis, McMinnville, Oregon City, and Roseburg. Transforming Downtown is for communities who are committed to downtown revitalization using the Main Street Approach but need technical assistance to take them to the next level. Transforming Downtown Communities include Astoria, Bandon, Canby, Carlton, Dayton, Cottage Grove, Coos Bay, Estacada, Hillsboro, Klamath Falls, La Grande, Medford, Philomath, Molalla, Oakridge, Port Orford, Sherwood, Sandy, Springfield, and The Dalles. Exploring Downtown is for those communities that demonstrate an interest in revitalizing their downtowns and want to learn more about the Main Street Approach. 59

University Programs

Master’s of Urban & Regional Planning (MURP) Workshop

The MURP Workshop focuses primarily on the six counties adjacent to Portland metropolitan region. Between 2004 -2013, MURP Workshops served Portland, TriMet, Metro, Milwaukie, Kalama, Vernonia, Oak Grove (Clackamas County), Weston, St. Helens, Cascade Locks, and Kelso. 60

**Next Generation Initiative**

Since 2000, the Center for Public Service has operated the Oregon Fellows Program, placing more than 300 exceptional men and women in 10-week summer internships in public and non-profit organizations. The Next Generation Initiative mostly offers volunteers in the Willamette Valley. Local Government Sponsors have included the City of Beaverton, City of Hillsboro, City of Medford, City of Portland, Clackamas County, League of Oregon Cities, Metro, and Multnomah County. Other Sponsors include the Association of Oregon Counties, Continuous System Improvement Group, Oregon Business Council, Oregon Coalition of Health Care Purchasers, Oregon Workforce Partnership, Portland Development Commission, and TriMet.

**Resource Assistance for Rural Environments (RARE) Program**

RARE serves the entire State of Oregon. During 2011 – 2012, RARE's 28 participants served in communities across the state from Port Orford to Pendleton, from Astoria to Lakeview and twenty-four other places in between.

**Sustainable Community Initiative (SCI)**

SCI serves the entire State of Oregon. During 2009-2013, the program concentrated on Springfield, Salem, and Gresham.

**Community Planning Workshop**

Community Planning Workshops focus primarily on the Eugene metropolitan area, but also reach statewide. The following areas received grants:

---
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• 2011: Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe of Indians, Lane County, Woodburn, Eugene, Turner, and Springfield.

• 2010: Coalition for Good Governance, Umpqua Community Development Organization, Deschutes County, Lane County Economic Development Department, Eugene, Eugene Water and Electric Board, Economic Development Administration at the University of Oregon, Oregon Transportation Research and Education Consortium, Eugene Water and Electric Board, Eugene, UO Office of Sustainability, Marion County, Oregon Transportation Research and Education Consortium, Rexius Sustainable Solutions, Warrenton, Canby, Clackamas County Tourism and Cultural Affairs, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Eugene, and Silverton.

• 2009: Eugene Water and Electric Board, UO Emergency Management, Corvallis Fire Department, Lane Transit District; Oregon Transportation Research and Education Consortium, Oregon Transportation Research and Education Consortium, Cascadia Region Earthquake Workgroup, Seniors and People with Disabilities Division, Oregon Department of Human Services, City of Eugene, Eugene Water and Electric Board, City of Mount Angel, City of Eugene, St. Paul Parish School, and UO Development Communications Department. 65

Coursework

The location of projects studied during the Portland State University (PSU) Master’s of Urban & Regional Planning (MURP) Courses and University of Oregon (UO) Portland School of Architecture & Allied Arts Courses are primarily dependent on the relationships of the individual professors. No comprehensive list of projects undertaken as part of individual coursework currently exists. For illustration, over the last five years coursework at UO Portland School of Architecture & Allied Arts included projects in The Dalles, Portland, Gresham, Tigard, and Eugene. 66 PSU MURP courses have

66 University of Oregon (UO) Portland School of Architecture & Allied Arts Courses, personal communication, June 5, 2013.
included planning assistance to Salmonberry Corridor (Port of Tillamook Bay Railway), Northwest Oregon Trails, and the Portland metro area. 67

Professional Organizations

Mayors Institute on Design

Although the Mayor’s Institute on Design serves the entire United States, several Oregon mayors have participated in their design assistance workshops. These include: Astoria (1990), Beaverton (2009), Corvallis (1997 & 2007), Eugene (2006), Forest Grove (2008), Gresham (2009), Hillsboro (2009), Lake Oswego (2002), Lake Oswego (2009), Milwaukie (1995), Milwaukie (2008), Newberg (2008), Oregon City (2008), Portland (1988, 2006 & 2010), and Springfield (1994). 68

Your Town Design Workshops

Although the Your Town Design Workshops serves the entire United States, a few Oregon urban clusters have participated in their design assistance workshops. These include: Coos Bay (2011), Sublimity (1997) and Charleston (1995). 69

The Urban Design Panel, Annual Symposium and Oregon by Design

The Urban Design Panel and Annual Symposium focused on the City of Portland. 70 Oregon by Design is a statewide initiative, but this is the first year of its study. 71

Process

How was that decision made?

---
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Summary

The project need is one of the criteria for most of the program's project selection. However, for universities and professional organizational programs, the needs of urban clusters and rural areas are often overridden. University programs and professional organizations cited distance to travel, learning objectives, professional opportunities, and the lack of existing qualified staff in urban clusters as reasons for concentrating efforts in the Portland metro region and urban areas.

Each of the State of Oregon, university, and professional programs choose to assist which urban areas, urban clusters and rural areas. In the following paragraphs, each organization’s methods for decision-making are explained.

State of Oregon

Transportation Growth Management (TGM)

Oregon’s Transportation and Growth Management Program supports community efforts to expand transportation choices for people. By linking land use and transportation planning, TGM works in partnership with local governments to create vibrant, livable places in which people can walk, bike, take transit or drive where they want to go. TGM promotes smart growth principles that enable communities to meet transportation needs while retaining their livability and economic vitality. These principles include: integrated transportation and land-use planning; efficient use of land and resources; well-designed, walkable communities; good connections between local destinations; pedestrian-, bike-, and transit friendly development; and stewardship of existing resources and investments.

First, the TGM Program distributes funding to the five geographic regions based on a calculation of population and number of urban areas and clusters. Then the TGM Program uses strict criteria to review project proposals with a committee. Applications are scored on a range of criteria and receive up to 100 points. Projects are selected based on the points scored, the grant amounts requested, the
estimated amounts TGM believes may be required to complete a project, the amount of grant dollars available for award within a geographic region, and the balance of grant dollars between Category 1 and Category 2 projects.  

In 2013, that criteria was as follows:

1. **Proposed Project Addresses a Need and Supports TGM Objectives** to addresses a local or regional transportation or transportation-related land use issue, problem, need, or opportunity through achieving one or more of the following TGM objectives.

2. **Proposed Project is Timely and Urgent** to address pressing local transportation and land use issues; make amendments to local plans or regulations necessitated by changes in federal regulations, state requirements, or regional plans; or to build on, complement, or take a necessary step toward completing other high priority community initiatives.

3. **Proposed Project Approach is Reasonable** to achieve the expected outcome, address the project need, are achievable considering scope, objectives, and benefits of the project, and are at a level of detail appropriate to the community.

4. **Proposed Project has Community Support** including partner jurisdictions, community institutions, or businesses.

5. **Proposed Project Sponsor Readiness and Capacity including** the jurisdiction’s planning and project management capabilities and experience, especially previous TGM projects (if any) and their performance.

6. **Proposed Project is Innovative** (e.g. health impact assessments or economic impact analysis).

---

Oregon Main Street

Oregon Main Street provides assistance, training, and technical services to communities who want to strengthen, preserve, and revitalize their historic downtown commercial districts. Oregon Main Street defines success by eight principles: Comprehensive and creating an ongoing series of initiatives; Incremental: and importance of Small projects; Self-help and the importance of local leadership; Public/private partnership; Identifying and capitalizing on existing assets; Quality of improvements; Changing community attitudes and habits; and Action-oriented and pro-active in planning for the future.  

The proposal and decision-making process is divided into three levels of engagement: exploring downtown, transforming downtown, or performing main street. Each of the three levels requires a different application process. Interested communities may join Exploring Downtown at anytime by submitting a letter of intent and completing a brief community assessment survey. Application rounds for Transforming Downtown Performing Main Street are held as resources permit.

University Programs

Master’s of Urban & Regional Planning (MURP) Workshop

For the Master’s of Urban & Regional Planning (MURP) Workshop, notice of the RFP is sent to over 4,000 community organizations in order to solicit proposals. Each year, 40-60 community partners complete the application and 5-8 proposals are accepted. Student teams of 4-6 students sift through the project proposals and make the final decisions about where they’ll focus their efforts. Students are encouraged to choose planning projects, not simply research projects, according to their individual education, skills, and engagement. “Entry level planners don’t have the opportunity to

---
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decide on what they work on and negotiate the scope (so the decision-making process gives them) the opportunity to decide what is fundamental to why they went into planning.”

Workshop principles guide the students to pick projects in which the product is essential, the planning process has reflection at its core, and it achieves local and regional goals for sustainability, quality of life and social justice. Workshop projects must: Address issues and conditions specific to this metropolitan area and its communities; Produce new insights through the thinking, analysis and process used to complete them; Clearly link findings and recommendations to field research and/or secondary data; Integrate core course theory and methods; Meet unmet needs; Have a scope and scale that is appropriate to the nature of this course and the time available; and Demonstrate and express a compelling narrative. No financial commitment is expected by the client.

**Next Generation Initiative**

“The goal of both the Oregon Summer Fellows program – and the recently launched Hatfield Resident Fellows Program -- is to inspire and support exceptionally talented young men and women to contribute their talents and energy to serve and lead public and non-profit organizations in Oregon and beyond.” The Oregon Fellows and Hatfield Resident Fellows programs foster “talent partnerships” between PSU’s Center for Public Service and public organizations in Oregon. The program intends to assist “public organizations identify, recruit, develop, and secure the high caliber talent (and to) attract and keep the talent and leadership needed to tackle the many challenges in the years ahead.”

Therefore the process for recruiting organizations and volunteer applicants relies on the Center’s extensive network of contacts within governments and not-for-profit entities. The PSU Initiative staff selects the cohort of volunteers during a two-day workshop according to criteria and to meet the

---
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needs of the potential community sponsors. Staff described themselves as match-makers and the process as “more art than science.” Then the potential volunteers and community sponsors conduct video interviews to determine the best fit for each party, including volunteer skills, community location and commuting distance.

Resource Assistance for Rural Environments (RARE) Program

RARE seeks to increase the capacity of rural Oregon communities to improve their economic, social, and environmental conditions. RARE AmeriCorps members are sought to develop and implement plans for achieving a sustainable natural resource base and improving rural economic conditions while gaining community building and leadership skills.

RARE reviews community proposals and volunteers available with a committee. Each project is matched up with a volunteer through a series of individual interviews. In 2012, the RARE program selected 20 volunteers from 130 applications and selected 20 community partners out of approximately 35 applications. Typically RARE partners include the Oregon food bank, small town governments and soil and water conservation districts. RARE volunteers then interview with three community partners.

Sustainable Community Initiative (SCI)

SCI intends with its program to conduct multidisciplinary research to meet local, regional, and national goals for sustainable city design and function; to provide service and technical assistance to Oregon and beyond; to attract and train the nation’s best students interested in sustainable cities, from design to policy; and to engage national experts in a mutually beneficial discourse and exchange of ideas.

---
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SCI staff reviews and evaluates community proposals according to the following criteria: Top-Level Support by City, County, District Manager and/or elected officials; Sustainability (e.g. reducing greenhouse gas emissions, fostering active transportation, improving social equity, increasing housing density/mix, improving urban form, reducing energy use, or redeveloping existing structures or sites); Financial Support of $200,000 to $300,000 to support 10 to 20 projects; Real Positive Impact on the community; Compatibility with the academic calendar; Logistics of collaboration and coordination for communities more than two hours’ travel time from Eugene; Match to faculty and student curricular and research capability, needs and interests; and External Organization Support and partnerships.  

**Community Planning Workshop**

For the UO Community Planning Workshop, students work in teams under the direction of faculty and Graduate Teaching Fellows to develop proposals, conduct research, analyze and evaluate alternatives, and make recommendations for possible solutions to planning problems in Oregon communities.

**Coursework**

PSU states in it mission statement that PSU “promotes a reciprocal relationship between the community and the University in which knowledge serves the city and the city contributes to the knowledge of the University.” Therefore, professors focus coursework on community based learning and to aid PSU based institutes that serve the community (e.g. Center of Urban Studies, OTREC, The Institute on Aging, Population Research Center).

---
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Professors determine the subject matter of university courses often according to relationships and prior knowledge of particular planning and design issues and projects. Coursework “comes down to individual professors (who) rely on personal relationships.” 87

For illustration, one UO Portland School of Architecture & Allied Arts architecture professor stated that studios are “influenced by what people have as problems out there.” 88 The architecture professor “was not interested in finding (but) was asked” 89 to help with an urban design assistance project by existing acquaintances in The Dalles in 2012 and in Tigard in 2010. Due to the existing relationship, financial support and challenge of the particular urban design problem, the professor agreed to study and provide design assistance through the architecture studio.

Professional Organizations

Mayor’s Institute

During 2008 and 2009, the Mayor’s Institute was held in Portland, Oregon and hosted by Metro. As part of the negotiated agreement for hosting the event, Metro secured six Oregon mayors a seat at the table. Mayors were then invited to participate based on existing knowledge of potential design projects and existing relationships. 90

The Urban Design Panel and the Annual Symposium

The ASLA Annual Symposium topic is chosen by the chair of the Oregon Chapter of the ASLA according to community need, existing relationships, and professional development opportunities by the participating landscape architects. First, the symposium intends to contribute to the broader community, engage and contribute in a positive way, give back, and educate the broader community on landscape architecture. Second, the symposium seeks to provide networking, educational and

87American Planning Association (APA), personal communication, June 5, 2013.
88University of Oregon (UO) Portland School of Architecture & Allied Arts Courses, personal communication, June 5, 2013.
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showcase opportunities for landscape architects. "Younger (entry-level) landscape architects get to put their own ideas into practice at the charrette, network with other firms, (and demonstrate) how they approach problems differently." 91

The six organizers of the Urban Design Panel review potential agenda items each quarter. If needed, the organizers brainstorm potential design projects and contact their professional and personal acquaintances to request ideas for design projects. The organizers then determine an appropriate design project or issue that will allow for future professional development of the participants. 92

**Current Conditions – Broken Network Governance**

The Network Governance policy theory shines a bright light on the importance of assistance to urban clusters and rural areas that cannot afford specialist for everything needed by their towns. Network governance essentially functions as a web of actors drawn together by intellectual and emotional commitment.93 Network governance requires skill sets of diplomat and statesperson in addition to technical competence. In order for it to be successful, it must be fluid and accessible, which also makes it fragile. 94

In the case of planning assistance to urban clusters in Oregon, a variety of important actors exist, but there is distinct lack of formal links, relationships or connections between the varieties of programs that currently exist. Programs are not coordinated by similar criteria, coordinated application materials or timelines, cross-pollination of players, or any explicit coordination or reference to other programs when a particular project is not chosen by one of the entities. This is to the detriment of the urban clusters seeking planning and design assistance. For example, when a town applies for a project to be completed by the Portland State University MURP Workshop and is not chosen, there is

---
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no formal referral to another planning assistance program exists. See below diagram of the current configuration of the broken network.

Figure 2: Existing Broken Network Governance

SIGNIFICANCE

Small communities and rural areas in Oregon lack capacity to analyze and plan for the planning-related challenges that face them. Many organizations offer planning assistance, but many are not aware of the needs of small communities and rural areas. Often, neither the planning organization nor the local communities know about all of the variety of resources available to help them deal with their challenges.

---

The planning assistance organizations decide individually according to either formal or informal uncoordinated criteria which projects are worthy of their attention. These projects do not always meet the greatest need of the local community. Instead these decisions meet the needs of the students to learn; academics to publish and get recognition; and the professionals to feel helpful, show off their skills, be considered for future contracts, speaking engagements at conferences and be honored by their peers.

A rural-urban divide separates the planning professionals located in the Portland metro region or other urban areas from the urban clusters and rural areas culturally and by distance. The planning organizations often factor in the travel distance, which thereby concentrates planning assistance available in the Willamette Valley and nearby the I-5 corridor.

Without collaboration between the various players providing planning and design assistance in Oregon, there remains geographic and financial inequity in the distribution of assistance to urban clusters in Oregon.

**POLICY ALTERNATIVES**

To change the dynamic of the current role of planning assistance to Oregon’s rural communities, there are several potential policy alternatives to consider. The following are logical groupings of planning assistance policy alternatives to be analyzed in the next section of this essay:

Policy Alternative 1. **Governance by Partnerships:** Instill a governance system of partnerships to provide coordinated planning assistance and grants.

Policy Alternative 2. **Coproduction Model:** Foster planning assistance by volunteer professionals and students. Strengthen the power of the contributions of students, professors, universities and professional organization.
Policy Alternative 3. **Collaborative Network Governance**: Create a new collaborative network to coordinate planning and design assistance in Oregon. Use the rational choice theory and new public governance models to inform this new collaborative network.

**Policy Alternative 1: Governance by Partnerships**

The Governance by Partnerships alternative legitimizes the variety of organizations, including State of Oregon, universities, non-profits, and professional associations, that currently provide planning and design assistance. As a partnership, these organizations would then provide coordinated planning assistance and grants.

Some challenges for this governance structure include that citizens, students or professors decide which projects are worthy of their attention and these decisions do not always meet the needs of the agency or the public. Instead, these partners focus on the needs of the students to learn; the professionals to feel helpful; or the professionals to show off their skills to be considered for future contracts or speaking engagements at conferences or to be upheld and honored by their peers.
Policy Alternative 2: Coproduction Theory

The Coproduction Theory alternative is useful understanding and structuring the range of relationships between public agencies and public, private and non-profit organizations which currently provide planning and design assistance. Coproduction essentially requires public administrators to work together with citizens and volunteers on public service projects and programs, for example citizen activity in crime prevention, such as Neighborhood Watch. Coproduction governance structure offers many advantages: fiscal responsibility, leverage of resources, effectiveness to obtain better outcomes, creation of an educated citizenship, and ownership by the citizens for the process and product.

"Confidence in the institutions of our government and for the people who occupy positions in those institutions has declined dramatically... The contemporary crisis of public confidence in the..."
institutions and leaders of American society is without parallel in this century." 97 Coproduction offers public administrators a chance to both reduce fiscal responsibilities and to reestablish trust and the support of citizens in government. 98 “The prospects for enhanced citizenship through citizens’ participation in coproduction arrangements are generally favorable.” 99

In order for citizens to want to participate, they must be equipped with the appropriate skills for the task-at-hand and be enticed to participate and maintain membership in a manner consistent with the humanistic theory of management. This includes incentives, independence, variety and cooperation. Incentives include monetary incentives, tax credits of volunteer work, or free day care and food for participants during the activities. Furthermore, "the importance ... in providing positive feedback to group members cannot be overstressed." 100 Independence refers to the lack of dependence on one person or one activity. "Getting people together to get to know each other" and making the volunteer activity one of many activities "would be a better mechanism for building and maintaining a ... group." 101 A wide variety of activities, membership and funding also leads enhanced attraction and retention of group members. Finally, "Neighborhood unity of sense of community is likely to be enhanced as members get to know each other" and lead to "the cohesiveness and solidarity of the community marked by gemeinschaft-like social relations among its members, such as mutual aid, cooperation, and holistic ties..." 102

Challenges of coproduction include the issues of shared responsibility, equity and building bridges to citizenship. In order to not threaten the professional staff, and vice versa, one must carefully delineate the responsibilities of the volunteer citizens and the professional and technical public administrative staff. The “equitable distribution of government burdens and benefits” 103 must be
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considered with coproduction models. “Wealthier, better educated or nonminority citizens may be more willing to engage in coproduction activities. To the extent that coproduction raises the quality of services received, it may exacerbate gaps between the advantages and disadvantaged classes.”  

However, coproduction offers a great potential to create a bridge to engaged citizenship. This bridge is built upon innovation and openness to new ideas and policies, the participation of citizens in the operations of the agency, and the growth in loyalty to “place, neighbors, and their community.”  

Citizen participation will lead to expanded “knowledge of citizens about services and service costs..., responsiveness, respect, and appreciation..., and citizen’s commitment to their community.”  

Examples of methods of building citizen loyalty include volunteer programs like *Friends of the Library* and *Adopt a Park.* “Loyalty develops through face-to-face contact and an investment of energy in the improvement of neighborhoods and communities.”  

**Policy Alternative 3: Network Governance**

The Network Governance alternative shines a bright light on the importance of assistance to urban clusters, which cannot afford specialists in everything needed by their towns, and the lack of connection between the State of Oregon, universities, non-profits, and professional associations that currently provide planning and design assistance in Oregon. 

Network governance consists of a web of actors drawn together by intellectual and emotional commitment. In order for the web to function, it must be fluid and accessible. 

Challenges of the collaborative network governances are that it requires the skill sets of diplomat and statesperson in addition to technical competence. The web of actors can also be fragile.  

---
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A challenge is the lack of urgency to create a collaborative network. Often new collaborative networks are formed at the juncture of a catalytic event. See below figure.

---

Another challenge is that a collaborative network relies on the individual motivation of interests, information, beliefs and opportunities to create individual actions in collaboration with the individual actions of the network members as diagramed in the rational choice theory. In order for the network to be successful, various players will need to articulate their underlying interests to set the stage for improved matching of the needs and interests of all parties involved.

111 Eric T. Mogren, PhD, personal communication, PA 540 presentation, April 2011.
POLICY ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

Criteria

Several criteria are proposed to judge each alternative: cost and benefit, timing, feasibility, efficiency, robustness, co-benefits, and equity.

Specifically:

- **Cost/Benefit**: What are the net costs of the proposed strategy, inclusive of economic, human and natural dimensions?
- **Timing**: What is the timing of the impact, and therefore the timing needed for implementation?
- **Feasibility**: How feasible is the strategy for implementation?
- **Efficacy**: To what extent will the strategy, if successfully implemented, increase community viability around the state?

---

• Robustness: How resilient is the proposed strategy?

• Co-benefits: Which strategies have positive effects on other systems or sectors? Unintended consequences: Which strategies may undermine the viability or the strategies of other systems or sectors?

• Equity: How does the strategy take into account environmental justice, intergenerational equity, and social justice concerns? 113

Project outcomes

The following are outcomes that might results from the four different policy choices.

Policy Alternative 1. Governance by Partnerships: This alternative formalizes the influence and decision making authority of the all of the assortment of organizations that currently provide planning and design assistance, like the State of Oregon, universities, non-profits, and professional associations. The coordination and partnership of these organizations would lead to coordinated by the same criteria, application materials and timelines. The greatest challenges for this governance structure would be the competing values and interests of the individual. In order to form a legitimate partnership, the organizations would need to agree on one set of criteria, application materials and timelines that meets all of the individual needs.

Policy Alternative 2. Coproduction Model: This alternative requires public administrators to work together with citizens and volunteers on planning assistance programs to urban clusters in Oregon. This governance structure promotes fiscal responsibility, leveraging of resources, effectiveness to obtain better outcomes, creation of an educated citizenship, and ownership by the citizens for the process and product. However, this model would include

113 Building Climate Resiliency in Lower Willamette Region. (2010).
the added complexity of shared responsibility between professionals and volunteers, the challenge of building an equitable system and an engaged citizenship.

Policy Alternative 3. **Collaborative Network Governance:** This alternative will create formal links, relationships and connections between the diversity of programs that currently exist. Programs would be coordinated by similar criteria, application materials and timelines. The collaborative network would allow for a cross-pollination of players and explicit coordination of programs in regard to a specific project in a particular urban cluster in Oregon.

**Analysis**

The following matrix shows the evaluation of the three policy alternatives to address the aforementioned key criteria.

**Table 2: Evaluation of policy alternatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Alternative 2: Governance by Partnerships</th>
<th>Alternative 3: Coproduction Model</th>
<th>Alternative 4: Collaborative Network Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost/ benefit</td>
<td>Medium/Medium</td>
<td>High/Medium</td>
<td>Low/High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Year 2020</td>
<td>Year 2020</td>
<td>Year 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robustness</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-benefits</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of these policy alternatives has constraints and limits to feasibility. The State of Oregon, universities and various organizations would need to agree to and implement any of the three policy alternatives.

**POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Collaborative Network Governance**

The Collaborative Network Governance alternative has the greatest potential to increase the coordination of planning assistance in Oregon for the least cost.

Under current conditions, rural communities in Oregon have difficulty accessing the planning and design assistance available through the State of Oregon, universities, non-profits, and professional associations. Each organization has its own criteria, decision making process, timelines and geographic areas. Many of the organizations are not familiar with the other programs and processes available to rural governments and districts and so cannot offer referrals if that individual organization cannot accommodate the need during a particular grant or planning assistance grant cycle.

In order to implement this policy, the individual organizations would meet quarterly to discuss, coordinate and leverage upcoming planning assistance and design programs. With greater awareness of individual programs, each organization could act as an ambassador of planning and design assistance to rural governments and districts in Oregon.

**Leadership**

However, collaborative networks require a strong facilitator, donations of meeting space and time of professionals and volunteers, and a strong investment in teamwork. University professors and professionals often compete for the same grant funding, journal publishing, government contracts
and other items. Therefore, teamwork and a collaborative atmosphere would require extra effort and a commitment to better serving rural Oregon.

Moreover, the recommendation will take leadership to challenge the current process and to inspire a shared vision. “Leadership requires ideas” and searches for opportunities to change the status quo and improve the organization or community.

The collaborative network will require real transformational and charismatic leadership to stimulate, motivate, and inspire collaboration among the wide assortment of organizations and address a wicked problem. Wicked problems in social policy planning are difficult or impossible to solve because of incomplete, contradictory, and ever-changing requirements. These problems have no one right answer and are not right or wrong. Each wicked problem is essentially unique and so there are no precedents to use for guidance. Wicked problems persistent in public administration demand ideas in line with the collective values.

To implement, foster and build the collaborative network, leadership will need to model the way, enable others to act, and encourage the heart. This “begins with the belief in the potential of people.” Leaders make people feel like heroes by “being needed; being involved, (and) being cared about as an individual.” In addition, leaders develop, express, and defend civility, respect, and an appreciation of the way in which we serve each other.

---
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## Conclusion

Oregon’s rural areas and urban clusters are at risk from major economic and demographic shifts and loss of community identity and livability. Planning and design assistance can make the difference between community survival and decay. The State of Oregon, universities, non-profits, and professional associations provide these services. By increasing access to those services, rural areas and urban clusters in Oregon have the chance to thrive and flourish.

---
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