Place-based Policy: A Rural Perspective

A Report to Human Resources and Social Development Canada, November 7, 2008

By
Bill Reimer and Sean Markey

Appendix A: Annotated List of Key References

The following annotated bibliography is composed of selected references that offer particularly insightful comments about place-based policy. The section is intended to guide the reader in an efficient manner to key themes or lessons learned in each paper. Each reference is accompanied by an abstract and a list of key themes.

List of References:

Amin, A. 2004. Regions unbound: towards a new politics of place. *Geografiska Annaler. 86 B.*

Abstract:

This paper proposes a non-territorial reading of a politics of place. Focusing on the politics of contemporary regionalism, it argues that globalisation and the general rise of a society of transnational flows and networks no longer allow a conceptualization of place politics in terms of spatially bound processes and institutions. The second part of the paper outlines an alternative politics of place that works with the varied distanciated geographies that cut across a given region.

Key words: relational politics, territoriality, cosmopolitan regionalism, place and space.

Key Themes:

Concept of Place/Space/Region
- Amin (2004) explores the traditional perception of regions as "container spaces" situated within larger "outside" global contexts and the ways in which the realities of globalization deconstruct the image of geographical scalar space. Arguing that global networks of social, economic and cultural relations among individuals living across vast geographical space challenge the traditional concept of region or community, Amin proceeds to question why the traditional perception persists and the political implications of interpreting space territorially or relationally.
- Although Amin does not challenge the merits of giving voice and representation to regional or local authorities, he questions whether there is "a defined geographical territory out there over which local actors can have effective command" (Amin, 2004, p.36).

Territorial vs. Relational Sense of Place
- Amin proposes a relational politics of place where regions are understood according to the characteristics and practices of a diverse population, as well as the close physical parameters within which the population lives (Microworlds sharing proximate turf) (Amin, 2004, p.39).
- Introducing the terms 'politics of propinquity' and the 'politics of connectivity', Amin argues that a relational politics of place must take into account the habits and interactions of the population at a local level as well as at a translocal level. Economic policies for local communities should be evaluated according to the policy's ability to meet the visions of residents whose "interests…may well be locked into spatial connectivities beyond the region" (Amin, 2004, p.41).
- Exploring regionalism in Britain, Poland and Hungary, Amin argues a common expectation that "territorial autonomy will: 1) restore local control and democracy; increase economic returns; and 3) strengthen sense of attachment (Amin, 2004, p.35). These expectations emanate, he argues, from a territorial rather than a relational sense of space.

Global Trends
- Protecting local or regional heritage from outside forces often motivates regional devolution. However, the threat of an outside force assumes a heterogeneity within the

regional population which is contradicted by global cultural trends. These politics are based on the 'myth of regionalized identity" (Amin, 2004, p.37).

Blank, R. M. (2005). Poverty, policy, and place: How poverty and policies to alleviate poverty are shaped by local characteristics. *International Regional Science Review, 28*(4), 441-464.

Abstract:

This article synthesizes an extensive literature on how local characteristics might affect the nature of poverty, particularly U.S. rural poverty. The attributes discussed include the natural environment, economic structure, public and community institutions, social norms, and demographic characteristics. In each case, the author discusses the ways in which these attributes can affect poverty and indicates what this implies about effective antipoverty policies. Multiple causal factors affect place-specific outcomes and interact so that "outcome" and "cause" are difficult to untangle. One implication is that both place-based and people-based policies may be necessary.

Key Themes:

Key Attributes of a Particular Place
442, This article focuses on the potential importance of five attributes of a particular region or locality: its natural environment, its economic structure, its public and community institutions, its existing social norms and cultural environment, and the demographic characteristics of its population.

Importance of a Dynamic Perspective:
442, Throughout the discussion, I emphasize the importance of a dynamic perspective in considering how these factors relate to the causes of poverty as well as the nature of policy impacts. In the short run, these different characteristics are fixed, but in the long run, many of them are changeable. Even more important, long-term changes in these attributes are endogenous. For instance, changes in social norms tend to be interrelated and simultaneous with changes in economic structure or population characteristics. Therefore, formal modeling of the role of "place" is extremely difficult. Empirically measuring the impact of changes in one of these variables independent of the others also is hard because of the simultaneous causality between them. This article does not try to develop formal models. It provides a descriptive discussion of the importance of each of these variables separately and of their potential interrelationships.

Geographic elements of place-based policy and policy implications:
444, In short, the geographic attributes of an area set the environmental context that helps or hinders economic development. Places that are more isolated or that have fewer natural advantages are likely to have fewer economic opportunities, leading to smaller and poorer populations. Policies designed to mitigate these environmental disadvantages through improved infrastructure may be more effective at reducing poverty in the long run than policies designed to address immediate income shortfalls.

Case for place-based policy *and* people-based policies
456, Imbedded in these examples is an explicit argument in favor of both place-based and people-based policies. From a policy perspective, the interaction of multiple causal factors in creating and sustaining poverty suggests that negative synergies can feed on each other once a region becomes economically disadvantaged. Interrupting this process is likely to require special regionally focused intervention, beyond the assistance that disadvantaged individuals would get regardless of...

Need to Maintain Appropriate Balance Between Local and Central Authorities
457, Locally designed efforts can take into account the specific history, geography, and demographics that produced local poverty, but the very presence of higher poverty in a locality means that there are fewer local resources available for antipoverty efforts. More centrally funded programs can provide antipoverty opportunities that the local community itself could not fund, but centralized funders rightfully demand to monitor and control the use of their funds. The primary policy problem is to maintain the appropriate balance between local and central authority so that local authorities have an ability to utilize their knowledge of the community and its needs in shaping programs, while central authorities retain the ability to impose broad restrictions regarding evaluation and monitoring of program effectiveness.

Difficulty of identifying causal factors and outcomes
457, Doing good research to identify causal place-specific factors that influence poverty and well-being in a location is difficult. Multiple causal factors affect place- specific outcomes and interact with each other in such a way that "outcome" and "causal" variables are often difficult to untangle because of their endogenous nature. In addition, the history of a place matters, which argues for dynamic models and variables that describe both current and past realities.

Additional Points for Summary:

442, As Bartik, Boehm, and Schlottmann (2003) have noted, the linkage between place-based problems and appropriate policy solutions remains poorly understood. Bolton (2004) also called for more integration of theory and policy on this issue.

447, The economic structure of an area is closely linked to its overall wealth and income levels, which affect the wealth available to the local public sector. Areas with more limited jobs and lower wages typically have a lower tax base as well, leading to poorer schools, poorer health care, or limited public services. More limited capacity within the public sector can also help perpetuate poverty and limit economic mobility". [interesting: Lower tax base as one cause of less infrastructure (as opposed to primarily the result of devolution)]

448, There is no cheap or easy way to alter an area's economic structure in the short term through public policy. Overtime, improving the skill base of local workers may be as effective in attracting a broader mix of jobs as any direct effort to manipulate industry location through tax incentives or subsidies.

456, This article has provided a condensed overview of some key reasons why the nature and character of poverty varies across different types of locations. Rural poverty is different from urban poverty because rural areas are more isolated, rural economies are different, the public

and community organizations in rural communities operate differently, social norms in rural areas are different, and rural populations differ.

457, Regionally based policy interventions may consist of more than standard economic development aid. They may involve restructuring civic institutions, providing more equal access to political participation and employment, or providing incentives for improved educational services. If poverty persists because of the conflux of institutional, behavioral, and economic factors in an area, policies that address only the economic factors by themselves may be inadequate.

457, If one is going to study policy effects on place-specific outcomes, there is also the problem of identifying the policy impact.

458, One response to these problems is to focus on case studies, dealing with these comparative and analytical issues by providing "thick" description.

See pages 457-459 for more research suggestions on place, poverty, and antipoverty policies

Bradford, N. (2004). Place Matters and Multi-level Governance: Perspectives on a New Urban Policy Paradigm. *Policy Options, 25*(2).

Abstract:

Canadian cities are back on the public agenda. Prime Minister Paul Martin has declared that there is "no question that the path to Canada's future runs through municipal governments large and small, urban and rural" (Girard, 2003) This article takes stock of the recent explosion of interest in Canada's cities, exploring the factors driving the new urban agenda, and the strategies needed to build healthy vibrant cities. Observing that Canada has become an urban policy laggard in the last decade or so, we consider possible lessons for moving ahead from recent developments in the European Union and the United States. In the 1990s, both of these jurisdictions experimented with novel forms of multi-level governance to tackle increasingly complex and localized public policy challenges.

Key Themes:

Case For Place-Based Policy:
In an era of wicked policy problems, the opportunity for progress on a host of urgent national problems is greatest in the cities, as is the possibility for effective coordination among all the relevant actors (TD Economics, 2002; Gertler et al. 2002; Ray, 2003). A new urban policy architecture is needed for a better alignment of aspatial policies (generally available to all individuals everywhere if they meet the criteria) and spatially-focused interventions (specifically targeted at deteriorating places). Much now depends on whether politicians and public servants from all three orders of government can find ways to work more effectively together. P.41-42

There is a strong rationale for new national policy engagement in Canada's urban centers. Not only are major public problems now spatially concentrated in cities, but the knowledge and

networks critical to their resolution coalesce in local communities. At present the costs of ignoring these problems are piling up at the doorstep of the municipalities. Soon, however, federal and provincial governments will also feel the effects as lost human capital, increased social tensions, and foregone economic opportunity take their toll. P.44

Lessons from the United States and Europe:
At this juncture, Canada's urban policy communities need to think comparatively about future directions. Particularly relevant are recent experiences in the United States and the European Union. In both jurisdictions, the 1990s was a decade of notable urban policy innovation, combining fresh ideas with policy action (Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 2001; Bradford 2003). Notwithstanding evident variation in structures and cultures (for example, the EU and the NAFTA represent very different models of supra-national governance, and the American federal government has long had more direct relations with cities than its Canadian counterpart), there are instructive lessons. With the latecomer's advantage, Canadian urban policy communities can now learn from recent European and American forays into place-based, multilevel governance. P.43

Institutional Challenges:
The concern here is that Canada's national policy machinery and intergovernmental system remains ill-adapted to changing policy realities and spatial flows. While governments at all levels are active in cities, there is little evidence of a coherent agenda, systematic co-ordination, or even appreciation of importance of place quality to good outcomes. Municipalities still struggle with a centuries-old subordination to provincial governments. Federal and provincial governments make unilateral fiscal cuts, program withdrawals, and institutional restructurings with little regard for the fall-out in different cities and communities. Not surprisingly, city representatives have now mounted a forceful national campaign for new recognition, respect, and resources. But the issues in this political debate go deeper than simply retooling municipalities, important though that is. In an era of wicked policy problems, the opportunity for progress on a host of urgent *national* problems is greatest in the cities, as is the possibility for effective co-ordination among all the relevant actors. A new urban policy architecture is needed for a better alignment of aspatial policies (generally available to all individuals everywhere if they meet the criteria) and spatially focused interventions (specifically targeted at deteriorating places). Much now depends on whether politicians and public servants from all three orders of government can find ways to work more effectively together. P.40

Given constitutional realities, inter-governmental rivalries, entrenched bureaucratic routines, and Canada's diverse urban landscape, progress in developing multi-level governance will take time. New forms of trust and accountability are needed, and these will come only through experimentation, monitoring, and learning. The federal government, with its spending power, budget surpluses and national perspective, is the necessary catalyst for collaboration, but the jurisdiction of the provinces must be respected and the voice of the municipalities — and their communities— must also be heard. Steering a course between top-down centralization and bottom-up decentralization, representatives from each level of government discover what works where and why, and how those solutions might be further applied. The result may be a robust national framework for local problem-solving. p.44

Bradford, N. (2005). *Place-based public policy: Towards a new urban and community agenda for Canada* No. F51). Ottawa: CPRN. Retrieved from http://www.cprn.com/documents/35238_en.pdf

Abstract:

Cities, large and small, are where today's major public policy issues play out. Yet governments in Canada have not made much progress toward adapting their programs and delivery mechanisms to this new reality. All three orders of government are active in cities – they spend, regulate, tax, and own property there, but in ways that are not coordinated within each government, let alone across the three orders of government.

To inform the efforts to address this new policy challenge now under way across Canada, this paper by Neil Bradford (CPRN Research Associate, Cities and Communities, and a Professor at Huron College, University of Western Ontario) explores experiences in Britain, Europe and the United States. Governments there started earlier than Canada and have progressed much further, by adopting the four key elements of place-based framework: a) tapping into local knowledge, b) balancing a mix of economic and social policies which combine place-based programs with broad income security and services such as health and education, c) governing through collaboration with civil society and each other, and d) recognizing the emerging roles of municipal governments. One way or another, these other countries have found ways to respect formal jurisdictional boundaries while acting on their policy interdependence with respect to place-based policy. Over time, they have tested and learned from their experience. Bradford extracts the learnings from these experiences, and then proposes action on four fronts: creating a new intergovernmental framework, adopting an urban policy lens based on knowledge flowing up from cities to provincial and federal departments, recognizing and resourcing local governments, and building on the Winnipeg and Vancouver experiences with Urban Development Agreements. These Agreements can be applied to one large city or to a cluster of cities with similar challenges – such as cross-border cities and immigrant-settlement cities. The paper is a companion piece to two previous papers by Neil Bradford – *Why Cities Matter* (2001) and *Cities and Communities that Work* (2003).

Key Themes:

Definition of Place-Based Policy:
This Research Report calls for a *place-based* public policy framework. In so doing, it takes a broader view than is often the case in assessing the problems and prospects of cities. An urban perspective concentrates on physical infrastructures and the powers available to municipalities. A community perspective focuses on social infrastructures and the networks for democratic participation. The place-based framework recognizes the importance of both perspectives, and seeks their integration through a mix of public policies responding to the needs of cities of all sizes and locations. P.v

Four key elements of the place-based framework:
• *Tapping Local Knowledge*. The attention now being paid to localities reflects the fact that many of today's policy challenges are resistant to sectoral interventions designed and delivered from above by government departments. Effective problem-solving requires that governments tap local knowledge, bridging outdated divides between experts, citizens, and community-based

organizations. Strong urban and community policies engage different forms of localized expertise including the "lived experience" of residents, the "action research" of community organizations, and the "technical data" of statistical agencies.

• *Finding the Right Policy Mix*. Acknowledging the significance of the locality for policymaking also means recognizing the potential risks inherent in the place focus if conceived too narrowly, or in isolation from broader policies. The mix of policies is crucial, balancing both spatially-targeted measures for distressed areas and "aspatial" policies for health, employment, education, and so forth. A robust place-based framework thus has two interrelated components: general policies guided by an "urban lens" and targeted programs informed by the ideas of residents.

• *Governing through Collaboration*. New relationships must be forged among government, civil society, and the economy, and across the different branches and levels of the state. These collaborations take horizontal and vertical forms. Horizontally, government departments represented in local projects need to join-up their interventions for a seamless continuum of supports responsive to the unique conditions on the ground. Upper level governments must also work with and through local partnerships, enabling them to revitalize their communities on terms of their own choosing, while also guarding against greater disparity between places.

• *Recognizing local governments.* Local governments are key actors in the governance of the place-based policy framework. Research shows that Canadians view municipal governments as the level most attuned to community needs and priorities. Moreover, municipal officials are best able to provide access points for citizen input, and to convene local actors for policy collaboration. Municipal knowledge is an important input for many public policies and often essential to effective implementation and evaluation. To make these contributions, however, local governments require appropriate recognition and capacity. P.v-vi

Key lessons from the British, American and European experiences:
In each case, the upper level government exercised a particular form of leadership to align better public policies with local needs and capacities. In Britain, the central government was the *driver* of the process. In the United States, the federal government was more a *facilitator* of action. In the EU, the Commission became a *catalyst* for innovation. Across the cases, the overarching theme was the need for balance. Experience shows that collaborative governance and place-based policy-making requires careful management of what in practice are a series of cross-pressures. These include respecting formal jurisdictional divides and acting on the fact of policy interdependence, meeting political demands for "results" and respecting the longer term planning required for successful partnership, and connecting localized interventions to wider regional strategies and national policies.

Three main lines of development:
1. *Intergovernmental framework* setting out basic principles, roles and responsibilities appropriate to place-based governance
2. *Urban policy lens*
3. *Action-oriented tri-level agreements* that presently tackle particular problems in different cities
p.vii-viii

Conclusion:
The Research Report concludes that place-based policy-making, properly designed and

implemented, can help governments meet the key challenges and opportunities currently converging in urban spaces. A main message is that Canadian policy communities are now well positioned for a concerted round of policy learning and practical experimentation. They can *learn from elsewhere*, drawing on the experiences of other jurisdictions, and they can *build from within*, reflecting on several promising collaborations already underway in Canadian cities. p.viii

Bradford, N. (2007). Placing social policy? Reflections on Canada's New Deal for cities and communities. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research, 16*(2), 1-26.

Abstract:

This article analyses the New Deal for Cities and Communities pursued by the federal Liberal government between 2004 and 2006. Situating the initiative in broader urban policy debates about the merits of place-based interventions in tackling problems of poverty and exclusion, it is argued that the New Deal represented a novel attempt at "interscalar policy coordination" within Canadian federalism. Three specific policy tools are identified as central to the New Deal framework—municipal revenue transfers; urban development agreements; and community action research. To understand the New Deal's impact, the implementation of these tools is explored in the context of the City of Toronto's concern with distressed neighbourhoods. Finding gaps in the application of the tools to the city's social development priorities, the article identifies limits in the federal government's policy vision and highlights four institutional factors impeding progress: jurisdiction; money; machinery; and time. The arrival in power of the Harper Conservative government, adhering to a traditional view of inter-governmental relations, is likely to reduce federal interest in tackling these obstacles to urban social policy.

Key Themes:

Merits of and challenges of implementing place-based policy
2, Among the most prominent policy developments has been introduction of spatially targeted or area-based interventions in specific neighbourhoods. The merits of this approach reside in the attention paid to local conditions, the recognition of the need for grass-roots policy engagement, and the potential for more 'joined-up' solutions. However, it is not readily apparent whether such localized responses can address the wider structural forces that are understood to create the new forms of urban poverty and social exclusion. Their implementation may only confirm the retreat of the state from the kind of universal social policies that remain the foundation of inclusive cities.

Call for collaborative forms of governance
4-5, While privileging local factors in shaping urban social sustainability, this perspective does not advocate that upper level governments disengage from city affairs, leaving localities to finance services or plan development on their own. The call is for more collaborative forms of governance, most importantly in the city itself across public, private and third sector organizations, but also between the locality and the extra-local public agencies that flow the resources and assistance required to solve complex problems of poverty and exclusion (Sandercock 2004). Upper level governments should support community-building strategies through *spatially targeted* interventions that engage and empower local networks as problem-

solving agents (Healey et al. 2002). Mobilizing resources in the specific areas where the problems manifest themselves, national governments can ensure their interventions respect municipal plans, tap local knowledge, and leverage neighborhood assets. "Our emphasis," Stren and Polese write, "must be on *local* policies and on *local* institutions, even though the dynamic of urban change incorporate complex elements from larger and more inclusive systems (Stren and Polese 2000: 14, emphasis in original).

Federal cuts to social services and provincial response of downloading
7, In terms of general policies, Ottawa's decisions to withdraw from social housing, limit eligibility for employment insurance, abolish the Canada Assistance Plan and reduce social transfers to the provinces all took their toll on the physical and social infrastructure of cities. Provincial governments were forced to meet their commitments in social services and municipal infrastructure with significantly reduced revenues. The details of the coping strategy varied by province but the general trend involved restrictions on social supports, and the downloading of numerous responsibilities to local actors—both municipalities and community organizations—without adequate resources or flexibility (Andrew, Graham, Phillips 2002).

Urban Development Agreements: collaborative governance to tackle complex problems
9, The agreements are negotiated on a city-wide basis, with the operational focus typically a specific area or neighbourhood. The purpose is to devise integrated revitalization strategies through coordinated interventions that cross both departmental silos and jurisdictional divides. The premise is that complex, multi-faceted problems such as concentrated urban poverty require the problem-solving resources of all orders of government. Through formal agreement identifying the different roles and responsibilities there is the potential to reduce duplication, fill gaps, and allow each level of government to focus on its specific areas of competency.

Bryant, C. and Joseph, A. (2001). Canada's rural population: trends in space and implications in place. *Canadian Geographer, 45*(1), 132-137.

Abstract:

In this paper, we describe the major demographic processes shaping 'rural Canada', especially over the last 20 years. Macro and micro scale processes are strongly linked, so we complement our demographic trends analysis by considering implications for the experience of rural life 'in place' and for public policy.
The paper is organized in four sections. First, we describe broad rural population trends. Second, we address population aging and migration, two defining demographic processes for rural Canada. Third, we consider the intersection of economic, social and political processes with demographic trends and discuss how they affect people's lives. Examples illustrate the importance of understanding the backdrop of institutional restructuring and opportunities for local involvement, especially in terms of the contemporary challenge of sustainability in rural Canada. Finally, we reconsider 'diversity' and speculate about the future population geography of rural Canada.

Key Themes:

Describes major demographic processes shaping rural Canada over the past twenty years.

Demographic Change:
The broad scale processes of population migration and aging are related to the restructuring of economic activity (e.g. corporate restructuring, technological change) and services (e.g. health care), changing household values (e.g. living standards, family size), and expansion of metropolitan employment opportunities (Bourne and Rose this issue). They combine in different ways in different contexts; witness the changing faces of communities in the city's countryside, the agricultural hinterlands and the remoter resource hinterlands. The mosaic of structures and change is even more pronounced at the community level. The general patterns are real, but so are the changes being constructed in communities by local actors, through both 'natural' and planned decisions (Bryant 1997; Bryant and Buffat 1999). P.134

Challenges:
Significant challenges exist, both for rural communities and central states. First, creating and maintaining adequate service levels requires major efforts in creating employment opportunities. Identifying these and supporting them will require a more creative and open approach to planning and managing change. Such an approach requires an open, transparent democratic process at the community level. The largest obstacle within many communities is the unwillingness of 'leaders' to share their 'power' even though they would benefit from the creativity and inventiveness of their populations. In many communities, a 'culture shift' will be necessary. P.136

Role of Provincial and Federal Governments:
…important roles still exist for provincial and federal governments. They concern relatively novel functions, such as supporting community capacity building for managing change, recognizing local leadership and creativity and not thwarting innovative change. Programs such as Community Futures in its early years contained the seeds for such innovative, support-oriented public policies and programs for rural areas. Given the great variety of rural spaces and communities, the major challenge is to develop federal and provincial policies that reflect the desire for standards (in terms of services and processes) while simultaneously recognizing the specificities of each locality and the legitimate concerns of citizens for participation. P. 136

Chokie, M., & Partridge, M. D. (2008). Low-Income Dynamics in Canadian Communities: A Place-Based Approach. *Growth and Change, June 2008, v. 39, Iss. 2, Pp. 313-40, 39*(2), Sept 27, 2008.

Abstract:

Canadian poverty rates have persisted at disappointingly high levels despite almost 15 years of continuous economic growth. The problem is exacerbated by some communities and neighborhoods having exceedingly high poverty, including very high rates for vulnerable demographic groups, such as aboriginals and recent immigrants. We investigate low-income rates (poverty rates) for 2,400 Canadian "communities" over the 1981-2001 period. By focusing

on communities, we fill a void in the related Canadian literature, which tends to focus on individuals, case studies, or more aggregate measures, such as provinces. Our approach allows us to assess the role of place-based policies. Particular attention is given to communities with differing shares of aboriginal Canadians and recent immigrants. One novel feature is our analysis of both "short-term" and "long-term" causes of differential community poverty rates. The results suggest that community low-income rates are more affected by initial economic conditions in the short term, with certain demographic factors becoming relatively more important in the long run.

Key Themes:

Importance of Place-Based Approach:
This broad place-based approach makes the paper unique, as previous studies on Canadian poverty usually emphasize the individual or household, or are case studies of a particular city or region…In particular, if there are place-based causes, such as weak local labor markets, household-level studies may provide an incomplete picture of potential solutions. For example, microanalysis may indicate that increasing a disadvantaged individual's education may sufficiently increase their earnings to lift them above the poverty threshold. However, Osberg (2000) notes that this may have no net impact on the *overall* regional poverty rate, as it may push another person down in the job queue and into poverty. Thus, individual- and community-level assessments may draw differing conclusions. Likewise, a case study of a province or of an urban area, such as Winnipeg, may provide needed context, but analysts are always interested in whether case studies generalize more broadly…In sum, this detailed analysis will allow us to explore whether place-based policies may complement general policies aimed at reducing poverty, which has implications for other countries (Blank 2005). P.314-315

Place-Based Policy to Address Poverty:
Local poverty also has broad regional dimensions that extend beyond a community's borders. For example, spatial mismatch models suggest that proximity to employment opportunities and spatial frictions in commuting and migration are important (Johnson 2006). Such frictions may create a mismatch between where the jobs are being created (say in the suburbs) versus where the poor families reside (say in the central city) (Levernier et al. 2000; Weinberg 2004). Likewise, access to jobs is also critical to the *rural* poor because job creation occurs disproportionately in larger urban areas, which may be difficult for the rural poor to access, especially if they lack adequate childcare and transportation (Blumenberg and Shiki 2004; Partridge and Rickman, forthcoming). In targeting the poor, place-based policy adherents argue that economic development policies should enhance *local* growth because of factors, such as peer effects, economic-role models, and knowledge spillovers (Fong and Shibuya 2003; Partridge and Rickman 2005; United Way of Greater Toronto 2004). Furthermore, the issue of spatial distribution of low and high poverty warrants more attention to discern the underlying causes. P.316

Potential Results of Place-based Poverty Reduction Strategies:
Thus, poverty reduction measures in one community will not only improve the situation in the targeted location, but it appears to have additional benefits for neighboring communities as well. P.323

Conclusion:
Using 1981–2001 census data, this study examined the prevalence of low-income households across nearly 2,400 rural and urban Canadian CCSs. Using CCSs/communities as our unit of observation allows us to assess some potential place-based policies. A particular emphasis was given to distinguishing short-term effects (five years or less) from long-term effects (five years or more), which to our knowledge is the first time such an effort has been undertaken. On account of concerns regarding the dynamics of poverty, this approach should be especially appealing to policy makers who are interested in changes over time. Among community-based demographic attributes receiving special attention were the aboriginal and recent-immigrant population shares. P.332

Dewees, S., Lobao, L., & Swanson, L. E. (2003). Local economic development in an age of devolution: The question of rural localities. Rural Sociology, 68(2), 182.

Abstract:

There is limited recent research on the strategies that rural local governments are employing in the face of changing intergovernmental relationships, especially in relation to local economic development. This paper draws on data from a survey of local governments in the Ohio River Valley Region that includes a mix of localities on the urban-rural continuum, to empirically address three issues. First, we examined the extent to which county governments have undertaken local economic development initiatives as well as other, extra-economic activities designed to improve community well-being. Second, we assessed the extent to which rural county governments vary from urban counties in their activities and available resources. Finally, we employed logistic regression models of factors associated with use of development strategies to determine the relationship between rurality and local development policy activities. The results show that rural counties are less likely than urban counties to undertake various economic development activities, with observed urban-rural differences largely attributable to county socioeconomic disadvantages, such as poverty and education.

Key Themes:

Increase in Local-Based Policies:
Over the past three decades, responsibility for a broad range of policy activities has become increasingly decentralized, with local governments playing a growing role in policy formation and implementation. Changes in the organization and administration of several federal programs, including but not limited to the federal welfare system, has shifted responsibility to state and local governments and in many cases has reduced government regulation in favor of presumed market efficiencies. At the same time, globalization is bringing about a new social restructuring and new economic challenges to distressed areas (Kodras 1997). These and other factors have revived an interest in locality-based policies and the role of the local community in the face of macro structural changes (Luloff and Swanson 1995; Swanson 2000). P.184

Local Communities Don't Have Capacity:
At the same time, research indicates that rural local governments are increasingly dependent upon state aid to ease local governmental fiscal burden (Johnson et al. 1995). In the face of

changing intergovernmental relationships, rural localities may only become more dependent upon states' willingness to provide a redistributive function. The Urban Institute indicates that federal outlays for community and regional development, agriculture, energy, transportation, and defense will decline as a percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) between 1996 and 2002. Historically, this group of federal programs constituted a significant growth machine for many rural communities (Steuerle and Mermin 1997). Without the buffer of redistributive aid from federal and state sources, rural counties may find it increasingly difficult to take on new responsibilities associated with devolution (Warner 1999). Local development efforts and locally raised revenues will become increasingly important. P.184

Pros and Cons of Local Econ Dev:
The social consequences of increasing local control over economic development are widely debated. The major argument for positive impacts of local control is that government closer to the people may have greater flexibility in addressing local needs and preferences (Garkovich 1998; Wolman 1995). Other arguments focus on critiques of government at various levels (Mitchell and Simmons 1994). Substituting the government's monopoly power for market competition is seen as more efficient and cost effective, helping to reduce the federal deficit, debt service costs, and tax burdens. Arguments for negative impacts often see decentralization as a symptom of broader political — economic change (see Staeheli et al. 1997). As government at all levels has become more fragmented and dominated by market relations, this changed policy environment places ever greater responsibility on local governments to mediate the impacts of macro economic changes. This can lead to localities managing competitive economic development programs that bring about bidding wars with other locales over the attempt to recruit new businesses, ratchet down the local tax base, and create fiscal stress (Kantor 1995). P.185

Lack of Social Capital in Rural Areas:
Research on rural communities indicates that many local governments are staffed by part time or volunteer leaders with little professional training (Brown 1980; Cigler 1993; McManus and Pammer 1990; Seroka 1986). Professional staff members, especially grant writers and economic development specialists, are critical of successful local development efforts. Insufficient personnel, inadequate administrative capacity, and lack of experience in negotiating tax abatements and managing business recruitment are seen to disadvantage rural local governments (Brown 1980; Cigler 1993; McManus and Pammer 1990). Past research on implementing block grants show that rural areas find it harder to obtain and implement such grants (Reeder 1996; RUPRI 1995). P.185

Potential of social capital to foster development:
The literature on community social infrastructure and social capital suggests that a community with an active civic sector, involving service clubs, volunteer groups, and development foundations, tends to be more successful in development activities (Flora and Flora 1991; Luloff and Swanson 1995; Swanson 1996). Communities with an active civic sector may possess a high level of social capital that can be important for successful development efforts (Turner 1999). P.188

Therefore, it is possible that local government capacity and local policy decisions are associated with socioeconomic factors such as education levels, poverty, and the economic base of the

county, rather than simple geographic location. P.188-189

Challenge for rural communities:
The ongoing devolution of federal government programs represents a potentially challenging environment for the fiscal well-being of local governments, especially local governments that possess limited staff resources and lack experience with local economic development policy. At the same time, the increasing globalization of the economy is resulting in a restructured economic marketplace where local communities face greater competition in the attraction of capital. Many argue that numerous local governments, especially rural local governments, will not be able to compete in this new policy environment because they lack the capacity to develop and manage local initiatives. Furthermore, it is assumed that the most isolated rural localities will be the most disadvantaged in this new environment. P.201

Place vs. Social Conditions:
Multivariate analysis suggests that program usage is better predicted by county education and poverty levels than by geographic location. Once these variables are controlled, the effect of rurality diminishes or disappears. Given the fact that most measures of rurality are correlated with poverty and lower education levels (with the most remote rural counties typically displaying high poverty levels), this finding still holds implications for rural communities. P.202

These implications are positive and negative. Rural counties with skilled leadership, lower poverty levels, and higher education levels appear to have a chance to mediate the effects of geographic isolation and macro-level economic change by using innovative economic development policy tools. However, it appears that rural counties with high poverty levels and few local resources are less likely to aggressively pursue the same quantity and quality of economic development strategies and will continue to face challenges. More importantly, however, these findings hold implications for all socioeconomically disadvantaged counties. The finding that high poverty levels and low education levels in counties are associated with less use of certain types of economic development strategies reveals that economically challenged counties may fare poorly in an environment of increased local fiscal responsibility and increasing global competition. Economically depressed counties that already have fewer revenue sources for local services may find it difficult to invest resources in economic development strategies to work against the larger forces of economic restructuring. P.202

Conclusion:
While the more prosperous rural areas appear to be taking initiative in economic development strategies, rural areas that are disadvantaged by a low tax base, low education levels, and a depressed economy may continue to struggle to compete in this new policy environment. While there is certainly evidence that localities are attempting to take an active role in determining their future well-being in the face of increasing local responsibility and macro-economic changes, the variation in the types of policies being used raises questions about local capacity and local prospects for success. P.203-204

Dorling D, Smith G, Noble M, Wright G, Burrows R, Bradshaw J, Joshi H, Pattie C, Mitchell R, Green A E, McCulloch A. (2001). "How much does place matter?". *Environment and Planning A, 33*(8)

Abstract:

Why put together yet another debate about the importance or irrelevance of place in society? The superficial reason for doing this here was that in Autumn 2000 I was asked to referee a paper by Andrew McCulloch (2001) which both impressed and concerned me. I was impressed by the amount of work and skill which had gone into this paper, as with much of the analysis of the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) coming out of Essex University. I was also concerned with some of the underlying assumptions and implicit beliefs expressed through this and in similar recent papers using the BHPS. The six short articles which follow and McCulloch's reply reflect much of the admiration for his work and skill, a great deal of support but also much dissent. I summarise them next; however, they are all kept short enough to be summaries of a much wider debate in themselves. The authors were chosen as being leading researchers in social science, ranging from the study of deprivation and poverty, to employment, housing, voting, area effects, health, multilevel modeling, and other similar subjects and techniques. They were limited (as am I) to only a few words and half a dozen references. Among a number of the critics, the paper raised the issue of whether area-based initiatives are a valid policy option for government today.

Key Themes:

Do we care about area effects? (George Smith, Michael Noble, Gemma Wright)
George Smith, Michael Noble, and Gemma Wright suggest that McCulloch is on shaky ground in arguing against area-based policy initiatives; in contrast to his claims they suggest that we do need such policies and that we do not need further evidence that area effects exist to justify area-based initiatives. P.1335

Place & People Based Policies:
ABIs [Area-Based Initiatives] are not necessarily presented as an alternative, but a complement or supplement to mainstream and/or individual level programmes...To argue that there is a rationale for area-based initiatives is not to argue that poverty should only be tackled using this kind of geographical targeting nor does it imply that ABIs are necessarily the most effective way of combating poverty. It is quite consistent to hold a view that the main policy prescription for the eradication of poverty should be through universal macroeconomic and social policies but still to see area-based policies as a useful addition to mainstream programmes. P.1342

Conclusion:
In conclusion, there can be no doubt that poor people are concentrated spatially and that over time some areas improve, while others seem resistant to change. Mainstream policies must be the first line in raising people out of poverty, but for people living in areas which lag behind when there are economic upturns an ABI may well be an appropriate policy response. Of course, ABIs need to be appropriately assigned to deprived areas, and rigorously evaluated to provide an evidence base for successful area interventions. But do we need evidence that area effects

actually exist to justify ABIs? Our conclusion is that we do not. P.1344

Evidence-based policy and practice (Roger Burrows, Jonathan Bradshaw)
In further contrast, Roger Burrows and Johnathan Bradshaw argue that there is little evidence that area-based policies alleviate poverty. However, they too believe there is not enough `evidence' in McCulloch's paper to support his general conclusions with which they sympathise. Both of the above papers argue for longitudinal studies. P.1335

Efficacy of Place-Based Approaches:
However, the truth is that despite the myriad of neighbourhood-based policy initiatives which have taken place (not to mention the billions of pounds spent on them) there is little in the way of reliable evidence on the efficacy, or otherwise, of area-based approaches to the alleviation of poverty and associated detrimental outcomes. The reasons for this are both methodological and political. P.1345

Methodological Problems:
At a political level these methodological problems have contributed to two major failings. First, the evaluations of neighbourhood interventions which have taken place have often been ill timed. The short-term political imperatives of demonstrating what has been done and, crucially, of promoting the spectacle of the intervention has often led to evaluations which are overly concerned with matters of process and short-term aims and objectives. P.1345

The second political problem "and this despite the mantra of `what counts is what works" is that, without any tradition of systematic reviewing, meta-analysis, or any clearly articulated hierarchy of research evidence within neighbourhood research in the United Kingdom, it has become possible for one or two studies to gain a disproportionate amount of political influence.P.1346

The analytic and policy questions that McCulloch has asked are very important ones. However, if we are to take the rhetoric of evidence-based policy at all seriously inthis area the methodological tools, data sources, and philosophical positions we need to develop are not the ones utilised here. The appropriate development of these presents us all with a very worthwhile challenge. P.1347-1348

Is there a place for area-based initiatives? (Heather Joshi)
Heather Joshi, a long-term advocate and researcher of longitudinal data, is largely supportive of McCulloch's findings, but still believes there may be a place for policies towards places, as long as they operate within a context of policies towards people. P.1335

On reinvented wheels (Charles Pattie)
Charles Pattie argues that McCulloch has many good points to make, but that we should not underestimate the political symbolism of area-based policies. He also points out some subtle inconsistencies in the logic of McCulloch's modelling in short that it ignores the possible past influence of contextual effects, using the past to `control' out context. Burrows, Bradshaw, and Pattie all call for a longer historical perspective in general, as well as in the actual modelling (in Pattie's case). P.1335

<u>Multilevel modeling might not be the answer (Richard Mitchell)</u>
The following contribution, from Richard Mitchell, partly provides this, as well as a strong critique of the kinds of multilevel modelling approaches McCulloch uses, from someone who has also used them for his own research. Self critiques are often the strongest kind as we tend to know many of our own weakness. P.1335

<u>Unemployment, nonemployment, and labour-market disadvantage (Anne E Green)</u>
Finally, Anne Green returns to some of the issues McCulloch's paper raises in relation to policy, noting the tendency of residents of poor neighbourhoods who get employment to `move on up' and leave the area, hence helping to maintain the context. P.1335

<u>Reply: Ward-level deprivation and individual social and economic outcomes in the British Household Panel Study (Andrew McCulloch)</u>
McCulloch replies to his critiques above by agreeing with many points they make but pointing out that: "The evidence presented in most analyses regarding local contextual effects is only circumstantial'' (page 1365). P.1335

Fluharty, C. W. (2002). Toward a community-based national rural policy: The importance of the social services sector. *Child Welfare, 81*(5), 663.

Abstract:

Although discussions of rural America's challenges have surfaced at regular intervals over the past half-century, the issue is receiving significantly greater substantive policy discussion today, as a dialogue regarding the development of a more integrative, community-based, national rural policy begins to emerge. This article outlines this unique "rural policy moment," assesses the potential for a community-based rural policy for our nation, and discusses the critical role rural social services practice and policy play in supporting these opportunities to address the significant challenges faced by rural people.

Key Themes:

<u>Rural realities key to developing an integrative rural policy</u>
665, One of the greatest challenges rural America faces in the public policy arena is its tremendous diversity across space, culture, and demography. Several specific rural realities, however, define how these differences improve or confound the potential for crafting a more integrative rural policy for our nation.

665, Rural America Is Much More than Agriculture
666, Today, only 63% of rural Americans live on farms. Farming accounts for only 7.5% of rural employment. More than 90% of rural workers have nonfarm jobs (Economic Research Service [ERS], 1999a, p. 86).

666, If a broad-based rural renaissance is to occur, and if farm families are to fully benefit from its development, new economic engines that optimize regional competitive advantage are needed.

666, The Rural Economy Has Strengthened but Remains Fragile

667, Persistent Pockets of Intractable Rural Poverty Remain

669, The Relationship Between Government and Government Revenue Streams Has Significant Rural Implications

Scope of American rural counties
669, As the nation's New Federalism policy framework evolves, local and regional government capacity become increasingly critical for rural communities. Today, 2,305 of America's 3,043 counties are rural. They account for approximately 76% of all counties, 83% of the nation's land, and 20% to 25% of the population (ERS, 1990).

Paradigm shift towards 'new governance' and place-based approaches
675, As this is occurring, important new constructs within the urban policy literature offer support for a more community- or place- based public policy paradigm. Two monographs point to a seismic paradigm shift in the conceptual framework of the urban policy community. Doug Nelson (2000), President of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, argued that social welfare policy must re- think its 25-year resistance to place-based policy, long thought to have institutionalized "the ghetto." Instead, he suggested that the public, private, and philanthropic sectors must create a unique new collaboration, forming a "new governance," a place-based framework for attention to America's most impoverished children and families.

Aspects of Rural Disadvantage

681, Unfortunately, an eminently clear rural disadvantage exists:
- Rural poverty rates have exceeded urban rates for decades.
- Of the 250 poorest counties in the United States, in 1998, 234 were nonmetropolitan.
- Rural workers are nearly twice as likely to earn the minimum wage and 40% less likely to move out of low-wage, entry-level positions than nonrural workers.
- Of 10 rural people in poverty, 6 do not own a car, yet 80% of rural counties have no public transportation.
- More than half of rural seniors have family incomes below 200% of the poverty level, compared with 40% of urban seniors.

Case for rural America to build coalitions with suburbs/ link with urban policy
685, In a public policy arena increasingly controlled by suburban forces, advocates for a rural policy framework must engage these forces, building either new coalitions for commensurate power or new understandings of the increased integration of policy effects across space from urban and suburban areas to rural America. The public rhetoric to support these efforts should coalesce around the question. What shall we do with the space between the suburbs? Rural America must either engage suburbanites in a dialogue regarding why they should care about rural areas and effectively address their questions, or seek new coalitions to increase their relative power vis-a-vis the suburbs. Regardless of the path, rural America has a unique opportunity to link with urban America in seeking a more place-based policy framework for future public policies.

Gillen, M. 2004. Promoting place: elevating place-based discourse and new approaches in local governance in New South Wales. *Urban Policy and Research*, **22(2), 207-220.**

Abstract:

In recent years, disenchantment of extant planning systems has assisted the consideration of alternative, place-based models. By offering a critical analysis of these approaches, this article attempts to explore the value and challenge of such for the planning system of NSW.

Key Themes:

History of Place Based Approach
- Gillen provides the background for the need for place based approaches. The conflicting views of individuals who share a space necessitate an approach which can meet various needs and perspectives. Furthermore, the individuality of each 'place' ensures that "no single place management model exists" (Gillen, 2004, p.208).

Role of Discourse and Ideology
- Discourse theory is identified as a useful means of exploring the ideological issues and relationships of power underlying place-based policy.
- Gillen argues that there has not been sufficient development of place management discourse in New South Whales to support the implemented policy. Attempts to change practice without sufficient changes in ideology results in interventions which are specific to a present situation but that do not affect planning in the long term.
- A list of criteria provided by Stewart-Weeks (2002) proposes the necessary ideological developments that must be in place for an idea to successfully institutionalized. Gillen's suggestion is that place-management and place-based planning has not yet met these ideological criteria.
- Gillen casts a recent debate between Walsh (2001) and Mant (2002) on place based policy in Australia, as an example of how place-based discourse has not been fully developed. Gillen argues that "Walsh provides a sound appraisal of the potential problems of area-based projects, but imperfectly uses these as the basis for a critique of the place management approach" (Gillen, 2004, p. 212). Gillen argues that place-management remains a competing discourse with dominant ideologies of governance.
- Drawing support from Mant (2002) and Croft (1998) Gillen argues that the successful implementation of place-management requires the restructuring of Australian government at state and local levels. This would require that place-based discourse achieve a more dominant status.
- Gillen reviews positive advancements in NSW place-based policy and management (such as *Plan First*) but continues to stress the necessity for place based theory to assume a dominant ideological position and for real structural change to occur within governmental organization.

Graham, S. & Healey, P. Relational concepts of space and place: issues for planning theory and practice.1999. *European Planning Studies, Vol. 7, No. 5. pp. 623-646.*

Abstract:

This paper seeks to conceptualize and explore the changing relationships between planning action and practice and the dynamics of place. It argues that planning practice is grappling with new treatments of place, based on dynamic, relational constructs, rather than the Euclidean, deterministic, and one-dimensional treatments inherited from the 'scientific' approaches of the 1960s and early 1970s. But such emerging planning practices remain poorly served by planning theory which has so far failed to produce sufficiently robust and sophisticated conceptual treatments of place in today's globalizing' world. In this paper we attempt to draw on a wide range of recent advances in social theory to begin constructing such a treatment. The paper has four parts. First, we criticize the legacy of object-oriented, Euclidean concepts of planning theory and practice, and their reliance on 'containered' views of space and time. Second, we construct a relational understanding of time, space and cities by drawing together four strands of recent social theory. These are: relational theories of urban time-space, dynamic conceptualizations of 'multiplex' places and cities, the 'new' urban and regional socio-economics, and emerging theories of social agency and institutional ordering. In the third section, we apply such perspectives to three worlds of planning practice: land use regulation, policy frameworks and development plans, and the development of 'customized spaces' in urban 'regeneration'. Finally, by way of conclusion, we suggest some pointers for practising *planning in a relational way.*

Key Themes:

<u>Globalization and Socio-Spacial Relations</u>
- Complimenting the discourse arguments presented by Gillen (2004), Graham & Healey suggest that although modifications are being made in place policy and action (especially with the rise of globalization), there has not been a similar development or advancement in the concept of socio-spatial relations. As argued by Amin (2004), Graham & Healey suggest that a perspective of cities as "containers" of space prevail and that "(c)ities are seen as special portions of space, bounded, enclosed and separated from rural areas by the frictional effects of distance and the time it takes to travel" (Emberley,1989), cited in Graham & Healey (1999, p.626).
- Graham & Healey argue that 'the city' continues to be interpreted as the focal point or "sum" of the many pieces of space which comprise a two-dimensional Euclidian perception of region. This perception 'reifies' space and city, and the concept of rural space is necessarily implicated.
- The authors are concerned with the concept of time and place (24 hour cities, globalization mixing times and places).
- Graham & Healey address an apparent contradiction that "(p)laces continue to matter in a globalized economy; some would say they are mattering more and more" (Graham & Healey, 1999, p.631). They ask, "why this apparently paradoxical situation: the re-assertion of place in a globalizing world?" (Graham & Healey, 1999, p.631). There response focuses on proximity to financial districts, media, university etc.

<u>Case Examples in Britain and France</u>
- A discussion of planning projects in Britain illustrates how a shift is taking place in planning action, which incorporates a relational perspective that considers the true extent of the impact of a project. The phases of British land planning practices over time are outlined and the changing perspectives of 'space' (activity spaces, channel spaces etc) and a case example involving Hampshire County Council are explored in detail.
- A discussion of the effects of globalization ensues with a case example from France which highlights the attempts of a "failing textile town" to globalize itself by installing networking infrastructure (Roubaix Teleport Strategy).
- The implications of 'stretching' and 'reducing' space between cities (and how this may effect local and rural populations and their specific needs) is further explored.

Kraybill, D. & Kilkenny, M. (2003). *Economic rationales for and against place-based policies.* **"Rural Development, Place-based Policy: Sociologists Critique Economists." AAEA-RSS Annual Meeting, "Spatial Inequality: Continuity and Change in Territorial Stratification," Montreal, Canada, July 27-30, 2003.**

Abstract:

This presentation discusses the role of place in classical, neoclassical, and new economic growth theories and presents arguments for and against place-based rural development policies. Based on neoclassical theory, we explain the market-failure rationale for place- based policies and present the five conditions necessary for social welfare optima. The fact that places are dispersed across space leads to violations of all five conditions. In particular, (i) labor, financial capital, and land are not perfectly mobile, (ii) space imparts monopoly power, (iii) fixed costs are a barrier to entry/exit, (iv) externalities (spatial spillovers, localization and urbanization economies of scale) are a fact of life, and (v) while information may be costlessly transported, knowledge is subject to spatial decay. The market failures that result from these conditions provide a rationale for certain types of place-based policy. Beyond neoclassical economics, we examine key features of the new economic geography and endogenous growth theory and discuss their implications for place-based policies. Finally, we also discuss the numerous pitfalls of place-based policies.

Key Themes:

<u>Discussion of people vs. place based policies:</u>
2, "Getting the mix of place and people right in rural development discussions is not easy. There is a tendency…. To treat place orientation and people orientation as non-overlapping categories of rural development policy … "[M]any policy discussions […obscure] the fact that people and places are intricately bound".

<u>Definition of place-based and people-based policies:</u>
2, We define "place-based" policies as those where the location of the beneficiary is a key criterion for eligibility. We do not consider policies tailored to local conditions to be "place-based". Locally-sensitive policies should be more effective than one-size-fits-all policies, so

barring excessive costs of local tailoring, there are *no arguments against place-tailored policy.* Place heterogeneity justifies place-tailored policies.

2-3, People-based policies target specific people (e.g., means-tested income-support programs) or guarantee public goods to all individuals. Place-based policies target recipients in specified places. People-based and place-based policies are not necessarily mutually-exclusive. Place-based policies can also target specific people or sectors. The target of all policy should be to help people. Ideally, we promote places (or commodities or sectors) only if the policies ultimately make people better off

Analysis of Policy Impact:
4, Thus, we can tell if a policy has made a place more attractive to businesses or people by looking at the policy's effects on local property values. This important indicator of place-based rural development outcomes is more sensitive than other indicators, such as changes in population, employment, business counts, or even incomes.

Summary:

10, We believe that the strongest justification for "place-based" policies is when such policies are the most effective and least costly ways to help people when markets fail. For example, a place-based policy of providing lump-sum grants to small-town entrepreneurs to help them retool or upgrade to become competitive and successful in the market economy, and to help their town grow to achieve the critical mass of population to sustain itself, may be less costly than people-based policies of buying every household out and relocating them, or providing income support (unemployment insurance or TANF) for the rest of their lives.

Lurie, S. & Hibbard, M. (2008). Community-Based Natural Resource Management: Ideals and Realities for Oregon Watershed Councils. *Society & Natural Resources,* 21(5), 430-440.

Abstract:

Community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) is presented as an alternative to conventional, top-down approaches to natural resource governance. It entails local, place-based projects, programs, and policies that have the goal of advancing healthy environments and human communities. CBNRM promises Jeffersonian ideals of civil society—local citizens participating in democratic decision making to create and maintain robust communities. Implementing CBNRM requires different institutions and organizational structures than those created during the rise of the administrative state. Watershed councils are a particularly pertinent example of CBNRM in practice. What are the issues facing watershed councils in a policy environment that places significant expectations and responsibilities on such entities? Drawing from a larger study of Oregon's watershed councils, this article explores some of the institutional and organizational realities of watershed councils in the current policy environment.

Key Themes:

430, notes trend "toward[s] devolution of authority and responsibility to lower levels of government and non-governmental organizations"

Reasons for an increased need for local and participatory governance
431, The growth of locally based decision making is the product of institutional changes that have taken place over the past several decades in response to increased citizen demands for direct inclusion in policy processes. These changes include expanded court standing and the provision for citizen suits; increasing mistrust of government and concomitant challenges to prevailing political institutions; public disagreements regarding scientific and technical information; and a growing expectation that decision makers should include equity issues in considering environmental policies.

Definitions of Community-based natural resource management
431, CBNRM "is a flexible, place based, multi-interest, cooperative effort linking private and public partners for problem solving. It typically involves consensus decision making and joint learning procedures in an effort to develop mutual gains solutions" (431)
432, "In the spirit of Jefferson, Weber (2003, 3) describes CBNRM as a process ''in which coalitions of the unalike come together in a deliberative format to resolve policy problems affecting the environment, economy, and community (or communities) of a particular place''

Decline in public confidence of top-down governance
431 "The current trend toward locally based governance characterized by CBNRM represents a turn away from the top-down governance institutions that evolved over the 20th century—the so-called administrative state, with its focus on scientific management and organizational efficiency, professional expertise and rational decision making (McKinney and Harmon 2004; Weber 2003). Faith in the administrative state and its problem-solving abilities reached its peak in the period from the 1950s through the early 1970s. Since then, public confidence in government has declined significantly, and narrowly focused, centralized, top-down government".

Case for CBNRM as link between top-down and bottom-up structures
"In a notably changed organizational, legal, and policy environment since the development of traditional institutions and organizations for natural resource management early in the 20th century, centralized, top-down decision making has become increasingly inadequate for responding to local natural resource issues and needs. CBNRM has demonstrated its potential to be an integral, significant link in the integration of top-down and bottom-up structures necessary for inclusive and appropriate natural resource management decision making if institutional and operational needs are met." (438)

Lack of resources as barrier to implementation
438, If Oregon watershed councils' operational realities are any indication, however, CBNRM in practice presents a significant conundrum. The lack of resources compels the use of volunteers and active partnering with other organizations in innovative ways that adds to community capacity for problem solving and makes further collaborations more likely. Lack of adequate funding and technical resources in particular, however, may consign many councils to less

complicated, less effective projects or otherwise blunt their potential to contribute to, or facilitate, place-based symbiotic sustainability.

Financial barriers as barrier to implementation
438, Given the constraints they face, watershed councils' accomplishments are all the more impressive. However, the CBNRM ideal of a democratic, locally based authority has not been achieved in Oregon's watershed councils. The reality of CBNRM is falling short of that ideal, not for lack of civic engagement, but for lack of sufficient financial and other key supports.

<see also application of CBNRM in case study of Oregon watersheds in latter half of article>

Markusen, A., & Glasmeier, A. (2008). Overhauling and Revitalizing Federal Economic Development Programs: Commentary. *Economic Development Quarterly, 22*(2), Sept 27, 2008.

Abstract:

Although federal economic development has fallen on hard times in the past decade, it remains important, especially in rural areas. In addition, the federal government can play key regulatory roles. We review the still powerful case for place-based approaches but argue that a number of program and policy reforms are pressing. Programs should place greater emphasis on human capital than they have and should explore the potential for consumption base strategies. Incentive competition should be regulated nationally. Greater coordination of economic development strategies across federal agencies is badly needed, and Congress should explore blocking up federal funding regionally. Better targeting and performance standards should be implemented and changes in crude place-based eligibility explored. Finally, rigorous and relevant evaluation research should be methodically undertaken, the results disseminated, and programs subsequently redesigned. We believe that these reforms can revitalize the practice of federal economic development and invigorate political support for it.

Key Themes:

People vs. Place:
In the normative debate over people-versus-place prosperity, there is growing consensus among economists that places do matter in wealth and income creation beyond the sum of the firms, workers, and owners of resources within them. Economist Roger Bolton (1992) demonstrated convincingly that there is an economic value to the sense of place. p. 83

(New) Role of Federal Government:
The Economic Development Administration (EDA) and other federal agencies—the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the Department of Defense (DOD)—have played a crucial role in this revitalization. Federal agencies have helped build planning capacity across neighboring communities that are too understaffed to do this work themselves. They have emphasized coordinated regional development approaches that direct attention to the longer term. They have provided timely economic adjustment assistance (both financial and consultative) to communities undergoing development shocks, enabling them to form and implement a strategy for recovery, as well as to

individuals experiencing sudden structural or policy-related unemployment. They have helped depressed rural communities in particular with infrastructure development. They have supported entrepreneurship and small business initiatives that create new and diversifying economic activity. They have provided workforce development programs that help match people who need work with employers who need workers. They have assisted existing businesses under competitive pressure to modernize and meet their competition. Nevertheless, federal economic development programs are in need of an overhaul that could markedly improve their effectiveness and make large contributions to local and national economic wealth and income generation. We base our remarks on our own research and experience as economic development advisors and our review of a rigorous and applied body of recent research by others. P.82-83

Effectiveness of Economic Development Programs:
Have these programs made a difference? Although the evaluation of economic development programs remains primitive and underfunded, several overall assessments have confirmed that they do enable communities and regions to overcome setbacks, create jobs, and raise income levels. P.85

Place-Based Policies for Poverty Reduction:
Even for persistently poor counties, evidence suggests that place-based policies emphasizing job development can reduce poverty rates among people who are poor. Probing poverty outcomes, Partridge and Rickman (in press) found that higher job growth rates in high-poverty places bring poverty levels down, suggesting that people who are poor respond affirmatively to economic and community development generated work opportunities. P.85

Challenges & Solutions for Federal Economic Development Policy and Practice:

Physical Versus Human Capital in Economic Development:
In general, federal economic development programs place too much emphasis on physical infrastructure and not enough on human capital and "soft" infrastructure, meaning organizational know-how and networking… The solution to this imbalance is greater emphasis on human capital formation and on links between physical and human capital development in federal programs. P.85

Balancing Export Orientation with Consumption Base Potential:
Federal economic development programs heavily favor export-oriented economic activities at the expense of the local consumption base and its potential for greater capture of local and regional spending… Federal programs should permit the use of economic development funding for selective investments of this type. P.86

Reining in the Competition for Capital:
Federally subsidized infrastructure investments help recipient communities but often underwrite a heightened competition for capital that simply moves jobs (and workers) from one community to another… Solutions to this dilemma include a stepped-up federal government role in dampening bidding wars… EDA could also fund three quarters of the cost of each state's adopting a minimally standardized, unified development budget… Unified development budgets enable decision makers and communities within states to see clearly the overall shape and

distribution of resources for economic development and make it easier to debate future levels, program composition, and distribution. P.86-87

Coordinating Across Federal Agencies:
The recent emphasis in EDA on coordinated regional development approaches is very welcome, but there remain high barriers between the programs of various federal agencies, resulting in considerable inefficiency. There is a pressing need to integrate economic with workforce development and environmental remediation and protection…The current Congress could raise considerably the stature of federal economic development work by adopting innovations that require agencies to work across departmental lines and create new incentives for communities to work together on a regional and cross-agency basis. P.87

Blocking up Federal Economic Development Funding Regionally:
Federal economic development program delivery remains complex and unduly resource consuming, even within a single agency like EDA. Congress could explore blocking up federal community and economic development programs under the stewardship of EDA, an approach that has worked well in the CDBG arrangement since the 1970s. p.87

Targeting and Performance for Federal Programs:
The consequences of economic development programs are often disappointing or difficult to determine. At worst, they leave communities owing for infrastructure that is not used or facing large operating deficits or both… Solutions would direct EDA and other economic development agencies to emphasize longer term job creation, require disciplined targeting of assistance, and strengthen the links between assistance and performance agreements and outcomes. p.88

Place-Based Eligibility Versus Place-Tied Problem Criteria:
In designing economic development programs, EDA and other agencies use place-based criteria such as per capita income to identify qualifying counties or communities…Although the particulars of each program vary in emphasizing unemployment, income, or unhealthy living conditions, in general, these programs are targeted toward places that are unable to generate sufficient local resources to provide necessary funds for development. But these criteria often depend on old data, lack spatial specificity, and rely on measures that do not reflect the variety of conditions found in American communities today…Two solutions are possible. First, existing criteria should incorporate a fuller set of place-related problem characteristics that trigger eligibility in programs and can be flexibly applied to communities within larger county units or metro areas...The second solution involves increasing CDBG, EDA, and USDA funds to help places in real need. Federal funds for place-based development have declined dramatically. The EDA is a mere shadow of its former self. P.88

Evaluation, Dissemination, and Program Redesign:
Evaluation of economic development programs is exceptionally thin, and thus, many programs and activities persist without the benefit of knowledge of cause and effect and without cost-benefit analyses that compare alternative approaches…A strong solution to this problem would be to designate the EDA as the primary national agency investing in research and evaluation aimed at helping economic development practitioners and leaders at all levels understand what really works. EDA could build a vigorous economic development data-gathering, research, and evaluation arm to marshal critical data, similar to the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the

Department of Labor. P.89

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). 2005. Place-based policies for rural development: Lake Balaton, Hungary (case study)

Key Themes:

- Provides detailed demographic information on Hungary (tourism, economy etc.).
- Outlines the objectives for the 2002-2006 Lake Balaton Strategic Development Program.
- Lake Balaton is a predominantly rural area. Its needs are consistent with "the national space-based and rural development objectives– expansion of rural income earning opportunities; development and improvement of infrastructure connected with agriculture; renovation and development of villages and protection and conservation of rural heritage; and Leader programmes" (OECD, 2002, 2.2.3). It consequently serves as an informative case example.
- The OECD provides an evaluation of the success of the project. Many positive advancements are noted, but a discrepancy between advancements in tourism for lake-shore and hinterland communities illustrates the need to further address the particular needs of the latter communities.
- Top-down vs. Bottom up organization is identified as an ongoing challenge to the successful implementation of place-based policy
- Some critique is offered regarding the coordination between the Ministry of Agriculture and those responsible for Balaton Tourism.
- Note: This study is one of a number of studies commissioned for the examination of place-based policy in the OECD.

Paasi, A. 2003. Region and place: region and identity in question. *Progress in Human Geography* 27,4 (2003) pp. 475–485

Introduction:

This report will review one specific part of the complicated identity discourse, the question of *regional identity*. Along with the tendencies depicted above, this old idea has gained new importance not only in geography but also in such fields as cultural/economic history, literature, anthropology, political science, sociology, psychology and musicology. I will first reflect the premises that geographers and others have associated with this mushrooming but rarely analytically discussed category, then map the conceptual gaps, and, finally, suggest some possible avenues for further research.

Key Themes:

- The author reviews the historical tendency to construct regional identity as an idealized harmony between a people and a neutrally defined land and the contemporary academic

disciplines which not only critique this interpretation of regional identity, but explore the reasons behind its production.

- Citing McSweeney (1999: 77–78), the author relates that regional identity does not exist as a 'real' concept to be found, but rather regional identity exists as a socially constructed discourse manipulated by individuals of power.
- Citing Della Porta and Diani (1999) and Hall (1993), Paasi elaborates that regional identity is a discourse which 'creates' and legitimizes the notion of a socio-spacial reality (how the individual and social intersect with a region or space). The consequences of this discourse result in the perception of the need for 'governance' and 'control' by higher powers and actualization of 'regional identity' and 'resistance' to control by lower powers.
- Paasi is particularly interested in the interaction between regional identity and politics and how 'political passions' are regionalized such as in the Europe of Regions.
- Paasi explores what regional identity is comprised of (ideas on nature, culture/ethnicity, marginalization) and how it is used in policy and development.
- *Identity of a region* (discourse about a region and resulting practices) is distinguished from *regional identity* (the actual perception of the people). Hogg (2000) is cited as a social psychologist who explores the motives behind identity formation.
- The study of regional identity in a globalizing world offers a unique opportunity to explore the nature of regional identity, who creates and perpetuates the discourse, and why.
- Paasi engages in an interesting discussion of 'borderlands' (such as the US-Mexican border communities) and how their situation challenges the dominant representations of nations.

Partridge, M.D. & Rickman, D.S. 2008. Place-based policy and rural poverty: insights from the urban spatial mismatch literature. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 1, 131–156.

Abstract:

Unless there are spatial barriers that limit adjustment, economists argue that policies to alleviate poverty should focus on poor people, not poor places. Akin to urban spatial mismatch hypotheses, we develop a distance-based friction explanation of higher rural poverty. Empirical examination of US poverty supports these frictions as partly underlying higher rural poverty. This follows from assessing the relationship between poverty and remoteness as well as labor supply responses. Higher rural poverty does not appear to be a simple result of the poor self-selecting to live in remote areas. The results suggest that place-based anti-poverty policies may be beneficial.

Key Themes:

Poor People or Poor Places
Partridge and Rickman identify persistently high poverty rates in rural America as evidence that people-based policy traditionally promoted by economists may be an insufficient framework to assist rural populations and that a place-based approach could prove to be advantageous when used in conjunction with people-based policy. Although the dominant perspective of economists

has been to help "poor people, not poor places," the authors argue that physical location is, in fact, a contributing factor to rural poverty in the US.

<u>Linking Poverty and Distance from Metropolitan Areas</u>
- This article investigates if higher rates of urban poverty are truly correlated with *distance* (i.e. space) from Metropolitan areas rather than other features of the population which could be best addressed by people-based policy. Partridge and Rickman explore a variety of variables to test for *distance-based friction.*
- The authors utilize previous research developed from *urban special mismatch theory* (which investigates higher poverty in inner city neighborhoods as opposed to metropolitan areas) to see if a similar pattern can be found in rural regions. The authors' hypothesis is that "spatial frictions may exist in rural areas…due to remoteness from agglomeration economies" (Partridge & Rickman, 2008, p.132).
- The authors discover that higher rates of rural poverty are correlated with distance from the closest Metropolitan Area, but in some cases only *up to a certain distance*, which the authors attribute to "a distance attenuation of agglomeration benefits which are only provided by the largest MAs" (Partridge & Rickman, 2008, p.132). Consequently, the authors suggest place-based policy should not be applied to the same way to all rural communities but should, perhaps, depend on their distance from MAs.
- The authors argue that place-based policy could be helpful in rural areas to balance the need for labor with the supply.

Partridge, M. D., & Rickman, D. S. (2006). *The geography of American poverty: Is there a need for place-based policies?* W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Book Review (review from: http://www.upjohninstitute.org/publications/titles/gap.html):

Poverty rates remain high in many central cities, inner suburbs, and remote rural areas in the United States despite antipoverty gains made nationally during the 1990s. Furthermore, as revealed in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans, pockets of deep poverty coexist alongside pockets of affluence. Does this disparity unveil some fundamental disconnect between local economic growth and poverty in certain areas across the country? If so, what can be done about it?

Partridge and Rickman explore the wide geographic disparities in poverty across the United States. Their focus on the spatial dimensions of U.S. poverty reveals distinct differences across states, metropolitan areas, and counties and leads them to consider why antipoverty policies have succeeded in some places and failed in others.

In assessing poverty, Partridge and Rickman explore the underlying spatial, demographic, and economic contributors to poverty rates and examine the spatial variation of state and county poverty rates and their trends over time. They find that poverty rates remain remarkably consistent—areas that had high poverty rates in the 1950s tend to have high poverty rates today. Their study includes a statistical assessment of the determinants of state poverty rates, focusing on the roles of economic growth and state public welfare policies. Included are case

studies of four states, which confirm the results of their statistical analysis. Partridge and Rickman also

- Examine 1989 and 1999 poverty rates for more than 3,000 U.S. counties, uncovering how family characteristics such as marital status and education correlate with poverty.
- Consider metropolitan and rural counties and find that the metro counties are not a monolithic block that should be considered in unison.
- Distinguish between the effectiveness of economic development policies for central-city residents and for those in the suburbs and describe job creation strategies for central-city counties.
- Explore the dimensions of metropolitan and rural poverty and find value in funding economic development projects in rural areas, though such policies may be more costly to implement.
- Find that, while labor-market conditions have modest impacts on poverty in general, they can have very important antipoverty impacts in central-city counties and in remote, rural counties.

Place-based policies have been tried but, as the authors admit, they have been generally unsuccessful. In fact, it is not clear whether local job growth helps the poor since many new jobs often go to commuters and new residents already above the poverty threshold. Therefore, economists and policymakers generally prefer people-based policies that augment the skills of disadvantaged individuals. Still, Partridge and Rickman contend that place-based policies are needed to supplement people-based policies primarily because disadvantaged workers are often less likely to move to locations with vibrant economies; jobs need to be created close enough to poor households that residents can take advantage of those jobs, whether they have received training or not. The authors show that the most economically disadvantaged areas experience the greatest reductions in poverty with the creation of new jobs.

Partridge and Rickman conclude that a unique combination of place-based and person-based policies is needed to help defeat poverty in the most distressed American central cities and remote high-poverty rural communities, and they develop a set of policy recommendations to ensure that job creation efforts benefit the poor—the intended beneficiaries. Overall, they call for a more integrated national poverty reduction strategy that recognizes that "one size doesn't fit all."

Key Themes:

- 2, Policies designed to eliminate regional pockets of poverty have been criticized on the grounds that it would be more effective to direct policies at individuals and not at places (Peters and Fisher 2002).
- 12, There is wide debate within the academic and policy communities on whether policies aimed at helping the poor should include place- specific elements to complement person-specific programs (Kraybill and Kilkenny 2003).

Pezzini, M. (2001). Rural policy lessons from OECD countries. *International Regional Science Review, 24*(1), 134-145.

Abstract:

Rural policy has seen significant shifts in the past two decades. Governance efforts have focused on improving central coordination, creating more flexible arrangements for central support, forming new institutional arrangements at local and regional levels, and building local capacity through leadership and community development programs. Policies objectives and instruments have focused on improving the competitiveness of rural areas, investing in human and social capital, diversifying economic activities, enhancing business assistance, commercializing natural and cultural amenities, finding market niches for local products, providing public services, and incorporating program evaluation procedures. Thus, rural policy has now gone beyond agricultural policy in many countries, offering new trajectories of development for rural areas. Yet these refinements and innovations tend to be recent and limited in scope. Additional work will be necessary to ascertain their effectiveness, durability, and transferability.

Key Themes:

Rural is not synonymous with agriculture
136, One is tempted to state that, currently, rural is not synonymous with agriculture, and even that agriculture is no longer the backbone of rural areas. In any case, data collected from member countries make clear how dysfunctional a single sectoral definition of rural areas is.

Case for restructuring process toward multi-sectoral rural development policy
136, Yet, agriculture plays an important role in shaping the rural landscape and remains a wellspring of national support for development. However, this seems to make sense if agriculture is conceived more as a part of a restructuring process toward multi-sectoral approaches (which encompass agriculture as one component of a comprehensive rural development policy) than as a traditional sector producing commodities.

Critique of sectoral policies and case for strategic investments rather than subsidizing sectors
136, A crucial implication is that while for a long period of time agricultural policies have been considered as rural policies, an approach extended far beyond agriculture is today required to cure rural ills. The interests of the majority of rural citizens, and even most farm families, are no longer (if they ever were) best served by sectoral policies, since they increasingly depend on employment and income generated by a complex mix of interacting economic activities. This is why a shift from an approach based on subsidizing sectors to one based on strategic investments to develop new activities is more and more expected.

136, The rationale for a territorial approach to rural policy is the result of the fact that the shift in the economic base of rural areas away from agriculture should be accompanied by policy intervention. Many but not all rural areas still suffer from relatively low incomes, high unemployment and underemployment, poor quality of employment, out-migration of young people, and low-quality services.

137, [place-based policy as a response to globalization]

137, Together with divergent growth patterns and endogenous development, a key change in thinking about rural policy has resulted from the emergence of a more general policy concern with sustainable development.

137 [Rural places as important to improving quality of life – contain public goods (landscapes, cultural heritage etc)]

Definition of rural development policies:
138, Against this background, rural development policies— the approaches and instruments used to promote economic development and employment growth in rural areas—can become entwined with broader issues.

141, The diversity among rural places makes it very difficult to design a national rural development policy that can take into account locally specific needs at the same time as geographically balanced objectives of national economic development.

Variety of institutional arrangements for the delivery of rural policy
141-142, In practice, a wide variety of institutional arrangements for the delivery of rural policy have been noted in OECD countries, but some common features are as follows:
- Decentralization toward regions and localities, sometimes involving efforts at community "empowerment," in order to better meet diverse needs and conditions found in rural areas and tap local knowledge and other resources;
- Support for bottom-up development initiatives, for example, through the Canadian Community Futures Programme and the EU LEADER program;
- Attempts at better coordination of policies affecting rural areas at central levels through interdepartmental and interministerial working groups or committees, some-times paralleled by rural affairs committees in national parliaments, and possibly involving various forms of "policyproofing" to ensure that all policies consider the rural dimension (policy proofing is the process by which a designated body "proofreads" legislation to verify that rural issues have been adequately considered);
- Greater coordination and cooperation at regional and local levels usually through partnerships involving the different public departments and agencies as well as private and voluntary sector interests.

Some relevant questions for policy development
142, Some relevant questions for policy development are as follows:
- How can partnerships be made more open, accountable, and democratic?
- How can the participation of citizens in public decision making be improved, especially in very sparsely populated areas with scattered settlement patterns?
- Should partnerships be reorganized on a territorial basis to serve the needs of planning for integrated rural development at local and regional levels and avoid proliferation of sectoral partnerships?
- Should partnerships be mainly a means of joint strategic planning, monitoring, and assessment, or should they be decision-making or implementing bodies as well?

<u>Conclusion</u>
145, Nevertheless, this brief survey lends support to the argument that rural policy has now gone beyond agricultural policy in many countries, both providing a complement to sectoral policy approaches and offering new trajectories of development for rural areas.

Reddel, T. (2002). Beyond Participation, Hierarchies, Management and Markets: 'New' Governance and Place Policies. *Australian Journal of Public Administration, 61*(1), Sept 20, 2008.

Abstract:

This paper argues that a 'new local governance' discourse offers some promise as a policy framework that can re-conceptualise the state-community (and market) relationship and deliver improved community outcomes, particularly in the context of place based or spatial policies and programs.

Key Themes:

<u>State vs. Community:</u>
Many of these directions, particularly the development of more spatially responsive and participatory policies and programs that can address poverty and social exclusion are supported. However, it will also be argued that much of this debate excludes or at least minimises the fundamental role of an active state by focussing on an uncritical an almost romantic concept of "community". Australian case studies will highlight the limits of previous attempts to foster community or citizen participation and to "coordinate better" based on either hierarchy/control or rational choice. P.50

<u>International Examples:</u>
The recent resurgence of Australian policy interest (albeit unfocussed) in a community, spatial or place perspective on public policy and service delivery is also evident in the international context, particularly in the UK, European Union and to a lesser extent in the USA. Badcock notes that there has been a revival of interest in locational disadvantage in the OECD, as the Europeans in particular strive to combat social exclusion and reintegrate forgotten places into the mainstream social economy (Badcock, 1998; aee also OECD 1996; Social Exclusion Unit 1998.) p.53

<u>Policy Framework and Themes:</u>
The Queensland experience over the last decade, coupled with recent international policy directions, highlights the lack of any real consensus regarding the theoretical foundations and policy methodologies implicit in these various community and place initiatives. A key task, then, should be to begin building a framework that can offer some theoretical and policy guidance regarding state-community relations, particularly in the context of place based or spatial policies and programs.
In addressing these concerns, I propose to firstly an briefly explore two broad policy themes or "traditions": (i) the suite of approached to public administration including the focus on

hierarchies, managerialism, markets and the methodologies of coordination; and (ii) the re-emergence of "community" as a critical location for political and policy making activity. I will then propose that a "new governance" discourse based on the themes of dialogue, deliberation and association, offers some promise as a policy framework that can re-conceptualise the state-community (and market) relationship and deliver improved community outcomes, particularly in the context of place based or spatial policies and programs. P.55

Conclusion:

In conclusion this paper has argued that the recent interest in community and place should be informed by the lessons of previous national and international policy debates. Of particular and more contemporary interest has been the supposed retreat from the state and anti-state crisis. This has been manifested in a number of ways, particularly in the emergence of the community discourse as a possible theoretical and policy response to the failures of both the "big-state" and market or competitive approaches to public policy. The new terrain of debate excludes or at least minimises the fundamental role of the state by focussing on two linked but different positions: an uncritical and almost romantic conception of "community" and an exaggerated view that the state and its institutions have been de-socialised and replaced by some form of community governance. There are also implicit dangers in promoting this new or networked governance as what Lowndes and Skelcher (1998:331) have called the "new Jerusalem" of public administration, pre-supposing an almost benign form of state action. Notwithstanding these concerns, a new approach to understanding the role of the state, particularly in relation [to] the civil society has been discussed. A new form of governance based on an active state and a reconstituted public sphere of dialogue and deliberation and an engagement with a strong civil society is proposed as an indicative framework to progress this idea. P.60

Spencer, J. H. (2004). People, places, and policy: A politically relevant framework for efforts to reduce concentrated poverty. *Policy Studies Journal, 32*(4), 545.

Abstract:

This article identifies the persistence of spatially concentrated poverty, reviews the literature on an implicit people-place binary theory of antipoverty policy, proposes a more integrated heuristic for understanding policy, and discusses how the classification can be the basis for a more refined understanding of the evolution of antipoverty policy, how and when politics drive the antipoverty agenda and uses the heuristic to encourage evaluators to refocus research on the multiple aspects of poor peoples' lives. In general, proponents of either people-based or place-based policies have dominated the urban poverty debate. This tension has led to a fragmented and piecemeal approach to spatially concentrated poverty that focuses on either people or places and does not best serve the poor. The new heuristic specifies both the policy targets and the policy mechanisms for major programs, examining the degree to which each focuses on people or places, and the degree to which each relies on supply and demand side assumptions. This reclassification suggests that the assumptions inherent in public policy can provide insight into how antipoverty policy makers and advocates might respond to political cycles and major sociopolitical events, as well as how they might more critically evaluate their efforts.

Key Themes:

<u>Case for a holistic approach rather than a silo/reductionist response</u>
546, This summary and categorization of the major U.S. antipoverty programs shows how a scholarly dichotomy of people versus places has become cemented in the policy imagination. The dichotomy, I suggest, has enabled visions of antipoverty policy that encourage partisan paralysis and guides politicians and policy makers to treat the poor living in large urban ghettoes as a set of antipoverty program recipients rather than as a fundamental social dilemma requiring multiple and widespread institutional responses.

<u>Definition of people vs. place-based programs:</u>
People-based programs target individuals or households, whereas place-based ones target particular poor areas and neighborhoods. Thus, for example, wage subsidies, housing vouchers, transportation vouchers, and other sorts of direct transfers of valued assets to individuals are people-based strategies, whereas business tax credits for specific areas, investments in improved fixed-place public transportation, and improved infrastructure are examples of place-based strategies.

Stauber, K. N. (2001). Why invest in rural America-and how? A critical public policy question for the 21st century. *Economic Review, 86*(2), 57.

Abstract:

Discusses rural policy in the United States. Benefits of rural public policy; Views on rural investment; Basis for rural development.

Key Themes:

<u>Critiques of current rural public policy</u>
58, Let's face facts--rural policy in America is unfocused, outdated, and ineffective:
- Today's rural public policy is not the product of contemporary, thoughtful, and informed public debate.
- Today's rural public policy is not based on carefully crafted, desired, public policy goals.
- Today's rural public policy is largely a "one size fits all" approach to the significant diversity that is rural America.
- Today's rural public policy consists of isolated elements of sectoral policy created without regard to extrasectoral effects.
- Today's rural public policy is often urban policy that is poorly modified to fit nonurban settings.
- Today's rural public policy is often national policy that has been created with little or no thought for its implications for rural communities.
- Today's rural public policy is based on the erroneous assumption that there are public institutions that serve the unique needs of rural areas.

Rural policy is focused primarily on agriculture and manufacturing
58, In terms of public dollars committed, rural policy now focuses primarily on two areas--agriculture and manufacturing. Neither focus is currently effective.

66, for/against place-based policies (response to economists' critique)

Definition of rural
72, The reality, of course, is that there is no one rural America; there are several. Focusing on the types of areas that represent the complexity of rural America allows policymakers to target desired outcomes and strategies, rather than creating national or state development policy based on inappropriate large-scale norms. Because no standard typology exists, this paper will use the following four rural types:(n6)

- Urban periphery--rural areas within a 90-minute commute of urban employment, services, and social opportunities
- Sparsely populated--areas where the population density is low and often declining and therefore the demand for traditional services, employment, and social opportunities are limited by isolation
- High amenity--rural areas of significant scenic beauty, cultural opportunities, and attraction to wealthy and retired people (Figure 1)
- High poverty--rural areas characterized by persistent poverty (Figure 2) or rapid declines in income

Societal benefits of successful rural public policy
72, But rural types alone are not enough. A set of agreed-upon outcomes is needed. As discussed above, the societal benefits of successful rural public policy include:
- Survival of the rural middle class
- Reducing concentrated rural poverty
- Sustaining and improving the quality of the natural environment

Public outcomes of implementing successful rural public policy
73, But what are the public outcomes that should be pursued to achieve these benefits? For this paper, the following outcomes will be explored briefly:
A. Increased human capital
B. Conservation of the natural environment and culture
C. Increased regional competitive investments
D. Investments in infrastructure that support the expansion of newer competitive advantage, not the protection of older competitive advantage

73, All four proposed outcomes have some basis in current practices but represent significant shifts from established directions. Local, state, tribal, and federal efforts already invest sizable amounts in human capital (A) and in conserving the natural environment and culture (B). But virtually all levels of government have been less involved in increasing; regional competitive investments (C) and investing in infrastructure that supports expansion of competitive advantage, not the protection of competitive advantage (D).

Case for implementing a regional approach due to spread out reality of rural

76, Because of their sparse and spread out populations, rural areas have trouble supporting the economic and social capacities that sustain community. While we typically think rural means small places, the opposite is true. Rural residents have to travel long distances to meet their needs. Rural actually means large, but many public investments continue to focus on small, isolated areas (Wilkinson, p. 8). In the 1930s, the Rural Electrification Administration realized that service could not be effectively provided individual by individual, or even small town by small town. A regional approach was required to insure economic viability. A similar approach is needed to increase regional, not single-firm, competitiveness.

76, If rural communities are to survive, they must figure out ways to connect to each other and to robust urban areas.

76, Public investments must shift from individual enterprises and communities to regions. This does not mean that state or national governments should mandate whether consolidated rural high schools are better than small ones. The desired "end" is that rural communities have the competitive capacities they need by joining together. The means should be left to the local communities.

A New Strategy Framework:
- 78, Redefine and restructure the rural-serving college and university so as to increase human capital in sparsely populated and high-poverty rural areas--Intersections A2 and A4
- 79, Create new market demands and linkages so as to increase regional competitive investments in urban periphery and sparsely populated areas-Intersections C1 and C2
- 81, Develop and use new technology to overcome remoteness to create infrastructure that expands competitive advantage in sparsely populated and high-poverty areas--Intersections D2 and D4
- 82, Encourage immigration to rural communities to increase human capital in sparsely populated and high-poverty areas--Intersections A2 and A4

83, While Americans are generally more likely to prefer market solutions to government interventions, without public action private decline will continue, often leading to the relocation of those with the most intellectual, financial, and social assets. Therefore, we must change both why and how we invest in rural America. Government support of development based on cheap commodities and labor is shortsighted anti unlikely to produce broad-based public benefits. But changing from the current distribution of benefits will be extremely hard. Rural people must play the critical role in deciding future priorities and strategies. But it must be all rural people, not just those with the most economic and political influence.

While we want a single, compelling answer to this difficult question, I don't believe that it is possible at this time. Instead, I suggest five possible answers, not in order of importance. Here are five reasons to invest in rural America:

84, *1. We invest in rural America to protect and restore the environment.* Rural people and communities are subsidized to increase environmental quality. The challenges with such an

approach include, first, whether it can provide adequate income to sustain rural communities, and second, our lack of experience incentivizing environmental restoration.

2. We invest in rural America to produce high-quality, de-commodified food and fiber. There is growing evidence that a portion of Americans are willing to pay more for food and fiber that they see as safer and better for the environment. Instead of subsidizing farmers and loggers to produce cheap, average-quality commodities, provide incentives to produce specialty, branded products. The challenges with this approach include that it is anti-mass culture, works best for communities in the urban periphery, and requires new distribution and marketing systems.

3. We invest in rural America as a laboratory of social innovation. America faces many social problems that are awaiting new, innovative solutions. Given the small size and strong social bonds, rural areas should have advantages in creating possible approaches. Challenges to this answer include rural resistance to change, lack of financial resources focused on social and economic innovation, and class and race divisions.

4. We invest in rural America to produce healthy, well-educated future citizens. This is a continuation of part of the Storehouse social contract. But if significant numbers of rural people are to continue to move to urban areas, they should move as assets, not liabilities. Challenges of this approach are that it assumes child development is an export industry and that it builds rural people, not rural places.

5. We invest in rural America to maintain population distribution and prevent urban overcrowding. Many urban areas are struggling with gridlock and sprawl. If another 15 to 20 million people move to major metropolitan areas, congestion will be out of control. This possible contract is challenged by the fact that many Americans benefit from increased growth and that this is a locational strategy, not a development one.

None of these potential answers is adequate. But they illustrate the approach we must take.

Without new approaches, rural America will continue to exist and it will become increasingly diverse. Poverty and wealth will continue to grow. Agriculture will continue to decline and become more concentrated. But with a new social contract and appropriate public policy, what could rural America become?

Swanson, Louis E. (2001). Rural Opportunities: Minimalist Policy and Community-Based Experimentation. *Policy Studies Journal, 29*(1), 96-107.

Abstract:

Rural America's experiences with federal policies provide lessons on both the benefits and liabilities of minimalist policy attention and community-based policy experimentation. Prior to the New Deal federal rural policies promoted incentives to settle vast territories, subsidize private development of internal market structures, and invest in the benefits of higher education. The New Deal redirected rural policies to more narrow foci on the farm economic and environmental crises. These new, more centralized policies were built upon the rapid

expansion of the Department of Agriculture into the first modern federal bureaucracy, politically legitimized on the basis of community-based policy experimentation. The seemingly unintended consequence of these emergency efforts to rescue farming was the marginalization of most non-farm policy concerns. The resulting minimalist federal approach to rural America was due to the absence of a unified national constituency for rural concerns. Understanding rural America's inadvertent experimentation in minimalist policy attention and in community-based policy structures can inform current policy initiatives to decentralize federal authority.

Key Themes:

But the minimalist federal policy toward nonfarm rural America and farm policies that utilize county boards as programmatic partners have forced rural people to accommodate "community-based" programs. The past and future importance of rural America for national policies, in part, rests on the central importance of "community" to rural public life. What happens in these seemingly backwater policy arenas has and will continue to exert a disproportionate influence on national policy options. P.96

For the past half-century and more, most efforts to develop rural nonfarm policies have been opportunistic and minimalist. Rural policies most often have been de facto extensions of urban policies, the same programmatic assumptions but on a smaller scale. Consequently, programs that impact rural people often have not fit the conditions of rural people and therefore have been seen as ineffective and even misguided. This de facto approach has forced rural officials to incorporate community-based orientations in order to bring greater relevancy of federal programs to their local conditions. P.97

Rural as synonymous with agriculture:
Commercial agricultural groups, whose rhetoric embraces concerns for nonfarm issues, tend to place little or no priority on nonfarm rural concerns. They often provide an agricultural determinism message that simplifies the characteristics and therefore the needs of rural America as being one and the same as those of commercial agriculture. P.97

Challenges of Rural:
Rural interest groups at the national level tend to be organizationally weak and fragmented. Their efforts are unsustainable since the interest groups upon whom rural stakeholders have attached themselves do not have continuing stakes in rural policy (Browne, 2001). Unsurprisingly, efforts to establish even a loose set of policy goals for rural people have been minimalist and short-lived. Hence, the propensity for rural people to focus on local policy solutions. But turning to local solutions has not always offered effective delivery of federal policy. Given their small economic bases for taxation, most rural communities do not have the fiscal capacity to effectively convert federal policy into local outcomes. This resource constraint has been a serious barrier to creating effective community-based policies (Rural Policy Research Institute, 1997). P.97

Switch to rural = farm
However, the economic and social crises associated with the Great Depression triggered both an expansion of federal authority and a narrowing of rural policy to farm policy. Nowhere was this more evident than in the transformation of the USDA. P.97

Switch to community:
Given the historic American popular distrust of centralized authority, this shift created a concern for and a suspicion of federal authority. This suspicion posed a serious political barrier to expanding federal authority to address the economic crises of rural America. The political solution was to gain legitimacy by instituting community-based programs. By sharing in program administration, local and state authorities accepted the rapid expansion of the USDA's presence in markets and social life. P.98

Community-Based Programs Supporting Elite:
The New Deal political solution for maintaining the political power of rural elites while quelling rebellion in rural America was for mandatory farm programs to be jointly administered with local stakeholders. This was accomplished through funneling federal relief funds to farmland owners (not to farmers without land) through locally elected and sometimes appointed Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA) boards… Southern Democrats interested in preserving segregation and social class divisions accepted what might appear as federal intervention into state and local political affairs by making sure their local elites controlled the AAA boards. This political deal was not intended to be a political vehicle for social reform but for economic recovery that maintained existing power structures… Once established during the New Deal, the new agricultural-centered--rather than rural-centered--programs transferred income from the federal government to local elites. This transfer, in turn, created a political opportunity for the further enhancement of the powerful but informal bipartisan farm bloc in order to continue this transfer.P.99

Potential of Community-Based Programs:
These programs are examples of community-based policy. And as such, they clearly demonstrate the capacity for such programs to either reproduce existing power disparities or empower disenfranchised segments of local societies. P.99

Local Policy:
This conflict is often simplified as between the public interest and private property. But it is far more complex than this. What is important here is that this arena of rural policy is highly contested and is seldom community based. The rural community fields of interaction within which these contests occur tend to lend little autonomy to locally originated solutions. P.101

Community Block Grants:
The latter part of the 20th century witnessed the emergence of federal community block grants. These grants can be simplified into two types: general block grants and competitive block grants. General block grants as a policy strategy tend to be "community based," but they are more a form of political pork with the pretense of reducing federal expenditures while funneling general funds to local political elites than goal-directed public policy. Block grants do not represent strong evidence that community-based policy works. Rather, they may be more an indication of a politically pragmatic emphasis on addressing federal fiscal and political legitimacy concerns. P.101

De-legitimacy of Community-Based Policies:
The legacy of racial segregation at all levels of social organization, but especially at the regional

and neighborhood levels, delegitimized local program solutions at the site of discrimination during the second half of the 20th century. The inability of states and counties to address environmental degradation further displaced public policy from community fields that might otherwise have addressed resource degradation. P.103

Shift towards local autonomy:
Certainly local activism continued during the second half of the 20th century with varying degrees of success (e.g., Lappe & Du Bois, 1994). And the bipartisan efforts in the 1990s to establish enterprise and empowerment zones suggest a willingness for modest experiments in community-based policies. It is this emerging willingness for policy risk taking at the local level, especially among the rural policy arenas, that may prove to be a harbinger of more qualitative policy shifts toward greater local program autonomy. P.103-104

Place-Based Policy:
The late 20th century search for community-based policies is more positively and securely rooted in the belief that less federal control and greater flexibility among local societies provide a more effective and efficient platform for achieving public policy goals in an extraordinarily economically, socially, and geographically diverse nation. This search is not a wholesale rejection of a federal role in policy, but one of testing for relative levels of programmatic autonomy between the primary government and private sector stakeholders. Among many of the rural policy arenas, it is a search for a more minimalist role for the federal government (Browne & Swanson, 1995). P.104

Challenges for Place-Based Policies:
But, as noted earlier, community-based policy is not a panacea for reforming federal program ineffectiveness. The challenges confronting effectively utilizing community-based programs for rural programs are impressive. But the benefits may eventually include creating a national rural constituency that could be strong enough to even support flagging agricultural-centrist federal programs. Four general challenges exist for developing locally relevant community-based programs. First, the 50 states may not be any more responsive to rural needs than the federal government. Second, there is little evidence that strong interest groups representing rural people will emerge at either the federal or state levels. Third, rural communities may not have the social infrastructure or social capital to manage the demands community-based policy will make upon their scarce resources. The fourth challenge is to tap citizen participation in local programs and policy creation. P.104

Social Capital:
Community-based policy is effectively tied to the social capital capacity of a community. Communities with high levels of social capital are more likely to make community-based policy succeed. The social capital capacity of rural communities varies greatly across the nation. It may be that a dimension of an effective federal policy that rests on community-based policy is the simultaneous development of social capital in rural communities. P.104

Conclusion:
Federal policy appears to be becoming more decentralized. This decentralization of federal policy to the local level requires a rethinking of community-based policies. The general neglect of policies designed for rural people (agribusiness and large farm policies excepted) has

necessitated they adopt community-based programs and the accompanying myriad local policies. But just because rural communities have been forced to adapt to universal one-size-fits-all federal programs, it does not follow that what they have done collectively or individually provides proven templates upon which to now adapt federal policies. But their struggles do provide evidence of the liabilities and opportunities for federal policymakers' experimentation with community-based federal programs. Perhaps the most significant lesson to be divined from the experiences of rural communities is that broad-based and democratic involvement of a community's citizens provides a basis for innovative experimentation and adaptation to undesirable outcomes.

Rural policies are likely to continue to be appendages to urban policies and programs. For this to change, powerful rural-centered interest groups must emerge. But for this to occur, a diverse bipartisan coalition similar to the farm bloc needs to form. Community-based policy that includes both a partnership with federal and state bureaucracies and the fiscal and institutional resources necessary to accomplish programmatic goals can provide the basis for such a coalition. However, in the absence of an economic crisis such as the Great Depression that will push the search for political legitimacy to the local level, it is unlikely these necessary conditions will occur. P.106

Swanson, L. (2001). Rural policy and direct local participation: Democracy, inclusiveness, collective agency, and locality-based policy. *Rural Sociology, 66*(1), 1-21.

Abstract:

During the closing decades of the twentieth century, the federal government has experienced a period of delegitimation and fiscal crisis that has led to decentralization of some federal programs and a fledgling revival of community- and place-based policies. These and other locality-based policies are not new tools. The renewed interest in this type of policy raises questions about their effectiveness. Historic and recent records of locality-based policies suggest that they are not panaceas for achieving programmatic goals. Three cases provide an empirical, comparative basis for assessing the liabilities of locality-based policies: the Third New Deal efforts to institute county land-use planning; Mexico's experiences with community forestry; and emerging grassroots ecosystem management movements in the western United States. Among other factors, the degree of local democracy and inclusiveness and the quality of local social, economic, and physical infrastructures are identified as important in mediating effective policy implementation.

Key Themes:

4 "The reemergence of locality-based policy is not due to any single factor or macro-political economy trend. Several trends may be identified, however. I propose the following, which are not meant to be a complete list: the partial delegitimation of the federal government; local resistance to globalization; and improvement of structural and cultural frameworks for viable local action, including renewed interest in civility and civil society. "

Untaru, S. 2002. Regulatory frameworks for place-based planning. *Urban Policy and Research.*
20, 2, 169–186.

Abstract:

This paper examines the application of concepts of place, locality and constructions of place
identities as frameworks for place-based regulatory planning instruments to control
development across whole local government areas. New approaches to achieving single-level,
place-integrated planning documents in NSW are summarized that move away from the
traditional format of land use zones. This will require a more place-focused governance to act as
a strategic relational arena in existing localities.

Key Themes:

Motivations for Place-Based Policy
- Australia has implemented federally funded place-based policies. Gibson and Cameron
  (2001, p.7) describe an "underclass" in Australian society as a motivating factor/concern.

Framework for Place-Based Policy
- Create under a single coordinated structure to address goals, policies and activities in
  localized areas (locality planning approach).Untaru describes the place-based approach
  developed in NSW for the Local Environmental Plan (WLEP 2000).

Meaning of Place
- Untaru proceeds to explore the literature on the meaning of place, how places are given
  meaning and how regional identities are formed. Place assumes, for Untaru, both a physical
  and a symbolic reality.
- Citing Sack, (1997, p. 84) Untaru relates that "nature, social relations and meaning form the
  structure of place" (Sack, 1997, p. 84) in Untaru (2002, p.173). Places are social constructs.
  Consequently, policy must take into consideration all the various factors which comprise
  social construction as well as land use/control.
- Social, cultural and economic interactions are identified as the primary relations which
  constitute a place. Untaru explores the literature on locality research (in the UK and
  Australia specifically). The UK identifies 'social capital' as a primary concern in place-based
  planning and the necessity of translating social capital into economic.

Public Space
- The public realm (streets, community centers etc) are largely symbolic. They have become
  more privatized and of lower quality (parks etc). This must be modified to promote social
  relations within a place/region/community

Zoning and Globalization
- Untaru discusses the advantages and disadvantages of applying a 'universalistic' zoning
  system to place-based planning in NSW.

- Untaru describes the ideological and discourse transformations which need to take place in order for place-based policy to adapt to globalization. Place-conscious governance and governance policies which recognize the heterogeneous nature of contemporary place identity is identified as a particular concern.

Walsh, P. (2001). Improving Governments' Response to Local Communities - is Place Management an Answer? *Australian Journal of Public Administration; Jun2001, Vol. 60 Issue 2, p3, 10p, 60*(2), Sept 20, 2008.

Abstract:

The notion of place management is emerging in public sector discourse as a potential solution to improve governments' responses to issues confronting local communities, particularly those experiencing high levels of economic and social disadvantage. Despite the increased currency of the term, there is a degree of confusion surrounding what it actually means. And it is not always clear what is meant by the notion of 'place'. This article attempts to clarify a working definition of 'place management' and to explore the policy and administrative implications for governments in adopting a place management approach.

Key Themes:

case (for):
As a result of these factors, it has been argued that government intervention is required in local areas of disadvantage and can be justified on the following grounds (Smith 1999):
- There are identifiable geographical areas that suffer disproportionately from problems. This places mainstream programs under pressure so that they operate less effectively than in other areas --something `extra' is needed.
- Problems are compounded in some areas because they all co-exist together -- the inter-connectedness and complexity of these problems requires extra action.
- An increased polarisation between disadvantaged and more affluent areas requires intervention to prevent further entrenching disadvantage in those areas.
- Focusing activity on small areas of disadvantage can, potentially, make more of an impact than if resources are dissipated.
- Successful area-based programs may act as pilots and ultimately lead to changes in the delivery of mainstream policies. P.4

Case (for):
According to Latham (1998), the benefits of place management come from restructuring the public sector around our most serious social problems through abolishing professional `guilds' and departmental silos and relying on multi-disciplinary management teams. The approach emphasises outcomes and achieves equity from targeting and redistributing resources on the basis of locational need. It facilitates the customisation of services for disadvantaged people and places and consolidates the notion of positive responsibilities within a single administrative system.

Although sketchy on detail, Latham's (1998) approach is based on a largely top-down and

centralist view of accountability. Even though he supports an active role for `civil society', there seems little room for community engagement in developing solutions. This approach has also been criticised as having an inherently `welfare service' focus that primarily deals with existing, largely welfare related services, and does not address the interconnections between economic and social development policies (Reddel 1999). P.5

In a similar vein, Mant (1998) emphasises an overall restructuring from input to outcome responsibilities in order to deal efffectively with the problem of places. Where there are traditional input based organisational structures, place management can be a useful strategy to manage high priority places:

Place management permits the allocation of clear responsibility and authority for the achievement of complex outcomes for individual places. It facilitates the achievement of urban design objectives, restoration or re-development of a place, improvements in safety and the better integration of place and system objectives (1998:30). Being responsible for a complex outcome rather than the provision of a particular input, place managers are able to use a wide range of techniques to achieve objectives. For Mant (1998), effectiveness does not depend on the allocation of resources and power (although this will obviously assist). The use of facilitation, persuasion and other strategies are also needed. P.5

Institutional Challenge:

Several reviews of the history of area based initiatives indicate that there are a number of reasons why past attempts have not translated into significant improvements (National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal 2000; Hall and Mawson 1999). For example, small area initiatives do not have the capacity or scope to address the type of economic decline associated with industrial restructuring. In addition, mainstream services have failed to adequately respond to problems in deprived areas. As a result, area-based initiatives have often simply plugged the gaps in these services. There are also significant cultural and institutional barriers that limit the capacity of public services to be integrated or even coordinated. Finally, there are inherent power imbalances between the capacity of different communities, different sectors and different groups to influence resource allocation. P.5-6

Best practice:

From a survey of ten industrialised countries, the OECD has identified some key elements in the development and maintenance of effective area based strategies (OECD 1998). First, more flexible, coordinated use of mainstream policies is required. In most cases, specific area-based initiatives are only providing modest resources. Sustainable change in these areas will come from achieving greater impact from existing investments through mainstream programs. Second, targeting initiatives to address problems at the local level is needed, while also appreciating the need to consider broader regional and central government policies. Neighbourhoods do not exist in isolation from their wider areas and, hence, need to be linked into the markets and service systems of their surrounding areas. Third, policy formulation and implementation needs to proceed through institutions based on a partnership approach involving formalised agreements between stakeholders. In particular, involving the private sector is a key challenge. On the whole, governments have been consumed with the challenge of achieving cooperation within itself rather than creating partnerships with the private and non-government sectors. P.6

<u>Indicators of Place-Based Development:</u>

"Rule of thumb' indicators for when place management is an appropriate response include:

- an identifiable and discrete `place' which provides a manageable scale and which can readily involve community partners and stakeholders;
- a sense of `crisis' associated with chronic social, economic and environmental problems in the area (at times, heightened by public/media attention);
- problems being largely unresponsive to intervention by an individual government agency (local or state);
- an associated need to achieve rapid and visible action and outcomes within a defined timeframe. P.7

<u>Definition:</u>
There is no single, concise or neat definition of `place management'. Rather, the term has often been used as a shorthand expression to indicate attempts to reform the delivery of government services to disadvantaged communities (Stewart-Weeks 1998). From the preceding discussion it is possible to identify a number of defining characteristics of place management:

- Equity and Targeting. Place management bas a fundamental equity objective. It is about redressing significant social and economic disadvantage experienced by particular groups of people in particular neighbourhoods or localities. It is recognition that not all people and places are equal in terms of opportunities and outcomes.
- Outcomes and Accountability. One of the key aspects of place management is the allocation of responsibility and accountability to a designated institutional point (usually a `place manager') for overcoming key problems and achieving defined outcomes within an area. Place management aims to achieve tangible improvements across a number of indicators of community well-being.
- Coordination and Integration in Service Delivery. In order to achieve improved outcomes and address complex and interdependent problems, improved delivery of coordinated and integrated policy and service responses to the community is required.
- Flexible Governance. To effectively achieve integrated service delivery arrangements, place management requires an institutional reorientation of the basic processes of governance and public administration. Approaches to funding, decision-making and accountability need to be flexibly applied and enable an appropriate role for the community.

In summary, the fundamental purpose and outcome of place management is to overcome complex, multiple and interdependent problems afflicting specific areas and communities, the causes of which often reside outside those areas, in order to achieve measurable benefits and improved outcomes for people living there. P.8-9

<u>Case (against):</u>
However, there is still considerable debate about the effectiveness of area-base approaches as a means of addressing disadvantage. A number of basic objections are raised in relation to the principles of area-based approaches (Parkinson 1998; Barker and Chalmers 2000):

- Displacement. Area based approaches simply displace problems between different neighbourhoods and do not add to the overall economic and social well being of cities and regions -- they are the equivalent of rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic.

- Scale. Trying to solve complex problems affecting neighbourhoods and local areas is bound to fail since the causes of the problems, and the potential solutions to them, lie outside those areas.
- Dependency. Providing particular communities with increased resources and attention creates a long-term culture of dependency that prevents residents from finding mutes out of poverty.
- Equity. Not all excluded individuals live in excluded areas and area-based approaches do not address their needs. Concentrating resources on one area deprives other areas, with possibly equally important problems, of similar support.

These objections highlight the importance of being clear about the role and purpose of place management as well as the limitations of this approach. They also raise questions about the scale of activity and at what level should intervention occur. P.9

Case (against):
A key understanding from overseas and interstate experience is that place management or area-based initiatives are targeted at particularly disadvantaged areas at a very local, often neighbourhood, level. The approach involves an intensive intervention through coordinated effort across a range of agencies to address a series of complex and interrelated problems. A distinguishing feature of place management is the use of a `place manager' to coordinate activity and to act as a point of responsibility and accountability for outcomes. Because of the intensity of intervention both in terms of resources and attention, there are limitations on place management.

First, there are limitations on the number of areas that can be targeted for intensive intervention. This is partly a function of the availability of resources to mount an intensive intervention across a large number of areas. However, it is also important to ensure that attention is not spread too thinly across too many areas and that there is an opportunity to build evidence and policy learning about the effectiveness of different models of intervention.

Second, there are limitations on the period of time that selected areas are the subjects of intervention. Place management as a time-limited intervention within a particular local area provides a `magnifying glass' effect to achieve visible outcomes. The evaluation of the NSW pilot place management projects suggested that there is a risk of intervention losing its potency should place management become a permanent feature of an area. There are also important equity considerations. A time-limited intervention in one area affords an opportunity to move on to other areas that also warrant an intensive focus. P.9-10