

Urban Governance Regimes and their Correlation with Environmental Sustainability

An American Studies Honors Thesis by Zachary Cuttler

April 25, 2007

Thesis Committee:

Kent Portney, Political Science

Jeffrey Berry, Political Science

Frances Chew, Biology and American Studies

Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank all of the people who took the time to fill out my survey. Without their input, this study would not have been possible. I would also like to thank Peter Steinbrueck, Richard Conlin, Diane Sugimura, Steve Nicholas, Chantal Stevens, Beth Conover, and Cecelia Ortiz for speaking with me and welcoming me into their beautiful cities. Their input and enthusiasm helped me to put friendly faces on the laws, policies, programs, and initiatives that help to guide their cities toward becoming truly sustainable.

I would also like to thank my thesis committee for helping me work through all the information and ideas I encountered during this study. I would particularly like to thank Professor Portney for providing me with his time, friendship, and tutelage over the last three years. I have sincerely enjoyed our time together and would also like to thank his wife and children for welcoming me into their home. Professor Portney's guidance and companionship are undoubtedly some of the most memorable experiences I will take away from my Tufts experience.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Case Example of Traditional (Unsustainable) Economic Development

Page... 1

Chapter 1: The Relationship between Governance and Sustainability

Page... 5

Chapter 2: Sustainability

Page... 10

Chapter 3: Urban Governance in American Cities

Page... 20

Chapter 4: Methodology

Page... 37

Chapter 5: Business, Governance Regimes, and Sustainable Cities: Are there Discernible Patterns?

Page... 48

Chapter 6: Theory in Practice: Examples of Economic Development and Negotiation with Local Business in Progressive Regimes

Page... 78

Chapter 7: Shortcomings, Concerns, and Areas for Improvement

Page... 89

Chapter 8: Conclusions

Page... 95

Works Cited:

Page... 98

Appendix A:

Page... 101

Appendix B:

Page... 108

Appendix C:

Page... 109

Appendix D:

Page... 111

When the Holy One created the first man, He took him and led him around all the trees of the Garden of Eden and said to him: “Behold my works, how beautiful, how splendid they are. All that I have created, I created for you. Take care, therefore, that you do not destroy my world, for if you do there will be no one left to repair what you have destroyed.”

–Midrash Kohelet Rabbah, 1 on Ecclesiastes 7:13

“I have drunk from wells I did not dig, I have been warmed by fires I did not build.”

-American Indian Aphorism

Introduction

Case Example of Traditional (Unsustainable) Economic Development

Singrauli, the “energy capital” of India, stinks. It stinks of human degradation and it stinks of the negligence of the Indian Government and the World Bank which have together created an environment described here as the lower circle of Dante’s Inferno. (Aiyar 1987)

-Shahnaz Anklesaria Aiyar, Indian journalist

By now, it has become almost axiomatic to accept the idea that economic development demands a certain level of natural resource and environmental degradation, and perhaps even accepted that the quality of life for some people may need to be undermined so that other people might thrive. As an archetype of the failures of traditional economic development when environmental and other local factors are not taken into account, I will briefly detail the events occurring in Singrauli, India that resulted from World Bank loans and investment.

In the early 1970s, large coal deposits were developed in the Singrauli region of India. Beginning in 1977 and ending in the 1990s, the World Bank committed four loans totaling \$850 million for the construction of the Singrauli Super Thermal Power Plant. (Rich 1994: 39) This project called for the development of a huge open-pit coal mine called Dudhichua that would help to create an intensive industrial region and become, as Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru envisioned, “a Switzerland” and one of “the temples of modern India.” (D’Monte 1985) With the World Bank as a lead investor, the project attracted billions of dollars in loans and grants from Western developed nations, Japan, and even a parallel investment by Russia. Developing the coal to fuel the economic growth engine of India seemed like an investment that could not fail.

However, the planners and financiers of the Singrauli project did not factor into their calculations the effect of the project on the local inhabitants or the natural environment. Madhu

Kohli, a local activist, describes Singrauli in her appeal to the World Bank Inspection Panel as a region of sustainable traditional agriculture before World Bank involvement. “These groups [the predominantly tribal, ethnic groups living in the region before displacement] primarily lived a sustainable agricultural existence, cattle raising being an integral part of the local economy. People depended for a host of their daily needs like fuel, fodder, medicinal herbs, [and] timber on the surrounding forests. They lived a near self sufficient life with very little dependence on the market economy.” (Kohli 1997) Yet, despite billions of dollars of investment aid, the situation and quality of life for hundreds of thousands of Singrauli inhabitants decreased precipitously. In the words of author Bruce Rich, the lives of Singrauli residents, “denigrated from traditional poverty in what was a society based on subsistence agriculture thirty years ago to absolute destitution.” (Rich 1994: 40) Neither Kohli nor Rich decry the decision to invest in Singrauli, but rather the manner in which the interested parties pursued development. The region once known for its natural ecological wealth, home to the famous white tiger, and known for its rich biodiversity, can no longer boast any of these qualities.

As of 1997, the Singrauli region housed six thermal power stations, nine open cast coal mines, an aluminum extraction project, a pesticide manufacturing industry, several explosives factories, three cement manufacturing units, and thousands of stone crushing units. The coal plants emit enormous quantities of sulfur dioxide into the air because none are equipped with scrubbers, in addition to over 1,650 pounds [1994 figures] of mercury each year. Vast amounts of coal dust and ash pollute the air and cement plants and thousands of stone crushers release over a thousand tons of cement and rock dust daily into the atmosphere [1994 figures]. (Rich 1994: 40) The local Rihand reservoir, originally constructed to provide hydroelectric power and irrigation water, is now used as a source of cooling water for the coal plants and as a toxic sink

for the mercury, fluorine, chromium and other hazardous and toxic wastes released during the energy production process. As a result of the above pollution, the productivity of the agricultural land has been destroyed.

In 1997, Madhu Kohli, a social activist working in the region filed a claim on her own behalf and on behalf of numerous families to the World Bank Inspection Panel requesting an investigation into the Bank's role in the power generation project. According to the claimants, the World Bank failed to adhere to its policies regarding involuntary resettlement, indigenous peoples, environmental assessment, participation, supervision and monitoring, and consideration of economic alternatives. The claim declares that the cost of the economic development is "being disproportionately borne by the local people whose lives have been disrupted and destroyed. The legacy of the World Bank's involvement in Singrauli includes greater impoverishment, the whole sale disruption of communities, abuse of basic human rights and an increasingly bleak future for the local people." (Kohli 1997) The Human Rights Watch conducted its own investigation and determined that the World Bank needed increased diligence and supervision in order to adhere to its own policies and standards, and that there were widespread accounts of human rights abuse in Singrauli. (Jones 1998) Peter Bosshard of the Swiss NGO Berne Declaration, a research and public advocacy group working towards equitable North-South relations, visited the region several times and agreed with Ms. Kohli in his detailed report that the development undertaken has had an adverse and negative impact on the local population. "These projects have caused public controversies for more than a decade, and have triggered widespread suffering and environmental degradation." (Villagers 1997)

The shortsightedness of large economic models at the time is evidenced by the exclusion of the costs of negative consequences to the environment and local inhabitants from the project's

plans. The banks, countries, and other financial donors involved never had to live in or even see the place in which they were investing. In the investors' minds, Singrauli was not a home, community, or ecosystem, but rather nothing more than an economic opportunity. Investors viewed Singrauli as, "an empty, fungible space, distinguished only by conveniently located supplies of coal and water." (Rich 1994: 40) As Rich explains, "To see Singrauli today is to witness a nihilistic negation of nature and humankind." (Rich 1994: 40) In her claim, Ms. Kohli declared, "The influx of multilateral and bilateral capital which brought with it high technology has destroyed the landscape, economy nay, the very identity and peace of this region." (Kohli 1997)

Unfortunately, cases like Singrauli are not uncommon. There are numerous examples of negligence on the parts of multilateral financial organizations and national governments. Cases like Singrauli helped to spur international deploration of the traditional economic development model and prompted desires that future development follow a different path. The problems underlying the Singrauli story are similar to not only other large-scale development projects, but also smaller, city-level developments. When economic development is pursued on any scale, a comprehensive and holistic analysis must be considered in order to fully comprehend the immediate and future implications of development.

The Singrauli case raises several important and timely issues regarding economic development and its relationship to the environment and to the quality of life of people most directly affected by development. As evidenced here, there is dire need for discussion on the models of traditional economic development, sustainable development, environmental justice, social equity, and environmental degradation. In this paper, I will explore these concepts and others in relation to development at the city level – specifically in the context of the United States.

Chapter 1

The Relationship between Governance and Sustainability

Why is it that some cities take the ever-growing concept of sustainability seriously, and others do not? What is it about the character of cities that pushes them to take action or remain inactive? Some cities in the United States have begun an extensive campaign to put their municipality on the track of smart growth and conservation. Others, the vast majority of cities in this country, remain in the fixed mindset of traditional economic growth and planning even in this time of rising gas prices, increasing pollution, and burgeoning populations.

In recent years, there have been a number of studies directed at identifying the impetus that drives cities to pursue sustainable development. Many scholars have set out in search of the key factor or factors that influence some cities to be more aggressive in their pursuit of sustainability than other cities. A recent study by Matthew Kahn identifies high income as a determining variable. (Kahn 2006) Other theories postulate demographics, ideology, and party identification of cities' populations as possible determinants. All of these arguments succeed in characterizing a piece of the drive towards sustainability, yet an all-encompassing variable has yet to be discovered. However, this should not be viewed as discouraging. It is highly unlikely that any one factor can account for the pursuit of urban sustainability. Rather, a multitude of factors, working alone and in combination, including those mentioned above, and others, probably conspire to motivate cities to practice sustainability.

This paper aims to add to the growing knowledgebase of what influences cities to become “green” by focusing on the influence of urban governance. The initiative to pursue policies and programs that promote urban sustainability derives from all sectors of civil society. Elected and

appointed officials, community organizations, private citizens, nonprofits, and business communities each have a part in developing, supporting, or opposing a city's sustainability strategy. These entities combine, officially or unofficially, to set agendas, create laws, pursue and develop business, and essentially govern cities. These represent salient characteristics of the "governance" of cities.

The central focus of this paper is on this idea of "governance." Governance comprises the traditions, institutions, and processes that determine how power is exercised, how citizens are given or not given a voice, and how decisions are made on issues of public concern. The central thesis of this paper is that the manner in which cities are governed is inextricably linked to how concerned city government is with environmental sustainability. It is the premise of this study that governance is directly related to sustainability and that by investigating the nature of governance in American cities, light will be shed on the factors that lead cities to pursue urban sustainability.

Why Focus on Cities?

While national and state policies do have direct and indirect effects on regional environments, I believe the municipal level offers tremendous opportunity for tangible improvement in the bio-physical environment to be realized. It is often argued that people are most likely to pay attention to the physical environment in which they live and, thus, that the governance mechanisms in cities are most likely to be responsive to the environmental concerns of their citizens. According to Mayor Greg Nickels of Seattle, "I've worked in local government my entire adult life. Because it's a place where you can make a difference: you can roll up your sleeves every day and at the end of the day see the difference you've made." (SustainLane's

2006 US City Sustainability Ranking) In many cities, one can contact the mayor and elected city officials without much difficulty or travel. This expediency means that cities receive feedback almost immediately. When subway lines or buses need repair, or when a water main breaks, city management usually finds out the same day.

According to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) “State of World Population 1999,” there has been a dramatic rise in urbanization over the last forty years. In 1960, 33% of the world’s population lived in urban areas. By 1999, the percentage of urbanized populations increased to 47%. The report predicts that by 2030, approximately 61% of the world’s population will be urban. The economic and socio-cultural impact of the trend toward urbanization cannot be overstated. The lives of city and non-city dwellers alike are dramatically impacted by urbanization. As evidenced by research on “ecological footprints,” urban populations levy resource degradation on both urban and non-urban areas. (Rees and Wackernagel, 1994) According to the UNFPA report, “... the ecological and sociological ‘footprint’ of cities has spread over ever-wider areas, creating an urban-rural continuum of communities that share some aspects of each lifestyle. Fewer and fewer places on the planet are unaffected by the dynamics of cities.” (State of World Population 1999)

There are several reasons why I chose the governance of municipalities as the focus for this study. First and foremost, there is a need for this type of research. Since their late-century reemergence and revitalization, cities have grown at tremendous speeds and have once again become centers of commerce, industry, and culture. People who live within the boundaries of cities are major consumers of goods and services and, in the process, depend on and often drain resources from the external regions on which they depend; as I will discuss later, the ecological impact of cities extends well beyond their geographic locations. Such growth and expansion,

planned or unplanned, has and will continue to have a significant impact on the American economic, demographic, and environmental landscape. It is necessary to add to the burgeoning knowledge base about the environmental impact of American cities in order to best respond to, prepare, and plan for future problems and externalities that stem from growth and urbanization.

Another reason for which cities are the focus of this study is that they make distinct, identifiable subjects for methodological research. A study into the pursuit of sustainability at a higher level, such as the state or national level, engenders the problem of deciding whom to target as research subjects. Does one focus on federal, state, municipal officials, or all three? At which level of government, if any, is the most significant sustainability work being done? Is it broad, national policies that shape environmental policy and planning, or are local politics the primary determinants? How does one statistically weight the responses and information from each level of government? All of these questions make a national or state focus much more difficult than the municipal level in terms of accuracy and pose methodological challenges. According to political scientist Lamont Hempel, “Global environmental protection begins at the community and bioregional level—the level where complex living systems are most interdependent and vulnerable. Local watersheds, ecosystems and microclimatic conditions are among the primary object of bioregional protection, and their alteration by human activities is much easier to understand from the vantage point of local communities than from the macro perspective of global ecology.” (quoted in Daly, Costanza, Prugh 1999)

As the world continues to urbanize and cities grow in number and size, discussions and debates concerning the best ways to make cities more efficient and work better for everyone are likely to become more heated. As the number and concentration of urban areas expand, a host of problems are and will continue to arise ranging from transportation and waste to energy, to name

just a few. A major component of these problems will be environmental in scope. Urbanists and city planners must work together with governing coalitions to meet the challenge of designing efficient land use, preserving open space, supplying clean air and water, and providing effective and environmentally sensitive transportation. (Global Issues: Green Cities 2000) For these reasons, cities are prime targets for study not only because of their viability and practicality as test subjects, but also because of the impending challenges resulting from their rapid growth and ecological impact.

The danger in studying cities, of course, is that it may obscure the relationships with other levels of government or other geographic areas, such as ecosystems, that are directly relevant to the health of the bio-physical environment and to sustainability. I do not assume that cities exist in a political or social vacuum. Rather, I focus on cities so that I may understand the kind of potential they have for pursuing sustainability, and more importantly, what it might take to convince cities to do more than they do now.

Chapter 2

Sustainability

The key “dependent variable” in this thesis is related to the concept of sustainability. The concept of sustainability is abstract and vague to many people, but in recent years, many scholars have made great strides in elaborating its meanings. Before explaining the definition of my central dependent variable, it is important to be clear about what sustainability means.

Definition and Primer

Sustainability is a vague concept referring to any number of environmental, educational, or planning methods. There have been countless attempts to define the term, and dozens of working definitions are currently in use. These varying definitions of the same concept are all reasonable and make sense when put in the proper context. The lack of consensus on a single definition is not at all negative; in fact, such ambiguity has allowed the concept of sustainability to evolve and take root in numerous different political, philosophical, and scientific arenas.

A broad definition of sustainability focuses on quality of life, livability, and environmental issues. In order to determine whether or not a city is working towards sustainability, it is necessary to look at the overall well-being of the city. A city’s overall well-being is determined by assessing its natural environment, education systems, population demographics, economy, transportation, equity, and numerous other characteristics. In terms of cities, sustainability is more functional and useful when viewed in terms of its close cousin, sustainable development. Cities are best viewed through the lens of sustainable development because of their role as market drivers and centers of commerce.

I draw upon two particular definitions as the basis for my working definition of sustainability and sustainable development.

- 1) *Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the needs of future generations to meet their own needs.* (The Brundtland Commission, 1987)
- 2) *[Sustainable development is a] strategy for improving the quality of life while preserving the environmental potential for the future, of living off interest rather than consuming natural capital. Sustainable development mandates that the present generation must not narrow the choices of future generations but must strive to expand them by passing on an environment and an accumulation of resources that will allow its children to live at least as well as, and preferably better than, people today. Sustainable development is premised on living within the earth's means.*

(National Commission on the Environment [NCE], 1993)

Although sustainable development as an applied concept is relatively new, the idea of sustainability is not. Famed conservationist and President Theodore Roosevelt invoked the idea of sustainability, though not by name, when he created the national park system. In regards to America's natural resources he declared, "I recognize the right and duty of this generation to develop and use our natural resources, but I do not recognize the right to waste them, or to rob by wasteful use, the generations that come after us."

The Sustainable City

The idea of a “sustainable city” is not much better defined than the broad concept of sustainability itself. It is probably safe to say that few scholars argue that there is really such a thing as a sustainable city. One scholar went so far as to question if the idea of a sustainable city constitutes an oxymoron. (Rees 1997) Suffice it to say here that a sustainable city is one that has achieved some degree of success in trying to provide a healthy and thriving bio-physical environment, and a high and relatively equal standard of living for its residents.

There are probably no cities in the U.S., and perhaps none in the world, that accomplish all that can be accomplished in terms of sustainability, regardless of how it might be defined. There are, however, many cities in the U.S. and around the world that are actively attempting to become more sustainable.¹ That being said, when “sustainable city” is used in this paper, it refers to cities that are actively attempting to become more sustainable. So what exactly does it mean to work towards a sustainable city?

A sustainable city takes the concept of self-sufficiency to heart. The more that a city can provide for the resource needs of its citizens and economy from within its own geographic borders, the more self-sufficient, or sustainable, the city will be. One good way to assess the self-sufficiency of a city is to measure its ecological footprint. The ecological footprint of a city refers to the size of the environmental impact that is imposed on the earth and its resources by the city. According to the authors of the term, Rees and Wackernagel (1994), the average American utilizes in excess of 12 acres of land to provide the energy, food, and shelter necessary to support their lifestyle. As no city is large enough to provide this amount of land per resident, cities inherently draw on resources from outside of the city limits. In fact, as Rees explains,

¹ For a current list of American cities taking sustainability seriously, see Professor Kent Portney’s updated list of Sustainable Cities in Appendix C.

cities “typically [occupy] less than 1% of the ecosystem area upon which they draw.” (Rees 1997) Considering that each citizen needs 12 acres of land and that no city is large enough to provide this amount of land, cities are far from being self-sufficient. (Portney 2003) Thus, the major goal of a city that takes sustainability and sustainable development seriously is to reduce its ecological footprint. Beatley and Manning describe a sustainable city as, “a place that seeks to contain the extent of the urban ‘footprint’ and strives to keep to a minimum the conversion of natural and open lands to urban and developed uses.” (Beatley 1997) Simply put, a city that “attempts to understand, and subsequently takes steps to reduce, its ecological footprint is more serious about sustainability than one that does not.” (Portney 2003)

The concept of an “ecological footprint” is a useful method by which to think about the sustainability of cities. No sustainable city has a program or department with “ecological footprint” in its name. Rather, cities attempt to become more sustainable by targeting energy, transportation, waste, water, efficiency, planning, and a plethora of others areas. Thus, the reduction of a city’s ecological footprint, or pursuit thereof, is the product of the above attempts. In this study, I do not attempt to assess the ecological footprints of cities, but instead introduce the term as a useful tool by which to think about the goals and efforts of cities that take sustainability seriously.

Taking Sustainability Seriously

As stated earlier, there is no city in the world that can be described as a completely sustainable city. If there are no sustainable cities, the question begs, why bother discussing them? Perhaps it is useful to think about the sustainable city in the same vein as utopia. Utopia is an idealistic concept of a perfect world or community, yet is also a place that is essentially

unattainable. Nevertheless, leaders and philosophers at all levels continually strive to create a utopia for their people. While a true utopia, like a sustainable city, may be an unattainable goal, it is still a desirable and worthwhile ambition. If a society works towards utopianism or sustainability, it may not reach its final goal, but will presumably be closer to that end than if the effort had never been made in the first place. Like utopia, it is very likely that there will never be a sustainable city. Nonetheless, if cities make concerted efforts to work towards becoming sustainable, the result would be a widespread reduction in the amount of natural resources consumed and open spaces lost, improving quality of life and quality of the environment.

“Taking sustainability seriously,” as coined by Kent Portney, elucidates a workable next step in operationalizing the general concept of sustainability and the ideal of the sustainable city. Cities can take the concept of sustainability seriously in their planning, law making, development, and all other aspects of governance such that they work towards creating a sustainable city. In America, there are hundreds of municipalities, large and small, that are taking the concept of sustainability seriously. However, there is no single path that these communities follow en route to trying to become more sustainable. Some cities like Austin, TX have created municipally owned wind power farms to decrease their reliance on fossil fuels and reduce the amount of pollution created by the electricity needs of its citizens. Cities like Boulder, CO and Buffalo, NY have instituted green building codes that emphasize increased electrical, heating, and material efficiency to reduce energy expenditure in addition to other benefits. Other cities build bike lanes, carpool lanes, redevelop brownfields, hold light bulb exchanges, or set aside park space in an effort to become more sustainable.

The opportunities and areas in which cities can make changes to become more sustainable are many. To fully understand the extent to which cities can identify areas for

change, one must understand the recent shift in environmental decision-making. Municipalities have always divided their governance duties into departments. Under a variety of names, there are departments of Transportation, Energy, Water, Planning, Waste, and, sometimes Environment. The department of the environment, which is not always present, is a separate entity like the others. Some cities, most often those that take sustainability seriously, have realized that this is a flawed system. The environment is not something that is separate from roads, power, or sewage plants. In fact, environmental issues are present in all of the other departments. There is oil leakage from cars onto roads that makes its way into the sewage systems. Energy and transportation emit pollution. Planning strategies can encourage or discourage automobile use. Cities can take sustainability seriously in all departments.

Simply put, “taking sustainability seriously” means that a municipality is making a concerted and determined effort to put the idea of sustainability into action by enacted various policies and programs that seem consistent with the goals and concepts of sustainability. However, the concept is quite vague and, as mentioned before, does not provide a concrete set of requirements or list of actions necessary for a city to be deemed “taking sustainability seriously.” Portney has created an index that operationalizes the term and provides an empirical basis by which to categorize whether or not cities are making the effort to become more sustainable.² This index provides a methodological basis by which to compare cities by focusing on 25 different government activities, policies, and programs. An assessment of actually how sustainable cities are is beyond the scope of the index, though it is safe to assume that assessing the sustainability of cities is premature because the idea of cities taking sustainability seriously is relatively new. Portney suggests that actions (policies and programs) by which cities engage sustainability will eventually contribute to producing a more sustainable city.

² See Appendix C for an updated list of cities (Portney, [Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously](#), p. 65)

Outline of Specific Actions that Cities can follow, based on Kent Portney's "Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously" Index

I will outline the general categories that comprise the bulk of the individual elements in Portney's Index. This outline is not ordered by importance, but rather follows the index created by Portney and provides general categories and examples of things that cities can do to pursue sustainability. As I will discuss in detail in the "Methodology" chapter, it is based on actions like these that Portney and I operationalize the distinction between our experiment and control cities.

An initial step towards sustainability that cities may undertake is the creation of a sustainability indicators project. Sustainability indicators consist of "efforts to devise specific measures of how sustainable the city is, to establish benchmarks, goals, and timetables for improvements, and to periodically assess progress toward achieving these improvements." (Portney 2003: 66) These indicators can be created and assessed by the city or by an outside agency like the nonprofit Sustainable Community Roundtable in Olympia, WA. Chantal Stevens, the executive director of Sustainable Seattle Inc. emphasizes the importance and power of a well-organized indicators index. Ten years ago, Seattle had a dearth of information on its urban sustainability. Since that time, Seattle has become an international leader in taking sustainability seriously and the problem now is organizing that data into an effective index. Through yearly assessments of the city's sustainability index, Sustainable Seattle Inc. and other interested parties can make well informed arguments to the city council, mayor, and chamber of commerce on exactly which aspects of sustainability the city is progressing and which areas need improvement. With such an index, Sustainable Seattle Inc. can, "Find problems, measure

problems, and then take action” by bringing information to the “fingertips of decision makers.” (Stevens, Chantal. Personal Interview. 9 August 2006) Creating indices can also benefit cities without agendas as advanced as Seattle’s. Data is a powerful tool and it is only with accurate figures that strong arguments for change and improvement can be made.

Another step that cities may take to enhance their sustainability is by pursuing “smart growth.” Smart growth refers to “any number of programs designed to help the city manage growth to avoid or eliminate suburban sprawl, and to direct economic development and population growth in ways that minimize their impacts on the physical environment.” (Portney 2003: 66) Examples of smart growth include eco-industrial parks, cluster or targeted economic development, ecovillages, and brownfield redevelopment.

In the same train of thought as smart growth, cities may also utilize land use planning and zoning to ensure that development occurs in an environmentally sustainable manner. Land use and zoning can be used to delineate environmentally sensitive areas and either preclude them from development or encourage development elsewhere through the use of taxes or other financial incentives, like fee waivers.

Expanding upon smart growth and land use planning, transportation can be an enormously important area in which cities can encourage sustainable growth. Planning techniques can, for example, discourage the use of automobiles and encourage biking. To this end, the city can limit the number of downtown parking spots, have defined carpool programs, build bike racks and create bike lanes. Public buses, subways, light rail or other mass transit systems can carry citizens efficiently and in a manner more environmentally friendly than individual transport. Further, the city can reduce energy use and pollution by establishing

programs to change the city's own fleet of vehicles to those that are gas/electric hybrids or run on alternative fuels like liquid natural gas or propane.

Cities can also focus their efforts on pollution reduction, prevention, and remediation. The local economy of cities differs greatly and thus some cities, those with more industry, will reap larger dividends from focus on this element of sustainability than others. Nonetheless, there are pollution actions in which all cities can engage. In terms of waste disposal, cities can create programs for recycling industrial, commercial, and hazardous waste. Curbing the use of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and banning the incineration of fallen leaves will reduce air pollution. Other pollution reduction methods that contribute toward sustainability are the municipal purchase of recycled rather than virgin products, asbestos remediation, lead paint abatement, and hazardous waste remediation.

The reduction and conservation of energy is another area that cities can target. It is well understood that fossil fuel use is detrimental to human and environmental health. Cities can purchase or produce their own alternative energy to reduce consumption of coal and oil. Alternative energies used by cities include wind, solar, and biogas, among others. Some cities like Austin, TX and Santa Monica, CA make provisions to encourage their citizens to purchase alternative energy. (Portney 2003: 68) Overall energy use can be reduced through voluntary or mandatory green building programs that increase the efficiency of residential and commercial buildings. Water conservation techniques like xeriscaping, the use of local drought resistant plants instead of exotic plants or grasses, can help to conserve water resources.

The organization of city government can also have a significant impact on the efficacy of sustainability initiatives. Cities with defined offices or departments of sustainability are more likely to effectively pursue sustainability than cities where sustainability issues are dispersed

amongst various departments. Part of the sustainability success of cities like Seattle, WA and Denver, CO can be credited to the forethought and commitment to creating and utilizing offices of sustainability. Mayors Greg Nickels of Seattle and John Hickenlooper of Denver deserve credit for creating functional departments and appointing qualified and dedicated directors, Steve Nicholas and Beth Conover, respectively. These departments allow not only the city to practice sustainability, but also empower local nonprofits and community organizations to be more effective because they have a receptive governmental outlet with whom to converse. The involvement of a city's mayor, city council, planning commission, local business, specific influential business leaders, or chamber of commerce can have a significant impact on the pursuit of sustainability.

Most of my research is based on the influence of these entities on sustainability. Particularly, it is on the pursuit of the above sustainability policies, programs, and initiatives by the government and business community that is the focus of this study.

Chapter 3

Urban Governance in American Cities

“Now it has always been held that if equality of power among citizens is possible at all—a point on which many political philosophers have had grave doubts—then surely considerable equality of social conditions is a necessary prerequisite. But if, even in America, with its universal creed of democracy and equality, there are great inequalities in the conditions of different citizens, must there not also be great inequalities in the capacities of different citizens to influence the decisions of their various governments? And if, because they are unequal in other conditions, citizens of a democracy are unequal in power to control their government, then who in fact does govern? How does a ‘democratic’ system work amid inequality of resources?” (Dahl 1961: 3)

As the above quote by Robert Dahl suggests, how cities are governed is a complex and multi-faceted issue. Even, or perhaps especially, in a local governance system that is said to be “democratic,” governance always raises issues of who decides what policies and programs a city will pursue, to whom the local government will respond, and which specific problems will get addressed and which will be ignored.

As noted earlier, the central focus of this paper is on this idea of “governance.” Governance comprises the traditions, institutions, and processes that determine how power is exercised and how decisions are made on issues of public concern. The central thesis of this paper is that the manner in which cities are governed is inextricably linked to how concerned the city government is with environmental sustainability. It is the premise of this study that governance is directly related to sustainability and that by investigating the nature of governance in American cities, light will be shed on the factors that lead cities to pursue urban sustainability.

Elected and appointed officials, community organizations, private citizens, nonprofits, and business communities each have a part in developing, supporting, or opposing a city’s

sustainability strategy. These entities combine, officially or unofficially, to set agendas, create laws, pursue and develop business, and essentially govern cities. These represent salient characteristics of the “governance” of cities.

There are two inexorably linked aspects of governance. One aspect comprises the political and structural characteristics of the governing system, and the other relates more broadly to the character of the policy making process. The structural and organizational aspect of governance has long been the subject of study and has often been credited as the major force in directing policymaking. Scholars of urban politics have long held that the structural and organizational characteristics of cities’ political systems have a strong and direct influence over the processes of making, or avoiding, public policy decisions.

Urban Governance: A Structural Description

In America, there are essentially two major forms of city government, with numerous variations on each. The relative power wielded by the mayor is one of the primary differences between the two government structures. A “strong mayor” city government system is designed to have both a mayor as the chief executive officer (elected directly by the general electorate, usually for a 4-year term of office) and city council (often elected in individual wards or precincts), with the mayor able to exercise the preponderance of authority. Mayors in these types of governments have the power to appoint and dismiss department heads with little or no input from the city council or the public. Strong mayors also have almost complete administrative authority and are responsible for preparing and administering the budget. However, the mayor’s budget usually requires approval from the city council. Strong mayor systems often bestow on the mayor the authority to veto items passed by the city council.

Due to the relative power wielded by the mayor in comparison to the city council, these government systems are inclined to develop influential “political machines.” Without going into great detail about this, department heads tend to be very loyal and hold allegiance to the mayor. Historically, strong mayor systems have resulted in governments that are particularly resistant to change and that engender what might be called cronyism (through political patronage) and inefficiency. Governments with strong mayors have resulted in infamous political machines like Tammany Hall in New York City. Fortunately, political machines as extreme as Tammany Hall no longer run major American cities, although strong mayor cities still place a great deal of policymaking and administrative control in the hands of the mayor.

The other major form of urban governmental structure is the weak mayor system. Weak mayor systems are largely the product of reactions to urban political machines, in which reformers wanted to design systems of city governance that would not be subject to the abuses of strong mayor systems. In a weak mayor system, the mayor does not play as central a role. Sometimes elected directly by the electorate, but for a shorter period of time, or by the city council, a weak mayor rarely serves as the chief executive of the city. Rather, a professional administrator, usually referred to as a city manager, plays this role. The city manager is then responsible for budget preparation and administration, with the mayor having diminished responsibilities.

Within the general framework of the weak mayor system there is another form of government, termed the commission government, which was also designed to prevent the development of political machines. This government is often referred to as the “reformed” city government structure. Similar to the weak mayor system, the city councilors, or commissioners, have more power than in the strong mayor structure. Indeed, very often the mayor is elected by

the commission from the ranks of the commissioners themselves. In this scenario, the mayor presides over city commission meetings. In addition to being legislators, commissioners also serve as chief administrators of city departments like public safety, energy, transportation, etc. Because the public elects each commissioner for a particular department, this governmental structure potentially provides the public with more control over the programs administered by city departments. As a result of commissioner and department autonomy, mayors in this system are effectively weaker and wield less authority than in strong mayor systems.

Mayors still play influential roles in weak mayor systems, but they must rely on their abilities to develop and implement particular strategies to be effective political leaders. As Robert Dahl explains in his seminal study of governance in New Haven, CT in the 1950s, the mayor, “rarely commanded. He negotiated, cajoled, exhorted, beguiled, charmed...even threatened, but he most needed support and acquiescence from other leaders who simply could not be commanded...Because the mayor could not command, he had to bargain.” (Dahl 1961: 204)

Although political scientists often argue that the structure of the local governance regime—strong versus weak mayor, or strong versus reformed government structure—should play a role in influencing public policies and policymaking, my expectation is that this is not a particularly salient characteristic of the local urban governance regime when it comes to understanding how seriously cities take sustainability. Although strong mayor systems are often associated with more slowly moving city policymaking (strong mayor systems are rarely noted for their policy innovations), and presumably the pursuit of sustainability represents a very innovative sort of public policy, there is little specific reason to believe that strong mayors and their respective city councilors will somehow be hostile to the concept of sustainability or to its

pursuit. Rather, other characteristics of cities' governance regimes are likely to exert greater influences.

From Governance to Governance Regimes

Earlier, I suggested that the central thesis of this research is that the manner in which cities are governed is inextricably linked to how concerned the city government is with environmental sustainability. As noted then, governance comprises the traditions, institutions, and processes that determine how power is exercised, how citizens are given or not given a voice, and how decisions are made on issues of public concern. In order to investigate whether there is, indeed, a connection between how cities are governed and whether or to what degree they decide to pursue some form of sustainability, the idea of governance must be clarified well beyond reference to the structural characteristics of governance.

Many scholars have developed specific ways of examining governance issues, and have tried to disaggregate the concept into numerous component pieces. In one way or another, discussions of governance focus on trying to understand who has power and who doesn't, who exerts influence over others, and for what purposes that power is exerted. To some scholars, the central issue is whether there is a governing "elite" that makes all of the important policy decisions in cities. These scholars of elite theory often point to the dominance of the business community as evidence of composing the core of such an elite. The implication, of course, is that such elite governance is antithetical to democratic governance. Other scholars have argued that understanding governance through elite theory is misleading. For example, Robert Dahl's examination of New Haven found that there was no single dominant elite, but rather there were separate "plural" elites, each of which was influential in making local policy decisions in

different policy domains (education, public safety, public works, etc.). This suggests that the local policymaking process is more democratic (or at least more representative) than elite theorists had believed.

More recently, scholars have adopted more complex views of local governance, often pointing to what has become called “governance regimes.” The governance regime in a particular city represents all the formal and informal processes and parties involved in making local public decisions. Such governance regime approaches to studying local policymaking typically try to understand decisions as dynamic processes that vary quite a bit from one city to another. The governance regime in one city will probably look very different from that in another city. The issues that arise may be very different; the individual people are obviously different; the type, nature, and strength of local “interests,” such as the business community, or local nonprofit organizations, and others, will also be very different. Yet, some scholars have tried to determine whether there are patterns to the operation of governance regimes—patterns that allow comparisons of policymaking processes from one city to another.

Urban Governance Regimes: The Real Source of Power in City Governments

As previously noted, political scientists have often sought to explain the difference in governance and policy making between cities through differences in governmental structure. They hypothesized that on specific issues, cities with strong mayors will decide to do X, while cities with weak mayors will decide Y, within reason. Despite this historic emphasis of study on government structure, some political scientists and I hypothesize that organizational structure does not sufficiently explain differences in public policy between cities. Even among cities with

the same government structure, there is great variance. Clarence Stone suggests that this variance is due to differences in what he calls “urban governance regimes.”

In his 1946-1988 study of urban politics in Atlanta, Stone found that there was much more to the picture of governance than the organizational structure of government. Analysis of the mayor and city council, as in Dahl’s study, did not seem to accurately reveal the full workings and machinations of governance. There were other entities involved that played major roles in directly or indirectly influencing policy making decisions. “Depiction of government structure is not enough. City Hall has to deal with a powerful business sector and sharp limitations on its own authority. Thus, public officeholders have to come to terms with private interests, especially business interests.” (Stone 1989: IX) Not only does city hall need to deal with business interests and the chamber of commerce, it must handle labor-union officials, party functionaries, officers in nonprofit organizations and foundations, church leaders, community organizations, the public, and influential individuals. Somehow the government must incorporate the desires and needs of this diverse group into a coalition that will allow for effective governance. Stone refers to the coalition that results from the amalgamation of these various and often opposing influences as the urban governance *regime*.

The word “regime” has many connotations. For the sake of this study, regime refers to the informal arrangements that surround and complement the formal workings of governmental authority. I have adopted Stone’s definition of urban governance regimes as, “the informal arrangements by which public bodies and private interests function together in order to be able to make and carry out governing decisions.” (Stone 1989: 6) What makes urban governance effective is not the structure and formal machinery of government, but rather the informal partnership between the business community and city hall. As the late governor of Alabama

James Folsom said, “Nothing just happens. Everything is *arranged*.” (quoted in Stone 1989: XII)

An urban governance regime is a multifaceted governing coalition. Governance regimes are organic, changing bodies made up primarily of influences from elected officials, the business community, and community and nonprofits organizations. As stated earlier, regimes cannot be defined simply by illustrating government structure. Public officeholders have to come to terms with, make concessions to, and exact deals with private interests, especially that of business. This process is the core of the urban regime. The exact influence of business communities on governance regimes will be further discussed later.

Urban regimes are, essentially, studies in cooperation, formal and informal, or the lack thereof. The study of urban regimes focuses on who cooperates and how that cooperation manifests. Moreover, cooperation and coalition building between diverse interests and across institutional boundaries occurs in a dynamic environment. Regimes are not static and regime dynamics, “concern the ways in which forces for change and forces for continuity play against one another.” (Stone 1989: 9) Urban regimes form and change in an ever evolving effort to “[manage] conflict and [make] adaptive responses to social change.” (Stone 1989: 6)

While each city has its own unique governance issues, their experiences are not mutually exclusive. Every city shares similar struggles for power, growth, and management of a diverse and changing populace. Necessarily, the informal arrangements through which governing decisions are made differ between communities, but, as Stone explains, are everywhere driven by two needs: institutional scope and cooperation. Institutional scope is a necessity because cities need to encompass a sufficiently wide range of institutions in order to mobilize the resources required to make and implement governing decisions. Cooperation is another driving force

because cities need to promote collaboration and coordination such that diverse participants can reach amenable decisions and sustain action in support of those decisions.

The first task at hand in organizing an effective regime is the assembly of a governing coalition. Because cities have diverse racial populations, social and economic stratifications, business interests, and key influential figures, governing coalitions are always different and not always easy to assemble. As it so often is with politics at any level, compromise is the tool used most frequently to coordinate coalitions. According to Stone, public policy is not simply a reflection of the social composition of a community, nor is it determined solely by economics. Policy decisions and innovations, the especially critical decisions made in response to social change, “emerge from and reflect the character of a city’s governing coalition.” (Stone 1989: 160)

The crucial issue is how exactly cooperation is achieved to create a governing coalition. Devotion to a common cause can create an effective governing coalition, but this is rarely a viable option. Any cause general enough to underpin a coalition is probably too broad and vague to provide any real direction or set a defined course of action for each participant. More often than not, pragmatism is a more effective coalition-builder than ideology. When each coalition member has a specific agenda, it is necessary to cooperate to achieve respective goals. Thus, reciprocity is a recurring and common interaction that unites regimes. Coalition members trust that the others will support their initiatives if they reciprocate. Loyalty through reciprocity is the glue that forms alliances. Coalitions must cooperate and be able to count on each other to, “contribute to the *combined* capacity to govern.” (Stone 1989: 180)

However, public policy is also not simply what the coalition partners want. Regime allies sometimes have conflicting desires. In Who Governs?, Robert Dahl declares as a self-evident

axiom, “To build an effective political coalition, rewards must be conferred on (or at least promised to) individuals, groups, and various categories of citizens.” (Dahl 1961: 94) Thus, coalitions do not always permit each coalition partner to achieve their goals and are not necessarily fair or equitable. The relative leverage that each coalition partner wields dictates whose specific agenda will be favored.

Types of Urban Governance Regimes

If every urban area has a different governance regime and a different collection of coalition members, how can any sense be made of urban governance regimes? While the particular assembly of coalition members does differ, there are commonalities that arise between cities. In some cities, the business community plays an overt role and exerts the majority of leverage in policy making decisions. Other cities are particularly influenced by certain nonprofits that have the ear of politicians and wield influence in decision making. Some city governments are able to listen to the desires of influential entities, but hold them at arm’s length in the policy making process. The players in each governance regime are inherently different, but, as Stone has determined, four main themes arise that encapsulate the majority of regime variations.

In “Urban Regimes and the Capacity to Govern: A Political Economy Approach,” Stone elaborates on his conception of urban governance regimes by describing four different types of urban governance regimes: 1) Maintenance regimes; 2) Development regimes; 3) Middle Class Progressive regimes (MCPR); and 4) Lower Class Opportunity Expansion regimes (LCOER). These four regime types succeed in delineating the vast majority of governance regimes in American cities. The typology of governance regimes provides a more concrete method by

which to operationalize the argument that governance requires more than simply elected officials or, “the capture of elected office.” The logic underlying the typology is that the generation of a substantial body of nongovernmental resources is necessary in order to “exercise political choice and alter current policy.” (Stone 1993: 18-22) Despite the appearance of a strong and authoritative government, weak and diffuse governmental authority characterizes governance in American urban centers. This situation favors any group that can act cohesively and control a substantial body of political resources. Governments endowed with the capacity to promote cooperation can attract allies and overcome oppositional forces and, thus, govern effectively. The following is a brief description of each regime.

Maintenance regimes represent governing coalitions who make no effort to introduce significant change. Succinctly put, while the demands in maintenance regimes are few, the opportunities for reward are few as well. The dominant focus of local policies in these cities is to keep levels and types of services from falling into decline. In maintenance regimes, there is no substantial mobilization of private resources and no major societal behavioral changes demanded because there is no effort to change established social and economic practices. According to Stone, this regime type is not as popular or widespread as it has been in the past. He attributes this decrease in popularity to the inherent nature of the regime; by maintaining things “as they are,” public officials, elites, and the city as a whole, forego opportunities to innovate, make changes for the better, and make names for the individuals or city. Due to the emphasis on preserving the status quo, maintenance regimes provide this typology and study with a benchmark against which to compare other regime types. (Stone 1993: 18)

Development regimes are concerned primarily with economic growth—the city as a “growth machine”—and have the greatest ties to the business community. The fundamental

essence of development regimes is grounded in the philosophy that the best way to positively modify established social and economic patterns is to link private investment to public action. In addition to their general practice of actively courting business and creating an enticing environment in order to attract new business, development regimes specifically utilize land use laws and zoning to promote growth and counter decline. Development regimes believe that in order to convince private investors to commit resources, investors must be assured that their outlay will yield positive results, particularly in economic gains. Thus, cities with development regimes take the necessary steps to assure investors that their investments will succeed. Such steps include acquiring and clearing land through the use of eminent domain, building public facilities (like parking lots, subways, roads, and other infrastructure), or providing other fitting subsidies.

According to Stone, development is not a particularly difficult governing task, yet it can have serious repercussions for elected officials if it is not pursued tactfully. Whenever developmental change is incurred, disruption and controversy arise. In order to advance development with the least amount of controversy, two things are necessary: 1) there must be coordination between institutional elites, and 2) the mass public must be relatively passive. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, institutional coordination is achieved by insider transactions and the pursuit of public action that directly attracts and entices private investment. The more difficult governing task lies in subduing public opposition. To achieve this, mayors and city governments take several courses of action. Mayors tend to associate themselves more closely with the announcement and conceptual idea of specific investments and then divorce themselves from the messy developmental externalities levied on the city. Another way by which city government suppresses opposition is by utilizing the abundance of possible incentives

generated by development. When development is pursued, opportunities to create jobs and contracts, build new schools, parks and theaters, and levy specific fees arise. All of these opportunities are beneficial to the city and help to temper public opposition, though some may consider it a form of bribery. Nonetheless, despite the pervasiveness of Development governance regimes, some city governments pay the price of electoral unpopularity as a result of development projects. (Stone 1993: 19)

Middle class progressive regimes (MCPR) focus on policies and programs such as environmental protection, affordable housing, historic preservation, and a variety of other social goals. MCPR are similar to Development regimes in that they encourage or at least do not discourage development, but differ in that MCPR monitor and exact more demands from private development. The major difference between the two regimes lies in that while Development regimes essentially place themselves at the service and mercy of business, MCPR endeavor to achieve a favorable economic balance. MCPR attempt to, “[calibrate] inducements and sanctions to gain a suitable mix of activity and restriction.” (Stone 1993: 19) Simply put, MCPR are not willing to accept development at any cost. Governments with this regime identify beneficial growth and separate it from non-advantageous growth, or growth for growth’s sake. They may also analyze the costs and benefits from development differently, attempting to weight the costs associated with development. Since these costs, both short-term and long-term, are sometimes too high relative to the benefits they bring, MCPR are likely to reject some kinds of development that other cities may be willing to accept just to accrue the benefits.

Thus explained, the difference between the MCPR and Development regimes begs the question of how MCPR can pick and choose its expansion, while Development regimes must do everything in their power to spur growth. Some argue that MCPR cities are simply more

attractive to business than Development regime cities and can therefore negotiate with and make demands upon investors. However, this explanation does not explain the entire story. Even within cities that are not economically advantaged or in strong leverage situations, there are particular areas within them that are attractive to development such that the city could negotiate with private investors in order to foster development that will best benefit the city. Further, there are many cities that are highly attractive to business and investment but, as in Development regimes, impose few restrictions.

While the mass public in Development regimes pose a problem to the governing regime, the public is an essential coalition partner in MCPR. In order to mobilize support for progressive measures, policies, initiatives, etc., MCPR rely on a base of active popular support. Public support can be essential to the passage of progressive agendas in two ways. The first way is that if referendum is a major method by which legislation is passed, the public has a direct impact on governance. The second way by which public support can be essential to MCPR is that legislation for progressive agendas often requires significant tradeoffs as a result of negotiation with business. Thus, it is essential for the government to keep the citizenry informed about the complexities of policy making and the need for compromise, while at the same time keeping citizens committed to progressive goals. The task of governing is significantly more difficult in MCPR because the mass public cannot be ignored or easily placated like in Development regimes. The task of governing is also made more intricate because development is less voluntary than in Development regimes. Investors are attracted to cities or areas in cities in MCPR, but negotiation and coercion must be applied to result in a mutually beneficial agreement. (Stone 1993: 19-20) The utilization of coercion and leverage power in the positive development of cities is essential to the analysis in this paper and will be further explored later.

The fourth regime type is more hypothetical than the other three. There is evidence to believe that this regime exists, but it is still a theoretical construct at this point. Lower Class Opportunity Expansion regimes (LCOER) engage in enriching education and job training, improving transportation, and enlarging opportunities for home ownership. Cities with LCOER strive for many of the same principles and goals as MCPR, but have larger lower class populations. Yet, because LCOER strive for progressive aims, the lower class is treated as more than merely claimants for public services. Regime efforts focus on expanding opportunities and building human capital such that advances in quality of life can be sustainable. If the regime can induce a significant increase in quality of life and quality of work from its public, then there will be economic and non-economic gains for the community as a whole.

Of course, the challenge, as Stone points out, is to organize the community and institutional elites to achieve such commendable goals. Indeed, the challenge of organizing a coalition to achieve these goals is sizable and perhaps is the reason that Stone considers this regime more hypothetical than reality. Much like in the MCPR, the major obstacle is motivating the mass public. However, in this regime motivation is a more difficult task because the lower class does not have the same resources at their disposal as the middle class. Stone explains, “Because a lower class constituency lacks some of the skills and organizational resources that a middle class constituency would start with, the effort to equip it for that watchdog constituency role is more substantial than the effort needed to mobilize a middle class constituency...” (Stone 1993: 21) This analysis explains only the resource component of the difficulty to organize and mobilize lower class constituency. Lower class populations are also often conditioned to restricted opportunities and have become accustomed to disappointment. I describe the lower class population in this way not to make excuses for their seemingly perpetual lack of progress,

but rather to point out that they have been perpetually abandoned and provided with fewer resources and opportunities than middle or upper class populations. It is the “conditioning” to frustration and disappointment that I wish to stress because such habituation can make mass mobilization an almost Sisyphean task.

LCOER prioritize their efforts to expand real opportunities for their constituency. In order to do this, schooling and other education requirements must be coupled with and followed by genuine opportunity for advancement rather than dead-end jobs. (Bernick 1987) It is only through success on a widespread community level that substantial change can be made to preexisting cultural expectations. Stone explains that the role of the regime in creating comprehensive positive change is to, “create a complex set of incentives that are extensive enough to affect classwide views and that are intensive enough to sustain ongoing personal commitments to make use of expanded opportunities.” (Stone 1987: 20-22) Lofty as the goal may be, with such a mandate as the definition of success, it is not entirely surprising that this regime type is largely hypothetical. Nonetheless, much like in the pursuit of the sustainable city, though the end goal may be unlikely, any progress towards that goal represents a significant positive change from the status quo.

The Importance of Regime Types in the Pursuit of Urban Sustainability

If Stone is correct in his contention that there are four distinctly different types of urban governance regimes, and that part of the difference is found in the types of policies and programs different cities choose to pursue, then what does this imply for local sustainability? It does not require a huge leap of faith to infer that one or two of the four regime types would seem to be much more likely to be associated with efforts to become more sustainable. As Stone notes,

MCPR focus on policies such as environmental protection, affordable housing, historic preservation, and a variety of other social goals, all of which appear consistent with trying to become more sustainable. Cities with other regime types apparently choose to ignore these kinds of policies. In short, a close reading of Stone's work strongly suggests that MCPR should be very different from maintenance regimes and development regimes, especially with respect to sustainability. LCOER pursue progressive goals similar to MCPR, though to a lesser degree because of the difficulties of organizing their mass public. Thus, I expect cities that are characterized as MCPR or LCOER to be cities that take sustainability seriously, and that cities characterized by one of the other regime types will be cities that do not take sustainability very seriously.

Chapter 4

Methodology

In order to further explore the theoretical relationship between environmental sustainability and urban governance, I created an empirical research study. This study included some personal interviews and the extensive use of a standardized survey questionnaire directed at elected and appointed top city officials as well as chambers of commerce. The purpose of the interviews and questionnaire was to elicit information that would not be available through other means, especially information directly related to aspects of cities' governance regimes.

The Cities Involved

To develop an accurate picture of governance regimes and their correlation with environmental sustainability, Kent Portney and I selected fourteen cities from across the nation. A decision was made to control for population size, focusing on fourteen moderate-sized cities. These cities all have similar population sizes, ranging on average from 400,000 to 600,000 residents as measured by the 2000 decennial Census. Due to time and resource constraints, we capped the study at fourteen cities, although there are only a handful of additional cities in the U.S. that fall into this population range. In other words, these cities represent nearly the entire population of U.S. cities in this population range. Although previous research has shown little correlation between the size of cities and their propensity to try to become more sustainable, a practical limit of fourteen cities suggested the wisdom of holding population size relatively constant.

Eight of the fourteen cities have been identified by Portney as “sustainable cities,” cities that have articulated policies aimed at trying to become more sustainable. Again, this does not

mean that these eight cities are actually sustainable, but rather that they are engaged in a significant number of sustainable practices and are taking the concept seriously. These eight cities represent communities that vary fairly widely with respect to the degree to which they actually take sustainability seriously. The cities range from exemplary examples of cities that take sustainability seriously, to cities that take the concept only moderately more seriously than the average American city. These eight cities served as our experimental cases. As will be noted later, because of the low number of questionnaire responses from Washington, D.C., the group of “sustainable cities” turns out to be seven rather than eight.

The other six cities serve as controls or comparison cities. None of these six comparison cities have articulated any type of sustainability policies, and are therefore not ranked on Portney’s list of Cities that Take Sustainability Seriously. Both the experimental group of eight sustainable cities and the six comparison cities were chosen to include cities from varied geographical and regional backgrounds. By including only those cities with similar populations and a wide range of geography, we hoped to avoid regional and population biases. Clearly, there are unavoidable regional differences. The comparison group cities are more likely to be in the South and less likely to be in the Midwest; the comparison group contains no cities from the Northeast or West coast. The possible implications of this will be discussed later in this thesis.

Table 1: The Cities Included in the Study

Cities Actively Engaged in Sustainability*	Cities not Actively Engaged
Atlanta, GA (14)	Charlotte, NC
Boston, MA (14)	El Paso, TX
Denver, CO (29)	Fort Worth, TX
Kansas City, MO (22)	Las Vegas, NV
Milwaukee, WI (9)	Memphis, TN
Sacramento, CA (21)	Oklahoma City, OK
Seattle, WA (30)	
Washington, D.C. (18)	

* (#) denotes sustainability score out of 35 points on Portney’s list of sustainable cities

The Research Subjects

In an attempt to fully explore the governance issues in each city, Professor Portney and I focused our attention on an array of elected, appointed, and private sector positions in each city's governance regime. These positions included mayors, city council members and commissioners, the presidents/CEOs and communication directors of local chambers of commerce, and three government agency positions including the planning director, economic development director, and environmental director. We dealt individually with specific cases where a particular position was in flux, did not exist, or was relegated to another position or office. In cities with influential nonprofits or economic development corporations, an additional questionnaire was sent to the director of the respective project. In all, a list of 240 public officials was compiled for these fourteen cities, representing an average of over seventeen people per city. Each of these people was mailed a printed questionnaire.

The Design of the Survey

In an effort to avoid any unintentional biases in eliciting information from survey respondents, Professor Portney and I created a standardized written questionnaire for each of four sets of subjects. The different sets of subjects were, "City Councilors" (mayors were included in this group, although no mayors responded), "Chamber of Commerce officials," "City Administrators," and "Nonprofit Leaders." A slightly different questionnaire was prepared for each of these types of respondents. The questionnaires were tailored to each city with the names of the respective cities embedded in the questions. Instead of making reference to generic language, such as "in your city," the questionnaires made reference to "in Atlanta," or "in Kansas

City,” etc., to personalize the questions. A copy of the questionnaire sent to city councilors can be viewed in Appendix A.

Once these questionnaires were designed and pre-tested by administering them to a few dozen disinterested individuals, the research design was submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost with a request to be exempt from IRB for research on human subjects. The exemption was requested, and subsequently granted, on the basis that the research subjects are public officials, a criterion that typically qualifies a study for exemption. After this written exemption was received, the questionnaires were mailed to each identified respondent. Consistent with recommendations from experts on mail surveys, a decision was made to offer incentives for respondents who returned completed questionnaires. Each respondent was offered the opportunity to receive a free copy of Professor Portney’s book Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously. Additionally, each respondent was offered the opportunity to be included in a raffle drawing for a free iPod Mini.³

The mailing included the questionnaire, a one page letter (on Tufts letterhead, a sample of which can be found in Appendix B) explaining why the respondent was receiving the survey, a prepaid postcard on which they could write their name so as to remain anonymous if so desired, and a prepaid return envelope with Professor Portney’s address at the Tufts University Political Science Department. The postcard was also used to determine eligibility to receive the free book and to be entered into the iPod raffle. After two weeks, a postcard reminder was sent to all respondents who had not yet returned a questionnaire. This postcard reminded the respondent that they had received our questionnaire and asked them to complete and return it. If they had not received a questionnaire, we asked them to contact us so that we could send them a replacement questionnaire. About three weeks after this step, we sent a second copy of the

³ The iPod Mini was randomly awarded to city councilor Jan Drago of Seattle.

questionnaire to those who we believed had still not returned a questionnaire. All of these steps were in accordance with the standard political science literature advising the best methods by which to follow in order to maximize response rates. (Dillman 2000) After speaking with a small number of respective respondents who expressed a preference for answering questionnaires over the Internet, an online version of the questionnaire was subsequently created with the assistance of Thomas McGuiness of the Tufts Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation. Email messages were sent to city councilors and city administrators who had not returned the initial mail questionnaire offering them the option of doing the questionnaire online. The intent of the online version of the questionnaire was to offer an alternative to the mail questionnaire for those who had not returned the latter. The online questionnaire induced six additional responses. The total number of completed questionnaires was 64. Calculating the response rate as the ratio of the number of completed questionnaires (64) to the total number of targeted respondents (240) yields an overall response rate of 26.7%. This is a response rate that is generally consistent with those reported for mail surveys in the survey research literature.

One city, Washington, D.C., turned out to be more problematic than the others. Only one official from that city responded, making the quality of the information suspect. Rather than making an extra-special effort to stimulate responses there, a decision was made to drop this city from the group of sustainable cities, focusing on the seven remaining cities.

Coding

In order to enable the quantitative analysis of the responses, the next step in the process was the coding of the variables from all returned questionnaires. An extensive codebook was created in order to transform our respondents' answers, many of which are verbatim responses to

open-ended questions, into numerical values. The coding scheme varied depending on the question. A decision was made to design the coding system in order to initially retain as much information as possible. Some questions were based on fixed responses where the coding was essentially automatic. Each fixed response was simply given a unique numerical code. Other questions included limited open-ended responses. Examples of these types of questions are those measuring the educational background of the respondents. Providing fixed responses for every possible degree or major would have been unwieldy and unmanageable, so this was treated as a limited open-ended question. Coding these answers simply entailed assigning a unique code to each degree or major encountered, often utilizing more than fifty codes that later had to be recoded into a smaller number of more manageable broad categories.

The final type of coding was that for the full open-ended questions. These questions elicited responses in the form verbatim sentences and paragraphs. These were the most difficult to code as they required making decisions about exactly what variables would be defined from the text, what the appropriate categories of these variables would be, and then transforming the often large amounts of writing into numerical codes representing each of the categories. It was during this coding that there was the largest potential “loss” of information. Though some information may have been lost in interpretations underlying the coding process, the original responses were still available as verbatim fodder for this study. Many of these coded variables had to be later condensed into variables with two or three broad categories. Also included in the survey were “multi-response questions” that asked the respondent to provide two or three responses for a single question. These were generally limited open-ended response codes, and none of these questions were used in the data analysis for this thesis.

Personal Interviews

With the help of the Summer Scholars Program research stipend and the Tufts Institute of the Environment Undergraduate Research Fellowship, I visited two study cities in order to conduct personal interviews. The mail and online surveys provided the statistical basis on which our research was conducted, but Professor Portney and I determined that one-on-one interviews would be better suited to illustrate how cities that take sustainability seriously actually function. Personal interviews would put a face on these cities and provide a “real life” addition to complement our theoretical and statistical study.

Denver, CO and Seattle, WA were chosen as our two target cities. Seattle is ranked #1 with a score of 30 out of 35 possible points on Professor Portney’s list of Cities that take Sustainability Seriously; Denver is ranked #2 with a score of 29. With one exception, all of the people who accepted an interview had previously received, if not filled out and returned, a questionnaire. In this section I will provide the names and positions of my interviewees, but the content of the interviews will be included in later sections and dispersed throughout the paper. While the responses to the standardized questionnaires were anonymous and confidential, those who allowed me to interview them gave me permission to attribute their name and position to their responses.

In Seattle, I interviewed city council members Richard Conlin and Peter Steinbrueck, Director of Sustainability Steve Nicholas, Executive Director of Sustainable Seattle Inc. Chantal Stevens, and Director of Planning and Development Diane Sugimura. Of these interviewees, only Chantal Stevens had not previously received a questionnaire, though she later received and returned a questionnaire. My interview with Diane Sugimura was unplanned and shorter than the rest. I had wished to interview her, but it had not been possible to arrange a meeting.

Fortunately, I happened to meet her in the waiting room of the city councilor chambers and she was able to speak with me for approximately 10-15 minutes. In Denver, I interviewed the Director of Sustainability Beth Conover and the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Development Cecilia Ortiz. Cecilia Ortiz had not previously received a questionnaire, as she was speaking for her superior, John Huggins, who had received our survey and was out of the state while I was in Denver.

For each respondent, I prepared individualized questions based on their particular position and responses from the standardized questionnaire. Some questions, like their interaction with the business community, remained consistent among all the interviews. Other questions utilized local current events and my knowledge of the city or the respondent's recent activities to elicit deeper and more textured responses. Often, I introduced additional questions based on things I had learned from other interviews.

In total, I spent three working days in Seattle and two working days in Denver. I was also in both cities for the weekends and I utilized this time to walk the streets and obtain a street level feel for the cities and their people.

Intent and Goal of the Surveys and Interviews

The purpose of the survey research and personal interviews was to help illuminate the relationship between urban governance and environmental sustainability. Particularly, I focused on the interaction between the city government and the local business community and how that dialogue and level of influence determines policy making in regards to sustainability. The standardized surveys endeavored to accomplish several goals. First, the surveys queried respondents on various background questions including their education and occupational history

as well as their tenure in their current position. The next portion, encompassing the vast majority of the questions, focused on the respondents' work in their current position. Of particular import to the study is the interaction between the respondent and business, or between the respondent and government if the respondent was in the business or nonprofit fields. The survey asks respondents to detail the number of such meetings they have had over the last year and the purpose and outcome of the meetings. The survey also asked questions pertaining to sustainability and livability in the respondent's city as well as their attitudes towards and opinions on particular proposals, economic and environmental.

This study attempts to ascertain the locus of power in city government. Who has the power and who makes key decisions that affect how seriously a city takes sustainability? Through the standardized questionnaires and interviews, this research seeks to establish whether it is the city council or mayor that controls governance, if outside organizations and businesses play a major role in shaping policy and planning decisions, if the policymaking process is collaborative or conflictual, and what role local nonprofit organizations play in conditioning or moderating the effects of the local business community. The access to and/or collaboration of the business community with the city government is an essential piece of evidence in determining the locus of power. Particularly, I focus my efforts on establishing whether or not the business community and the government are "on the same page," or if they are at conflict. If business and government agree, why it is that they share a common viewpoint and how much of a role does business play in developing future plans?

As noted earlier, this thesis hypothesizes that there is a correlation between urban governance regimes and urban environmental sustainability.

Cities with Middle Class Progressive and Lower Class Opportunity Expansion governance regimes are more likely to take sustainable development seriously than cities with Maintenance or Development regimes.

The logic underlying this hypothesis is that the same urban governance regime factors that promote progressive policy making, as defined by Stone, should also engender sustainable development.

Rooted in the primary hypothesis, this study has a secondary concentration that focuses on nongovernmental influence in policy making and the balance of power, as well as the leverage relationship between city governments and local business communities. This secondary focus hypothesizes that there is a negative relationship between the influence of the business community on policy making and the pursuit of sustainability.

The more influence that the local business community is able to exert on urban governance and decision-making, the less likely it is that a city will take urban environmental sustainability seriously.

The logic of this secondary hypothesis is based on the understanding that business is, more often than not, a conservative entity. Businesses and chambers of commerce that speak for business communities that are large enough to exert significant influence on urban governance tend to follow traditional economic models and are generally averse to government induced changes in the way they conduct business. Thus, I conjecture that if public officials identify the business community as a major contributor to and wielder of influence on decision-making, then those cities will be less likely to pursue progressive sustainability measures.

The questions in the survey were intended to elicit responses that would shed light on the issues and relationships that define the policy making process in urban governments.

Refining Governance Regime Typologies

As defined by Stone and previously described in the section on governance regime typologies, there are four types of governance regimes: Maintenance, Development, Middle Class Progressive, Lower Class Opportunity Expansion. I have hypothesized that cities with the latter two regimes, MCPR and LCOER, are more likely to take sustainability seriously than cities with Maintenance or Development regimes. Although the original intent of this study was to utilize all four regime types and designate cities into one regime or another, it proved impossible to do so with the data that respondents provided. Instead, the data differentiated cities into two distinct categories rather than four. Thus, I condensed Stone's four regime types into two regime clusters. Because MCPR and LCOER both focus their efforts on progressive goals, and it is these progressive strivings that I believe correlate with sustainability, I combined these two regimes into a single Progressive typology. Likewise, due to their connection to the business community and relative lack of innovation in policy making, I combined the Maintenance and Development regimes into a single Traditional typology.

Chapter 5

Business, Governance Regimes, and Sustainable Cities: Are there Discernible Patterns?

It is suggested in the literature that there are real differences between cities with varying levels of business influence on decision making, between cities that take sustainability seriously and those that do not, and between cities with different governance regimes. The question now begs, how do the patterns within each of these variables interact with each other? This section operationalizes the variables used to assess the relationships and correlations between business influence, the pursuit of sustainable development, and governance regime.

Operationalization of the New Governance Regime Typologies and Subsequent Findings

In order to operationalize the two new regime types and test the hypothesis, it was necessary to formulate survey questions whose answers would be used directly or indirectly to measure some characteristic of the governance regime type that the respondent was describing in their city. While all thirty questions in the survey aided generally to establish how governance in a particular city operates, there are six questions that were specifically designed to help place cities into one of the regime-type categories. The six questions used to operationalize the regime types were: 1) the respondent's attitude towards a specific proposal arising from the city's Comprehensive (long-term strategic) Plan; 2) the respondent's reaction to a proposal for preserving open space; 3) the respondent's assessment of who controls economic development in their city ("City Government", "Private Sector", or "True Partnership"); 4) the prevailing attitude towards economic development in the city; 5) the involvement of the business community in formation of the city's economic policy; and 6) a ratio of the number of meetings city officials

had with business officials compared to the number of meetings city officials had with nonprofit or community officials. I will include the verbatim questions in the data analysis and the questions can be viewed in context in Appendix A.

In order to examine whether there are patterns of correlation, I crosstabulated each of these independent variables with two dependent variables. The two dependent variables utilized were the “City Name” and the “City Group.” The crosstabulations using the “City Name” question correlate the respondent’s answer for each independent variable with their particular city. The other dependent variable, “City Group,” is a dichotomous variable that divides the cities based on whether they are in the sustainable cities group or the comparison group.

In the next section, I will explain how I operationalized each of these specific variables and will describe the process in greater detail. Additionally, I will provide aggregated crosstabulations (using “City Group” as the dependent variable) and disaggregated crosstabulations (using “City Name” as the dependent variable) by which to analyze the relationship between governance and sustainability by city group and by individual city. After I present and explain the findings of the data for these six questions, I will present two tables describing the overall findings for each city.

Ratio of Meetings with Business Officials compared to Meetings with Nonprofit and Community Officials

A major component of Stone’s concept of governance regime has to do with the role of business (the private sector) in local policymaking. Two survey questions asked the respondent to list the number of times they met with business officials and nonprofit or community officials, respectively. The questions are necessarily worded differently for surveys sent to chamber of

commerce and nonprofit officials, thus the responses from chamber of commerce people, nonprofit, and community officials were not used in the operationalization of this particular variable.

One of the underlying premises of the modified regime typology is that cities with MCPR and LCOER tend to keep business at arms length and give credence to views other than those purely economic, thus distinguishing them as Progressive regimes in comparison to the Maintenance and Development regimes that are more responsive to business. Answers to the first question—how often the respondent met with business representatives—would be inadequate measures of the potential influence of the business community because it only tells part of the story. Perhaps a particular city councilor met with dozens of business leaders and another only met with a few. It would be tempting to infer that the former communicated more with business, but perhaps the former actually met with more representatives from the nonprofit community than with the business community, and the latter met with no one from the nonprofit world. In order to account for the relative numbers of contacts, a ratio of meetings with business officials compared to meetings with nonprofit or community organization officials was computed. The expectation is that officials, especially city councilors, with a low ratio of business meetings to nonprofit or community meetings should be officials in the Progressive regime cities, while respondents with a high ratio should be in cities with Traditional regimes. Table 2 shows the results of the crosstabulation between this ratio and the type of city the respondent is from.

Table 2: Crosstabulation of the Ratio of Business to Nonprofit Contacts and City Type for City Councilors

Ratio of Business Meetings to Non-business Meetings		
	0-.6 (Low Ratio)	.61 and above (High Ratio)
Sustainable cities	76.2	46.7
Comparison cities	23.8	53.3
Total (n)	100% (21)	100% (15)

This aggregated crosstabulation of the results from this variable indicates that of respondents from cities that have a low ratio of meetings with business officials to nonprofit or community officials, 76.2% come from sustainable cities, while only 23.8% of respondents with a low ratio of business contacts come from comparison cities. Among respondents who interact with business leaders at a higher ratio, 46.7% of respondents are from “sustainable cities” compared to 53.3% from comparison cities. Both of these findings are consistent with Stone’s notion that cities with Progressive regimes are expected to keep business at arms length, but the percent difference between respondents from sustainable and comparison cities who have a low ratio of business meetings is staggering; there is a 52.4% difference between the two city groups.

Before I begin to draw any inferences from this simple pattern of difference, it is valuable to look at how individual cities score. Are the general patterns in Table 2 borne out for all of the cities in the respective group, or are there notable exceptions? The disaggregated crosstabulation of the ratio of business to non-business meetings, shown in Table 3, allows us to assess patterns for individual cities. Once again, if there is a relationship between taking sustainability seriously and Progressive governance regimes, the ratio of business meetings to non-business meetings should be lower in sustainable cities than in the comparison cities.

Table 3: Disaggregated Ratio of Business to Nonprofit Contacts and City for City Councilors

Ratio of Business Meetings to Non-business Meetings			
	0-.6 (Low Ratio)	.61 and above (High Ratio)	Total
Sustainable Cities			100% (23)
Atlanta	33.3%	66.7%	100% (3)
Boston	100.0%	0.0%	100% (1)
Denver	83.3%	16.7%	100% (6)
Kansas City, MO	33.3%	66.7%	100% (3)
Milwaukee	100.0%	0.0%	100% (3)
Sacramento	66.7%	33.3%	100% (3)
Seattle	75.0%	25.0%	100% (4)
Comparison Cities			100% (13)
Charlotte	50.0%	50.0%	100% (2)
El Paso	33.3%	66.7%	100% (3)
Fort Worth	50.0%	50.0%	100% (2)
Las Vegas	0.0%	100.0%	100% (1)
Memphis	0.0%	100.0%	100% (2)
Oklahoma City	66.7%	33.3%	100% (3)

The disaggregated data in Table 3 indicate that four of the seven sustainable cities have a low business contact ratio. The responses from Atlanta were 50-50. Of the sustainable cities, only Boston and Kansas City have business contact ratios in the high category. In the comparison group, with the exception of Oklahoma City and Fort Worth, every city has a business contact ratio that falls in the high category. The responses from Fort Worth were 50-50. The ratio of business meetings to non-business meetings appears to support the theory that sustainable cities have Progressive regimes in that they limit their exposure to business, or temper their exposure to business with other opinions, such as those from the nonprofit or community arenas. Clearly, with a few exceptions, the sustainable cities seem to keep business more at arms length than do the comparison group of cities.

Control of Development: Private Sector vs. Government or True Partnership

Contacts between business leaders and public sector officials are not the only indicator of the role and influence of business in local policymaking. Another element has to do with perceptions of who controls economic development in the city. Again, Stone's theory suggests that business should play a lesser role in cities with Progressive regimes than in cities with Traditional regimes. In order to look at perceptions of who controls development, respondents were asked this question fairly directly. This question attempts to ascertain which institutional entity has power in economic development decisions.

“Overall, who would you say exercises the most control over Economic Development in [city name]? Would you say that it is largely the **city government** that controls Economic Development, the **private sector**, a true **partnership** between city government and the private sector, or **someone else**?”

While most respondents seemed to have no difficulty making a choice, one respondent wrote in that both the government and the private sector controlled development equally but not as partners.

Cities with Development and Maintenance regimes, which I have combined together into the Traditional regime, are, according to Stone, more likely to have their economic development directed by the private sector than by the government. Thus, officials who perceive that economic development is controlled by the private sector are expected to be from cities with Traditional regimes, while cities whose economic development is perceived to be controlled by the government or a partnership are likely to be from cities with Progressive governance regimes. Table 4 examines whether this relationship seems to be accurate.

Table 4: Crosstabulation between the Perception of Control in Economic Development and City Type

Control of Economic Development		
	Private Sector	Government/Partnership
Sustainable Cities	58.6%	47.1%
Comparison Cities	41.4%	52.9%
Total (n)	100% (29)	100% (34)

As it turns out, the overall crosstabulation for this independent variable communicates the opposite findings of what my hypothesis expected. Respondents from sustainable cities indicated that the private sector is in control of economic development more so than the government or a partnership. Though the percentage is not highly indicative, it is worth noting that of respondents who indicated that the government or a partnership directed economic development, more than half came from the comparison cities.

Table 5 shows that the majority of respondents from five of the seven sustainable cities indicate that the government or a partnership control economic development in their respective city. It turns out that a major reason why the overall pattern in Table 4 and disaggregated pattern in Table 5 differ is the city of Denver. There are more respondents from Denver than any other sustainable city, and 71.4% of Denver’s respondents perceive the private sector as the controller of economic development. Thus, when Denver’s influence is taken into account, that the vast majority of respondents in sustainable cities, 71.4%, support the notion that sustainable cities, like Progressive regimes, are likely to have their economic development controlled by the government or a partnership. If the question of who controls economic development is to differentiate between Progressive and Traditional regimes, and unsustainable cities are expected to be Traditional, then the data from the comparison cities appears to refute such an argument. Although five of the seven sustainable cities do show patterns consistent with having Progressive

regimes, as per the operationalization of this variable, four of the six comparison cities also show similar patterns of having Progressive regimes.

Table 5: Disaggregated Crosstabulation between Perceived Control of Economic Development and City

Control of Economic Development			
	Private Sector	Government/Partnership	Total
Sustainable Cities			100% (34)
Atlanta	75.0%	25.0%	100% (4)
Boston	33.3%	66.7%	100% (3)
Denver	71.4%	28.6%	100% (7)
Kansas City, MO	20.0%	80.0%	100% (5)
Milwaukee	40.0%	60.0%	100% (5)
Sacramento	50.0%	50.0%	100% (4)
Seattle	0.0%	100.0%	100% (5)
Comparison Cities			100% (30)
Charlotte	14.3%	85.7%	100% (7)
El Paso	71.4%	28.6%	100% (7)
Fort Worth	0.0%	100.0%	100% (4)
Las Vegas	33.3%	66.7%	100% (3)
Memphis	66.7%	33.3%	100% (3)
Oklahoma City	33.3%	66.7%	100% (6)

Although findings from the aggregated crosstabulation in Table 4 show that respondents in the sustainable cities asserted, on average, that the private sector controls economic development, the disaggregated data appear to tell a different story.

From the literature on sustainability in Denver as well as my experiences there, I do not find it surprising that the majority of respondents from Denver believe that the city’s economic development is controlled by the private sector. Mayor Hickenlooper is credited as the major driving force in the success of Denver’s recent sustainability efforts and he can also be pointed to as the main reason why the private sector wields immense policy-influencing power in the city. Hickenlooper’s background is very traditional. He was trained as a geologist and is a local businessman. He owns several breweries and restaurants in the city, and was influential in

helping to redevelop LODO, Denver's now thriving lower downtown. Because Hickenlooper spent the majority of his career in the private sector, he has many contacts in that realm and is seen as a peer leader within the business community. When I queried Cecelia Ortiz, Denver's Deputy Director of Economic Development, as to who wields the most power in city government, she responded, "The mayor runs the city." (Ortiz, Cecilia. Personal Interview. 10 Aug. 2006.) The mayor's power relationship with the business community and his interest in sustainability makes for a unique situation that differs from the typical relationship between sustainability and the business community.

In general, business communities view with distrust sustainability and environmental initiatives that arise from city government. For this reason, I operationalize and interpret the "who controls?" variable such that control by the private sector corresponds with Traditional regimes. However, because Hickenlooper is a product of the private sector *and* is interested in pursuing sustainability, he throws a wrench in the traditional economic development machinery by personifying the new wave of thinking about sustainability. Denver's mayor has utilized his standing in the business community to convince his private sector peers that sustainability is not harmful to the bottom line and can in fact often be beneficial. Hickenlooper persuades the business community of the logic of sustainability by developing and delivering a strong "business case." This strategy has manifested in many arenas, but none more successful than in the realm of green building.⁴ Briefly stated, the "business case" refers to a traditional finance plan that explains a project's strategy, costs, return, and bottom line.

According to Ms. Ortiz, the business community accepts the "business case" for the mayor's sustainability agenda because his business background "gives him credibility." The

⁴ A deeper analysis of the effect of the "business case" on the business community and its manifestation in green building can be found in Appendix D.

private sector sees him as a credible source of information and direction and thus stands behind and in support of the mayor. The business community in Denver is not progressive by any means, but rather appreciates the “business case” presented for the growth of the city in the long run. (Ortiz, Cecilia. Personal Interview. 10 Aug. 2006.) The private sector even fully supported Fastracks, Denver’s light rail initiative, and other progressive ideas that would have met with harsh opposition from the business community in other municipalities. The business community also supports “Greenprint Denver,” the strategic plan for sustainability in Denver. In fact, according to Denver’s Director of Sustainability, Beth Conover, half of the Greenprint Council is comprised of influential business people. The Greenprint Council is a leadership group comprised of city and community members with diverse areas of expertise in public policy, land use and development, energy, education, law, and other fields. The Council serves as a guiding element for the direction and implementation of Denver’s sustainability action agenda. The city intentionally appointed business people to the Council because doing so enhances the credibility of the sustainability effort in the eyes of the city council and private sector. (Conover, Beth. Personal Interview. 10 Aug. 2006.)

It is clear that the combative or at least distrustful relationship between the government and business community on which I base the operationalization of this variable does not characterize the relationship of the two entities in Denver. A more thorough investigation into the internal governance of Denver reveals that the relationship between the government and business community represents a situation that does not fit into the operationalization of the “who controls?” variable. I will discuss how Denver pursues sustainable development in more detail later, but for now accept that Denver is an exception to the theory that business has a negative influence on sustainability.

Prevailing Attitude toward Economic Development

Another element that attempts to distinguish Progressive regimes from Traditional regimes is the prevailing attitude toward economic development. In cities with Traditional regimes, the prevailing attitude is that any and all economic development is good. Indeed, some have argued that in this type of city, economic growth represents the third rail of local politics. In such cities, the idea that local government would exist for any other reason is rarely questioned. (Molotch 1976) On the other hand, cities with Progressive regimes are more likely to see economic development as a means to other ends, and individual economic development strategies and projects are evaluated on the basis of whether or not they contribute to these other ends. In sustainable cities, for example, economic development would be favored if it promoted some conception of sustainability or livability, but opposed if it undermined this goal. In order to examine the prevailing attitude toward economic development, the questionnaire included a question that queried respondents as to their perception of the prevailing attitude toward economic development in their city. This question attempts to discern the attitude of a city's governance regime towards new economic development.

“What is your assessment of the prevailing attitude toward Economic Development in [city name] today? Would you say that the attitude would **accept just about any kind of Economic Development proposed by the business community as long as there was not significant public opposition, or would **accept Economic Development only under specific conditions.**”**

According to Stone, cities with Maintenance and Development regimes rely heavily on the business community for economic development. The city government does not take an active role in determining future development and in the case of Maintenance regimes, abstains

altogether from influencing development. Development regimes do take an active interest in economic development, but do not set guidelines or parameters. Rather, they encourage or subsidize the efforts of the private sector. Alternatively, Progressive regimes *do* actively attempt to influence the economic development that occurs in their cities. Progressive regimes will not accept any and all kinds of economic development proposals. Instead, they utilize their governmental authority to encourage particular businesses and discourage others. Thus, the operationalization of this variable is such that those respondents who indicate that their city will accept, “just about any kind of Economic Development proposed by the business community” describe a Traditional regime, while those who respond that they would “accept Economic Development only under specific conditions” describe a Progressive regime. Once again, based on my hypothesis’ conflation of Progressive regimes and sustainable cities, I expect the responses from sustainable cities to show that they will accept only some kind of economic development.

The overall crosstabulation of the results from this variable, presented in Table 6, show a substantial divergence between sustainable and comparison cities. The preponderance, 69.2%, of respondents who answered that their regimes would accept any kind of economic development reside in comparison cities. Conversely, only 30.8% of respondents from sustainable cities responded that they would accept any kind of economic development.

Table 6: Crosstabulation between the Prevailing Attitude toward Economic Development and the City Type

Prevailing Attitude toward Economic Development		
	Accept Any Kind	Accept Only Some
Sustainable Cities	30.8%	57.1%
Comparison Cities	69.2%	42.9%
Total (n)	100% (13)	100% (42)

While only a small number of respondents gave the “accept any kind” of economic development answer, the pattern indicates a divergence between sustainable and comparison cities. Of the respondents who would accept only some economic development proposals from the business community, 57.1% were from sustainable cities compared to 42.9% of respondents from comparison cities. According to this overall crosstabulation, there appears to be a notable correlation between sustainable cities and Progressive regimes and between the comparison cities and Traditional regimes.

The disaggregated crosstabulation of responses for this variable, shown in Table 7, make a strong case that sustainable cities are likely to have Progressive governance regimes. All seven sustainable cities report that their regime would accept only some economic development proposed by the business community. Four of the seven cities state this fact unequivocally with 100% of respondents.

Table 7: Disaggregated Crosstabulation between Prevailing Attitudes toward Economic Development and City

Prevailing Attitude toward Economic Development			
	Accept Any Kind	Accept only Some	Total
Sustainable Cities			100% (28)
Atlanta	0.0%	100.0%	100% (4)
Boston	33.3%	66.7%	100% (3)
Denver	28.6%	71.4%	100% (7)
Kansas City, MO	0.0%	100.0%	100% (2)
Milwaukee	25.0%	75.0%	100% (4)
Sacramento	0.0%	100.0%	100% (4)
Seattle	0.0%	100.0%	100% (4)
Comparison Cities			100% (27)
Charlotte	14.3%	85.7%	100% (7)
El Paso	71.4%	28.6%	100% (7)
Fort Worth	0.0%	100.0%	100% (4)
Las Vegas	33.3%	66.7%	100% (3)
Memphis	66.7%	33.3%	100% (2)
Oklahoma City	33.3%	66.7%	100% (4)

As evidenced by Table 7, unlike the sustainable cities, the results for the comparison cities do not elucidate as strong a trend towards a Traditional or Progressive governance regime. Although my hypothesis expected comparison cities to accept any kind of development from the business community, this is not the case. Only two of the six comparison cities would accept any economic development proposed by the business community. The other four comparison cities report that, like the sustainable cities, they would accept only some economic development proposals from the business community. Using this variable, one cannot make the argument that comparison cities have Traditional regimes, even though sustainable cities do seem to have Progressive regimes.

Involvement of Business in Policy Decisions

Yet another dimension of the role of the business community on governance focuses on how directly involved the business community is in the process of setting local economic development policies. One question on the questionnaire attempts to determine the extent to which the business community is involved in policy-making decisions.

“Over the last five years or so, how involved has the **business community** been in formulation of [city name] Economic Development policies and strategies? Would you say that the business community has been **highly involved** in the formulation of the City’s Economic Development policies, the business community has **operated at arms length**, or has been **largely uninvolved**?”

Like the preceding questions, this question strives to illuminate the interaction between government and the business community in regards to policy making at the city level. As per our understanding of the modified regime typology, this variable is operationalized such that cities in which business is “highly involved” in the policy making process have Traditional governance

regimes, while cities that keep the business community “at arms length” or in which the business community is “largely uninvolved” in the policy making process have Progressive regimes. Thus, the “at arms length” and “largely uninvolved” responses are combined into a single category, “not involved.”

The aggregated crosstabulation for this variable, shown in Table 8, indicates that there is a difference between sustainable cities and comparison cities in regards to the involvement of the business community in policy making. Of the respondents who said that the business community is highly involved in policy making, less than half, 45.7%, are from sustainable cities while more than half, 54.3%, are from comparison cities.

Table 8: Crosstabulation between the Involvement of the Business Community in Policy Decisions and City Type

	Involvement of Business in Policy Decisions	
	Involved	Not Involved
Sustainable Cities	45.7%	72.2%
Comparison Cities	54.3%	27.8%
Total (n)	100% (46)	100% (18)

Further, of the respondents who reported that business was “not involved” in policy decisions, 72.2% were from sustainable cities as compared to only 27.8% from the comparison cities. This divide is quite striking. Both responses support the argument that sustainable cities are more likely to have Progressive regimes, regimes with little or no business involvement in local policymaking, while comparison cities are more likely to have Traditional regimes.

The disaggregated crosstabulation of responses for this variable, presented in Table 9, does not illustrate any clear-cut trends within the two city groups. The respondents from only two of the thirteen study cities indicate that the business community is not involved in policy making. Considering the importance and impact of city policy on the local business community

in a given city, it is not surprising that more cities do not, or cannot, keep the business community from being highly involved in policy making.

Table 9: Disaggregated Crosstabulation between the Involvement of the Business Community and City

Involvement of Business in Policy Decisions			
	Involved	Not Involved	Total
Sustainable Cities			100% (33)
Atlanta	100.0%	0.0%	100% (4)
Boston	66.7%	33.3%	100% (3)
Denver	71.4%	28.6%	100% (7)
Kansas City, MO	40.0%	60.0%	100% (5)
Milwaukee	20.0%	80.0%	100% (5)
Sacramento	75.0%	25.0%	100% (4)
Seattle	80.0%	20.0%	100% (5)
Comparison Cities			100% (30)
Charlotte	100.0%	0.0%	100% (7)
El Paso	71.4%	28.6%	100% (7)
Fort Worth	100.0%	0.0%	100% (4)
Las Vegas	66.7%	33.3%	100% (3)
Memphis	66.7%	33.3%	100% (3)
Oklahoma City	83.30%	16.70%	100% (6)

However, the two cities whose responses indicated that the business community is not involved in policy making, Kansas City and Milwaukee, are both sustainable cities. Thus, while the disaggregated data indicate that the business community is likely to be in some way involved in the policy making process in both city groups, there is some evidence to suggest that sustainable cities are more likely to keep the business community at arms length or uninvolved in the policy making process than cities who do not take sustainability seriously. Nevertheless, according to the findings for this variable, there does not appear to be a city-by-city basis by which to determine that sustainable cities are likely have Progressive regimes and the comparison cities are likely to have Traditional regimes.

Attitude toward Open Space Proposal

More so than the other six, this question directly asks respondents to weigh in on an environmental or sustainability issue.

“If a proposal came before the City Council to **protect a significant amount of open space** from future development, what do you think your initial response would be? Would it be likely or unlikely that you would recommend such a proposal?”

As I explained in the regime typology section, MCPR and LCOER take progressive issues like environmental protection into account in their policy making more so than Maintenance or Development regimes. Therefore, if sustainable cities have Progressive regimes and comparison cities have Traditional regimes, one would expect the respondents from sustainable cities to be more likely to recommend the hypothetical proposal for open space than respondents from comparison cities.

The aggregated crosstabulation for this independent variable is not included here because it shows no significant differences between the two city groups.

According to Table 10, in neither the sustainable nor comparison group is there a sustained pattern of attitudes toward the hypothetical open space proposal. The respondents in two of the sustainable cities would strongly recommend the proposal while the others would not. Sacramento was split 50-50. Within the comparison group, respondents from two cities would respond favorably to the proposal, while the others would not.

Table 10: Disaggregated Crosstabulation between Attitudes toward an Open Space Proposal and City

Attitude toward Open Space Proposal			
	Not Favorable	Favorable	Total
Sustainable Cities			100% (33)
Atlanta	25.0%	75.0%	100% (4)
Boston	100.0%	0.0%	100% (3)
Denver	71.4%	28.6%	100% (7)
Kansas City, MO	80.0%	20.0%	100% (5)
Milwaukee	80.0%	20.0%	100% (5)
Sacramento	50.0%	50.0%	100% (4)
Seattle	0.0%	100.0%	100% (5)
Comparison Cities			100% (30)
Charlotte	57.1%	42.9%	100% (7)
El Paso	42.9%	57.1%	100% (7)
Fort Worth	75.0%	25.0%	100% (4)
Las Vegas	66.7%	33.3%	100% (3)
Memphis	100.0%	0.0%	100% (3)
Oklahoma City	33.3%	66.7%	100% (6)

Considering that this question was the only one that specifically focused on an environmental issue, I was quite surprised to find that sustainable cities were, on average, opposed to setting aside open space. In an attempt to delve deeper into the root of this conundrum, I reviewed the surveys and closely examined the verbatim explanations for which the respondents chose the “depends on specific proposal” or “unlikely to favor” options that composed the “not favorable” category, and the “likely favor” options that composed the “favorable” category. This exercise proved fruitful and exposed a major philosophical difference that divides the respondents from the two city groups.

Respondents from both city groups that were favorable to the proposal shared the same general positive sentiment towards the protection of open space. The real difference lay in the explanations provided by respondents in the two city groups for being “not favorable” to the proposal. On the whole, respondents from comparison cities made two arguments for opposing the open space proposal. One argument cited the importance of personal property rights and an

opposition to public “takings.” As a city councilor from a comparison city stated, “While I value the need for open space, I also value individual property rights, so any ‘protection’ of open space must be accomplished without ‘condemning’ vested property rights of the present land owner’s space.”⁵ The other argument held that the free market should decide land use. A chamber of commerce person from a comparison city stated simply, “I believe that the market should drive development.”⁶ These arguments were not mutually exclusive and there was significant overlap of the two arguments within the responses.

Of respondents from sustainable cities who answered in the “not favorable” category, not a single explanation utilized either the individual property rights or market forces argument. Responses from sustainable cities utilized an entirely different reasoning. Some respondents from sustainable cities explained that they would not favor the hypothetical open space proposal because their cities already had substantial amounts of open space and good park systems. A city councilor from a sustainable city explained, “[City name] has an arguable overabundance of open space and parks currently, to the point that the existing space is being poorly maintained and utilized. The need is not for more space. It is for better use of existing space.”⁷ Another councilor noted, “Our park system has been one of the best in the country and we are close to build out. We also have much open space from the former manufacturing industries.”⁸ It is evident from these responses that these councilors did not oppose the open space proposal because of a philosophical belief in economics or property rights, but rather because their cities already have substantial open spaces.

⁵ Survey # 25

⁶ Survey # 44

⁷ Survey # 36

⁸ Survey # 13

I was particularly surprised that the response from a particular high ranking city official in Denver was in the “not favorable” category. However, the thorough explanation provided pointed out a major concept of sustainability that I had not previously touched upon in my explanation of the concept. The respondent began by focusing on city planning and the relation of the open space in question to other open space and land use patterns in the city. Next, they elucidated the difference between those who promote “no growth” versus those who promote sustainable growth. “No growth” proponents, as the name suggests, oppose nearly all new development and lobby to preserve as much open space as possible. In contrast, sustainable development strives to achieve a healthy balance between preservation and development. The respondent used an example from Denver to explain the difference by first detailing the desire of “no growth” advocates and then the response from sustainability advocates. “Many people felt the former Stapleton Airport [a large tract of land in Denver that will be further discussed later] should be a giant park. It is actually stronger for the city [to combine] new urbanist development along with significant park land that also provides habitat and water quality benefits.”⁹ A sustainable approach to open space does not favor all potential open space proposals. Rather, it tries to work with the private sector to make development occur sustainably and simultaneously preserve particularly important open spaces. A city councilor from a sustainable city who echoed this sentiment explained that while he/she generally supported open space preservation, “[It] needs to be weighted against compact urban growth policies.”¹⁰ This qualification demonstrates that the benefit from promoting urban infill and urban density may outweigh the benefit garnered from preserving that site as open space.

⁹ Survey # 19

¹⁰ Survey # 50

A superficial analysis of the survey data reveals no difference between sustainable and comparison cities in regards to their attitudes toward preserving open space. However, when the explanations for those attitudes are studied, dichotomous fundamental philosophies arise that underpin the arguments and logic used by respondents from each city group.

Attitude toward Specific Project from Comprehensive Plan

As mentioned earlier, many traditional thinkers believe that the purpose of city government is to promote economic growth. Within this mindset, some cities focus all their efforts on raising revenue and keeping costs low. Their support for or opposition to specific proposals reflects this thinking. This question attempted to determine the reason for which a respondent would favor a specific proposal.

“What would you say is your predominant attitude **with respect to costs of a specific proposal that arises out of the City’s Comprehensive Plan? Would you say you would **rarely recommend such a proposal regardless of costs**, you would **recommend a proposal only if it promises to reduce the City’s operating costs from the outset**, you would **recommend the proposal only if it promises to reduce the City’s operating costs after some specified period of time**, or you would **recommend the proposal even if it increases the City’s operating costs by a small amount as long as it promises to contribute to making [city name] more sustainable?**”**

The respondent placed a check next to the line corresponding with their answer and was also given the opportunity to provide a more detailed answer. The more detailed answers are not included in this specific analysis.

The differentiation in this variable between Progressive and Traditional regimes strikes at the core question from which the two regime types diverge. What is the purpose of city government? Is the purpose of city government to provide basic services to its citizens while

keeping the city budget and taxes as low as possible, or is the purpose of city government to not only provide basic services, but also to promote livability and encourage social progress? This question represents a fundamental philosophical difference between Progressive and Traditional regimes. Traditional regimes tend to believe that costs and taxes should be kept low and that it is not the duty of government to pursue social aims. Progressive regimes explicitly focus their efforts on the advancement of social causes and pursue such ends even if they result in increased costs for the city. Progressive regimes value the advancement of social goals and believe that it is either worth the cost to the city, or that improvement in those social arenas will lower social costs (such as healthcare costs) in the future.

In operationalizing this question, all of the responses that included some reservation or qualification based on cost were combined into the “cost dependent” category. The one answer that favored the proposal even in the event of increased costs, (“recommend the proposal even if it increases the City’s operating costs by a small amount as long as it promises to contribute to making [city] more sustainable,”) is the “not cost dependent” category.

The aggregated crosstabulation of the findings for this variable, shown in Table 11, indicate that there is a difference between sustainable and comparison cities based on the cost of a proposal.

Table 11: Crosstabulation between Attitudes toward Specific Project Proposals and City Type

Attitude toward Specific Project from Comprehensive Plan		
	Cost Dependent	Not Dependent on Cost
Sustainable Cities	46.2%	54.9%
Comparison Cities	53.8%	45.1%
Total (n)	100% (13)	100% (51)

Of the responses that say their support is dependent on the cost of the proposal, more than half, 53.8%, are from comparison cities compared to only 46.2% from sustainable cities. Of the respondents that say their support is *not* dependent on the cost of the proposal, 54.9% are from sustainable cities as opposed to 45.1% from comparison cities.

The disaggregated crosstabulation of data for this variable indicates that the respondents from every sustainable city except Atlanta would favor the proposal even if it increased costs as long as it increased the sustainability of their city. Atlanta’s respondents were split 50-50. The results from the comparison cities are similar to those from the sustainable cities. The respondents from five of the six comparison cities also said that they would favor the proposals despite a cost increase if it would increase their city’s sustainability. Only the respondents from Fort Worth indicated that costs were their overarching concern and they would not support the proposal without appreciation of its costs.

Table 12: Disaggregated Crosstabulation between Attitudes toward Specific Project Proposals and City

Attitude toward Specific Project from Comprehensive Plan			
	Cost Dependent	Not Cost Dependent	Total
Sustainable Cities			100% (33)
Atlanta	50.0%	50.0%	100% (4)
Boston	33.3%	66.7%	100% (3)
Denver	14.3%	85.7%	100% (7)
Kansas City, MO	20.0%	80.0%	100% (5)
Milwaukee	20.0%	80.0%	100% (5)
Sacramento	0.0%	100.0%	100% (4)
Seattle	0.0%	100.0%	100% (5)
Comparison Cities			100% (30)
Charlotte	28.6%	71.4%	100% (7)
El Paso	14.3%	85.7%	100% (7)
Fort Worth	75.0%	25.0%	100% (4)
Las Vegas	0.0%	100.0%	100% (3)
Memphis	0.0%	100.0%	100% (3)
Oklahoma City	16.7%	83.3%	100% (6)

When I posed this question about costs to Seattle city councilor Peter Steinbrueck, he responded that he would support a proposal that increased costs as long as it promoted Seattle's sustainability because, "Urban sustainability reduces societal costs in the long run." (Steinbrueck, Peter. Personal Interview. 7 Aug. 2006.) Apparently, Mr. Steinbrueck is not alone in his thinking. The majority of respondents from both cities believe that there is value in promoting urban sustainability that supercedes short-term costs.

Conclusions from Aggregated and Disaggregated Data Analyses

It is apparent that the results of the six questions used to determine the governance regime of each city do not produce clear-cut findings. However, there are several poignant conclusions that do illustrate patterns within the city groups. The charts below list all of the study cities and assign a point value to each city corresponding to its responses to the six questions that determine governance regime. If a city responded 50% in each regime, it is given a one-point score in both regime types.

The two tables below, Tables 13 and 14, represent the conglomeration of the scores given to each city for each of the six operationalized variables. Table 13 displays the scores given to each city based on Progressive regime characteristics. Table 14 displays the scores given to each city based on Traditional regime characteristics.

Cities with Progressive Regimes

For each of the six questions, this scoring mechanism gives a city one-point for having a majority of its responses indicate that it has a Progressive regime. The highest possible score is 6.

Of the sustainable cities, all seven receive a score of 3 or above. Of the comparison cities, only four of the six receive a score of 3 or above. When a more stringent test of the Progressive regime is used, the difference is more decisive. Of the sustainable cities, five of the seven receive a score of 4 or above. Three of these cities receive a score of 5. Of the comparison cities, only two, Charlotte and Oklahoma City, receive a score of 4 or above. The only comparison city that receives a 5 is Oklahoma City.

Table 13: Scoring for Progressive Regime Characteristics

	Urban Governance Regime: Progressive						Total
	Meeting Ratio	Control Of Development	Prevailing Attitude	Business Involvement	Open Space	Project Attitude	
Seattle (30)	1	1	1		1	1	5
Denver (29)	1		1			1	3
Kansas City (22)		1	1	1		1	4
Sacramento (21)	1	1	1		1	1	5
Boston (14)	1	1	1			1	4
Atlanta (14)			1		1	1	3
Milwaukee (9)	1	1	1	1		1	5
Charlotte	1	1	1			1	4
El Paso			1		1	1	3
Fort Worth	1	1	1				3
Las Vegas		1				1	2
Memphis						1	1
Oklahoma City	1	1	1		1	1	5

To obtain the average score for Progressive regime characteristics by city group, I summed the totals for each city within the group and divided that total by the number of cities in the group. The average score for Progressive regime characteristics for sustainable cities is 4.1. The average score for Progressive regime characteristics for comparison cities is 3. It is apparent from the analysis of Table 13 that cities that take sustainability seriously are more likely to have Progressive governance regimes than comparison cities.

Based on this chart, there does not seem to be any correlation between a sustainable city's rank based on Portney's sustainability ranking system and the degree to which they fit into the Progressive regime typology. Seattle (30), Sacramento (21), and Milwaukee (9) all receive a score of 5, while Denver (29) only fits the Progressive regime when the less stringent scoring method is used.

Cities with Traditional Regimes

For each of the six questions, this scoring mechanism gives a city one-point for having a majority of its responses indicate that it has a Traditional regime. The highest possible score is 6.

Of the sustainable cities, four of the seven receive a score of 3 or above. Of the comparison cities, five of the six receive a score of 3 or above. When a more stringent test of the Traditional regime is used, the difference is once again more decisive. Of the sustainable cities, only one, Atlanta, receives a score of 4 or above. Of the comparison cities, three of the six receive a score of 4 or above. One of these cities, Memphis, receives a score of 5.

Table 14: Scoring for Traditional Regime Characteristics

Urban Governance Regime: Traditional							
	Meeting Ratio	Control of Development	Prevailing Attitude	Business Involvement	Open Space	Project Attitude	Total
Seattle (30)				1			1
Denver (29)		1		1	1		3
Kansas City (22)	1				1		2
Sacramento (21)		1		1	1		3
Boston (14)				1	1		2
Atlanta (14)	1	1		1		1	4
Milwaukee (9)					1		1
Charlotte	1			1	1		3
El Paso	1	1		1			3
Fort Worth	1			1	1	1	4
Las Vegas	1		1	1	1		4
Memphis	1	1	1	1	1		5
Oklahoma City				1			1

To obtain the average score for Traditional regime characteristics by city group, I summed the totals for each city within the group and divided that total by the number of cities in the group. The average score for Traditional regime characteristics for sustainable cities is 2.3. The average score for Traditional regime characteristics for comparison cities is 3.3. It is apparent from the analysis of Table 14 that cities that *do not* take sustainability seriously are more likely to have Traditional governance regimes than sustainable cities.

While sustainable cities were very likely to have a Progressive governance regime (4.1 average), comparison cities do not have as strong a correlation with Traditional regimes (3.3 average).

Urban Governance Regime Conclusions based on Scoring Mechanism

The findings from Tables 13 and 14 elucidate that among cities within each city group, sustainable and comparison, there are similar governance characteristics. These governance characteristics correlate Progressive regimes with sustainable cities and Traditional regimes with

cities that do not take sustainability seriously. This conclusion supports my primary hypothesis that cities with Progressive regimes are more likely to take sustainability seriously than cities that do not take sustainability seriously.

My secondary hypothesis suggests that cities in which the business community has significant influence on governance and policy making are less likely to take sustainability seriously than cities that are more insulated from the influence of business. Three of the six governance regime questions focus directly on the influence of the business community on governance: 1) the ratio of the number of meetings city officials had with business officials compared to the number of meetings city officials had with nonprofit or community officials; 2) the respondent's assessment of who controls economic development in their city; and 3) the involvement of the business community in formation of the city's economic policy. I utilized each city's score for these three variables in the Progressive and Traditional scoring schemes to determine whether there is a correlation between business influence and sustainability. If my hypothesis is correct, the average score for sustainable cities in Table 15, the Progressive regime characteristics table, should be closer to 3 (the highest possible score) than the average score for comparison cities. Similarly, the average score for comparison cities in Table 16, the Traditional regime characteristics table, should be closer to 3 than the average score for sustainable cities.

To calculate the average score for each city group, I summed their totals for the three business questions and divided the total by the number of cities in the group. Findings are minimally distorted because some cities' responses are counted in both regime types due to the 50-50 determination.

**Table 15: Scoring for Progressive Regime Characteristics
Based on Business Influence Questions**

Progressive Regime			
	Total Score	Average	Number of Cities
Sustainable Cities	12	1.7	7
Comparison Cities	7	1.2	6

When the influence of the business community on governance is directly targeted, the result mirrors those of the larger finding. On average, cities that better insulate themselves from the influence of the business community are more likely to be cities that take sustainability seriously than comparison cities. Based on the influence of business on governance, sustainable cities have a 57% likelihood of having a Progressive regime compared to a 40% likelihood for comparison cities. According to Table, 15, sustainable cities are 17% more likely to have Progressive regimes than comparison cities.

**Table 16: Scoring for Traditional Regime Characteristics
Based on Business Influence Questions**

Traditional Regime			
	Total Score	Average	Number of Cities
Sustainable Cities	10	1.4	7
Comparison Cities	13	2.2	6

Based on the influence of business on governance, sustainable cities have a 47% likelihood of having a Traditional regime as compared to a 73% likelihood for comparison cities. According to Table 16, comparison cities are 26% more likely to have Traditional regimes than sustainable cities.

The findings from Tables 15 and 16 support my secondary hypothesis that cities are less likely to take sustainability seriously when the local business community is influential in the

policy making process. Nonetheless, while the findings do concur with my modified version of Stone's regime typology, the data do not unconditionally support the patterns Stone describes within each regime. For the most part, cities that are largely influenced by business tend to have Traditional regimes; however, cities like Denver demonstrate that this pattern is not concrete. Similarly, Oklahoma City fits into the MCPR or LCOER regimes, yet does not pursue progressive policies like sustainable development. It is my assessment that Stone's typology is generally sound and can describe the majority of governance regimes with some accuracy, but that real life examples elucidate that cities are more nuanced than concrete in their governance characteristics and cannot be easily pigeonholed into regime types.

Chapter 6

Theory in Practice: Examples of Economic Development and Negotiation with Local Business in Progressive Regimes

It is reasonable to conclude from the findings of this study that there is a relationship between governance and the pursuit of sustainability. In particular, there is evidence to believe that sustainable development is more likely to be pursued in cities with Progressive governance regimes than in cities with Traditional governance regimes.

Up to this point, this study has pursued the connection between sustainability and governance in a largely theoretical capacity. Without real life examples of sustainable development in action, it is difficult to fully comprehend the way in which cities with Progressive regimes pursue sustainability. Much like I felt that my research was insufficient without in-person interviews to provide texture and a human touch to the data, I believe the argument that sustainable cities pursue development in a different manner than other cities is inadequate without strong case examples. I have included three such examples that demonstrate how cities with Progressive regimes act in the pursuit of sustainability. The first two examples focus on interactions between the private sector and the city government. The third example illustrates how a city government can proactively plan for and dictate the development of its municipality.

Case Examples of Interaction with Local Business in Cities with Progressive Regimes

The SuperSonics, a National Basketball Association franchise, currently reside and play in Seattle, Washington as they have since they joined the NBA as an expansion team in 1967. Since that time, they have called several sports arenas home, including the Seattle Center

Coliseum, the Kingdome, the Tacoma Dome, and most recently the KeyArena in which they have played since 1995. The Sonics, as they are commonly referred to, have enjoyed their share of success and failure throughout the years, winning the NBA Championship once and producing several Hall of Famers. Nevertheless, the future of the Sonics in Seattle is uncertain.

The owner of the Sonics and chairman of Starbucks, Howard Schultz, sold the team in 2006 for \$350 million to the Professional Basketball Club LLC, a group of Oklahoma City investors led by Clay Bennett. (Levine 2006) The Sonics, Seattle's oldest professional sports team, are now embroiled in a crisis concerning its future home. Mr. Schultz believed that the KeyArena, remodeled in 1994 and currently the smallest in the NBA, was no longer a fiscally viable NBA arena and had attempted negotiations with the city of Seattle to either renovate it or build a new arena. Mr. Schultz and the Sonics attempted to secure \$200 million in public financing for a renovation of KeyArena. The team would have contributed \$18 million. (Kowal 2006) After two fruitless years of negotiations, he was unable to reach a deal with city or state officials. According to Mr. Schultz's ownership group, they had lost \$60 million since purchasing the team in 2001 and blamed the losses on the uncompetitive finances of KeyArena and an unfavorable lease arrangement with the city of Seattle. (Bishop 2006) The major motivating drives to sell the team included rising losses and the lack of success in negotiations.

Now Mr. Bennett's group has picked up where Mr. Schultz left off and has delivered an ultimatum to Seattle. If, after twelve months, Mr. Bennett and his partners cannot reach an agreement with Seattle over a new stadium, they claim that they will be forced to move the team to a new location, presumably Oklahoma City. "If we [are not] able to find a successor facility and relative lease by then [twelve months], we have the option contractually to evaluate our position." (Sonics, Storm 2006) Oklahoma City, where Mr. Bennett's group has the most ties, is

the home of the currently empty Ford Center, a modern four-year-old 19,599-seat arena that was used by the New Orleans Hornets franchise after Hurricane Katrina. Despite voicing his desire to remain in Seattle, this option is the source of Mr. Bennett's greatest leverage in negotiations with Seattle.

The major sticking point in negotiations between Seattle and the Mr. Bennett revolves around the financing of a new arena. Mr. Bennett and his partners want Seattle to extend current hotel, car rental, and restaurant taxes to help pay for the construction of the new arena. These taxes were originally levied in order to pay off the debt on Safeco Field and Qwest Field, Seattle's professional baseball and football stadiums. The taxes, to be applied after they expire for the other Seattle stadiums, include a one-half of 1 percent sales tax on restaurant tabs and rental cars, and a hotel-motel tax in King County. At the time of the construction of Safeco and Qwest Field, there was significant opposition to public financing of the arenas, but city and state officials, with the help of local billionaire Paul Allen, were able to sufficiently suppress public opinion to push construction through. Now, the Seattle public has had its fill of financing private industry and is not willing to accept the high price tag Mr. Bennett's group wishes Seattle to assume.

The new arena that Professional Basketball Club LLC wants to build is slated to cost as much as \$530 million, ignoring any cost overruns. Mr. Bennett expects public financing to cover at least \$300 million, any cost overruns, and additional financial help from the city. Sonics representatives tout the proposed arena as a multipurpose building that would host conventions, hockey games, concerts and other events. Mr. Bennett cites Denver's Pepsi Center, which was named to host the 2008 Democratic National Convention, as a model for the type of large event-drawing facility the team wishes to build. However, arena critics note that the Pepsi Center was

built almost wholly with private financing. (Brunner 2007) Critics feel that the city of Seattle and state of Washington should not be responsible for subsidizing private industry when there are other pressing social issues at stake, such as education, health care, homelessness, and the future of Seattle's waterfront and Alaskan Way Viaduct.

Two recent polls have demonstrated overwhelming opposition to subsidizing sports arenas in King County and across the state. (Brunner 2007) In addition to general public opinion, several advocacy groups, including Citizens for More Important Things, have been waging war against publicly funded stadiums. According to David J. Olson, professor emeritus of political science at the University of Washington, owners of professional sports teams have long argued that their stadiums and arenas spur economic development, create jobs, boost tourism, and enhance a city's social status. However, Seattle does not buy into this theory. According to Professor Olsen, "Citizens in Seattle look around and see Microsoft and Boeing doing fabulously, the Port of Seattle is booming and trade with China is going to define this city's existence for the next 50 years...Seattle has said, We can be a big-league city, we can be an international city, without kowtowing to professional sports franchises." (Kowal 2006) Adam Glickman, a spokesperson for Service Employees International Union Local 775 said, "The public has made itself crystal clear over and over again that the public has no interest in tax subsidies for wealthy sports stadiums." In light of such vocal opposition, it is not surprising that Mr. Bennett wishes to avoid a public vote on the matter and has instead focused his efforts on persuading influential public officials.

Professor Olsen's analysis of Seattle's public opinion fits neatly into the ideas underlying a Progressive urban governance regime. Seattle recognizes itself as an attractive city for investment and does not see any need to subsidize private industry. Seattle is not desperate for

investment and it is confident that any revenue lost from the Sonics, if they move, will be made up for by another investor. According to the co-founder of Citizens for More Important Things, Chris Van Dyk, other cities “may be so desperate to lure tourists that they have to overpay for an N.B.A. team. Seattle doesn’t have to lure anybody.” (Kowal 2006) Seattle trusts in its own magnetism to draw new business and would rather spend its tax dollars on other more pertinent social needs.

It does not help the Sonics leveraging power that Seattle’s positive self-evaluation was vindicated when a major philanthropic nonprofit decided to build its new headquarters near the Sonics’ home. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation plans to build its privately financed headquarters in Seattle Center. The foundation, which provides billions of dollars to improve global education and health, has paid \$50 million for real estate, will build three office buildings, and will pay \$1.7 million for traffic improvements. As part of the deal, Seattle will build a \$15.3 million parking garage, which the city will own. The end result of this deal is several-fold. It demonstrates that Seattle is an attractive home to investment, and in this case, socially responsible investment that will create quality jobs and enhance Seattle’s status. It is not necessary for Seattle to subsidize private industry in order to spur economic development. Further, Seattle can pick and choose the kinds of industry it wishes to promote. While there is little concrete evidence that an NBA franchise provides social benefits, The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation exemplifies the social ethic that Seattle wishes to project worldwide. By making a minor financial commitment to the parking garage, Seattle becomes not only the home of one of the world largest aid organizations, but also replaces much of the economic development lost from the Sonics and creates high quality jobs.

As journalist Jessica Kowal points out, “To many Sonics fans, the rejection of sports financing proves that old, laid-back Seattle has been crushed by elitist Prius-driving do-gooders.” (Kowal 2006) While this sentiment may ring true, Seattle sees little wrong with being a do-gooder. Seattle would rather push for initiatives that benefit the socially progressive programs its citizens hold dear than perpetuate traditional economics for little benefit. And Seattle is not alone. Sacramento, another city with a Progressive regime also rebuffed its professional basketball team’s initial efforts for a new publicly financed arena.

Sacramento’s anti-stadium sentiment was demonstrated when voters rejected a sales tax increase to pay for a new arena for the Kings. One public financing proposal suggested was to raise the sales tax in Sacramento city and county by a quarter-cent for 10 years. According to Robert Waste, professor of public policy at California State University, Sacramento, “It remains to be seen whether local voters would accept anything of the sort.” Unless the Kings’ ownership sweetens the deal for Sacramento, it is unlikely that public opinion will allow for any such financing. A poll released last year by California State University, Sacramento, found that the majority of people in the region do not think the Kings need a new arena and are unwilling willing to pay for one. “The real question,” according to Professor Waste, is “Can Darrell [former state Assemblyman Darrell Steinberg] or anyone else close the gap between the money needed for an arena and the public support needed for an arena?” (Vellinga 2006)

The public financing scenarios in both Seattle and Sacramento demonstrate the fundamental leverage relationship between city governments and local businesses. Cities with Progressive regimes take into account more than just traditional economic development ideas. While both Seattle and Sacramento want to grow, they wish to pursue positive growth. Positive growth is growth that benefits not only the city’s coffers, but also creates high quality jobs,

reduces pollution, promotes high-tech industries, or somehow reflects the social ethic of its citizens. In Seattle's case, a \$300-400 million subsidy to keep a mediocre basketball franchise is unappetizing in comparison to the other social and environmental projects and initiatives it deems important. That same amount of money could be used for immense social benefit or the taxes could not be levied at all and taxpayers could reinvest that money as they see fit. In the mind of a Progressive governance regime, growth for growth's sake is not growth worth having.

A Denver Nugget: Economic Development as (Un)usual

Denver, another city with a Progressive regime has also come to the conclusion that it does not have to accept or pursue any and every kind of economic development. In the past, Denver was a very growth oriented city and nearly all proposed new development was accepted. Today, according to the Deputy Director of the Denver Office of Economic Development, Cecilia Ortiz, things have changed. Now the city questions, "Is this the right growth?" The former notion of, "Growth, growth, growth," is being debunked in favor of positive growth. Denver has begun asking itself, "How do we *become* a sustainable city." Questions like these led Denver to pursue positive growth by practicing the concept of "economic gardening." So how does one cultivate economic growth to ensure the best possible growth rather than the "biggest or fastest?" In recent years, Denver has become more proactive in its approach to growth and has articulated a plan of what it wants to see from new businesses. Essential to Denver's success, this plan is clear and easily accessible to new businesses. The city, "wants to be clear on its strategies and goals" for a sustainable future. Through a series of governmental, nonprofit, and private sector partnerships, Denver has developed a collective "vision" that has taken hold. (Ortiz, Cecilia. Personal Interview. 10 Aug. 2006.)

Denver's desire for sustainable development manifests itself in the development of the old Stapleton Airport. Stapleton Airport is located within Denver's municipal boundaries and was the city's primary airport from 1929 until 1995. In 1995, the newly built Denver International Airport (DIA) took over as Denver's primary airport and Stapleton has languished as empty space ever since. The site, approximately one-third the size of Manhattan, represents one of the largest development sites in the world to be located near a major downtown area. As a result, there have been political and economic battles fought for control of development rights. The interesting twist in the Stapleton case is that the land was owned by the city of Denver, not the private sector. Thus, Denver was able to choose a destiny for the Stapleton site that matched its vision for sustainable development.

Denver took full advantage of its position as owner of this developmental gem and called on its citizens, the private sector, community organizations, and city planners to help create a plan for the site. The city plan for Stapleton was created through the efforts of many dedicated groups including the Stapleton Foundation, city officials, outside urban planners and urbanists, and other organizations. Ms. Ortiz points out the contributions of philanthropist Sam Gary's investments in the planning of the area and help in writing "The Green Book," also known as the Stapleton Master Development Plan. The Stapleton site was eventually sold for \$123.4 million to Forest City Enterprises, a worldwide development corporation. However, the land was not sold outright to Forest City; the site came with stipulations articulating that the site was to be developed with environmental sustainability and livability in mind. Even the sale price included environmental protection. Of the \$123.4 million, only \$79.4 million was for the land to be developed. The other \$44 million was dedicated for open space creation and maintenance. (Gleason, Tom. Tour Guide. 10 Aug. 2006.)

Tom Gleason, Vice President of Public Relations for Forest City Enterprises Stapleton, gave Jonathan Kevles of the Rocky Mountain Institute and me a personal tour of the Stapleton development. During the tour and while Mr. Gleason extolled the virtues of Stapleton, I saw for myself the creative use of preexisting resources and development techniques that help to create the burgeoning sustainable neighborhood. Once fully developed, the entire Stapleton site will be home to 30,000 residents (a small city), extensive greenways and open spaces, schools, and mixed-use commercial areas connected by transit-oriented development (TOD), including rail. Water issues are of major concern in the region and thus they are also of primary concern in Stapleton. In an attempt to reduce the impact of the new development on water supplies and municipal infrastructure, Stapleton uses artificially constructed wetlands to deal with a large percentage of water purification and runoff. As a result and also due to the efficiency of the homes, Stapleton will utilize less water than it is legally entitled to use. The houses are all built to specifications that are 30% more efficient than the average home because all homes are equipped with ENERGY STAR appliances. An example of the site's use of preexisting resources can be found in the former airport runways. Of the former runway concrete, 100% is being reused onsite as walls for water channels, pavers, sidewalks, and road edges. Further, in an attempt to make housing more affordable, 10% of the homes will be affordable at 80% of the average median income (AMI). (Gleason, Tom. Tour Guide. 10 Aug. 2006.)

Ms. Ortiz credits the success of sustainable development in Stapleton on several factors. First and foremost, the key factor that allowed the site to become an example of sustainable development was that the land was owned by the city. Because of this, Denver was able to develop its own vision of what it wanted. Had the land been privately owned, "It would have had to be a really visionary developer" for the site to end up as impressive a final product. Ms.

Ortiz believes that a private developer would not have given as much credence to or brought in the same number of community groups as Denver did. “Often it is the role of government to provide an environment for creative thinking.” Without the institutional backing of the city, the site’s development would most likely have followed that of traditional economic models.

Despite all this, Ms. Ortiz admits, Stapleton was only able to become the model for sustainable development it is becoming due to “a perfect storm” of events. By this she means that there were certain key elements in place at important times with just the right individuals in charge. The city owned the land, the timing was right, and the philanthropy and community input was indispensable. (Ortiz, Cecilia. Personal Interview. 10 Aug. 2006.)

While Forest City has followed the overall green blueprint Denver set forth for Stapleton, there is more that could be done. For example, there is little effort put forth towards renewable energy options. Although Denver receives over 300 days of sunlight each year, there are no photovoltaic cells incorporated into homes. I inquired as to the forethought put into the roof construction and the ease with which a homeowner could install photovoltaics. Our guide’s response was that of disinterest and a general lack of concern. This and other gaps lead me to believe that while there is obviously a serious effort to undertake sustainable development, I see in Forest City Enterprises the undeniable hint of greenwashing. As Mr. Gleason himself pointed out, “Forest City is just implementing the plan given to it by the citizens and city of Denver.” (Gleason, Tom. Tour Guide. 10 Aug. 2006.) He said this with pride, demonstrating Forest City’s dedication to following the directions of the city. However, it also speaks to the separation between the ideals of the city and the business of development. Forest City fulfilled Denver’s wishes by pursuing sustainable development diligently, but no further than was necessary. While the city of Denver and others may have wanted Stapleton to go one step

further, both Denver and Forest City, as well as the residents who will inhabit Stapleton, should be content. Even if there is some element of greenwashing, Denver and Forest City have succeeded in encouraging and implementing substantial positive economic growth, while at the same time being able to say that they significantly reduced the environmental impact of development. All entities involved in some way with Stapleton agree that a final positive note gleaned from this case is that beyond the impact on the immediate land, the apparent success and high profile of the Stapleton project has had a substantial positive influence on the entire region's perception of sustainability, thus increasing the potential for future sustainable development projects.

Chapter 7

Shortcomings, Concerns, and Areas for Improvement

In many ways, this paper accomplished its goals and addressed its weaknesses as it progressed. However, there are many things that I would have liked to accomplish with this project that have been left unfinished as well as several areas that show room for improvement.

First, Professor Portney and I collected an impressive amount of data on each of the fourteen original cities in this study. The survey respondents provided us with rich detail about their backgrounds, specific issues within the city, and a variety of other topics. Nevertheless, of the thirty questions asked of respondents, only eight were really used in this study. There is sufficient data with which to write theses on several other topics and there is a significant amount of data that I would have liked to include in this thesis. For example, I would have liked to continue a previous research topic that correlates the backgrounds of city officials with the pursuit of sustainability. My original research could be strongly augmented with the new data from such a large number of cities and by adding the additional individuals who compose the governance regime of each city. Also, this research provided fascinating insight into the relationship between the gender of a respondent and their attitude toward sustainability. In brief, females consistently responded more positively toward sustainability initiatives than their male counterparts based on three variables measuring the attitudes of respondents toward sustainability. There are numerous other research possibilities that arise from the data collected and hopefully I will have the opportunity to pursue them in the future.

Due to the constraints of my hypothesis, time, and resources, I was unable to adequately tackle the issues of environmental justice, the correlation between economic stratification, race, and other variables on the pursuit of sustainability. The literature on environmental policy and

public opinion suggests that individuals with greater wealth and higher levels of education are likely to be more supportive of environmental protection. Racial and ethnic minority groups have been generally characterized as less supportive of environmentalism than whites. However, environmental justice research suggests that this is not necessarily the case. (Bullard 1994) I broached this subject during the interview process, but did not have the opportunity to utilize the responses in this thesis.

One methodological shortcoming of this thesis lay in the geographical diversity of the study cities. Although nearly every American city within the population range was included, there appears to be a regional bias between cities in the sustainable and comparison groups. The cities in the sustainable group are weighted heavily toward the Pacific Northwest, the Midwest, and the Northeast, while the comparison cities are located largely in the South. This regional division occurred as a coincidence. Because of this pattern, one may be inclined to dismiss the findings of this study as based on regional differences rather than differences in governance. While this is a valid concern, there are several reasons for which to forgive or dismiss this notion. First, within the study cities, there is regional overlap between the city groups. Included in the sustainable cities group are Atlanta and Kansas City, both of which are located in the South. Milwaukee and Denver, though not located in the South, are, like Atlanta and Kansas City, located in Republican leaning states. Further, of the comparison cities in the study, Las Vegas is not located in the South. More importantly, the comprehensive list of American cities that take sustainability seriously, as identified by Portney, includes the entire spectrum of regions within the United States. Southern cities in Portney's list of forty cities that take sustainability seriously include Tampa, Chattanooga, Austin, Jacksonville, St. Louis, Orlando and others.¹¹

¹¹ See Appendix C for a full listing of American cities that take sustainability seriously.

Earlier, I alluded to demographic differences between regime types. I would have liked to incorporate the individual demographics of each city into the overall analysis. I did not utilize such analysis during the study, but will provide a few interesting findings here. As seen in Table 17, the sustainable cities are on average, 100,000 residents smaller than comparison cities. However, sustainable cities have on average, 2000 more residents per square mile than comparison cities. This means that cities that do not take sustainability seriously are larger and more sprawling than cities that do take the concept seriously. This finding fits nicely into the expected planning practices of sustainable cities. The median family income, percent African American, and percent of families below the poverty line in each city group are relatively similar. While there is great variance across individual cities, on average, the two city groups are similar in terms of these demographics.

Table 17: City Demographics based on 2005 Census*

Sustainable Cities	Population Size	Median Family Income	Percent African American	Percent Families Below Poverty	Population Density (per sq/mile)
Boston	520702	49320	24.6	17.8	5557.9
Denver	545198	52139	10	12	3625
Seattle	536946	69795	8.2	6.6	6706.8
Kansas City	440885	50540	30	12.9	1420
Milwaukee	556948	35675	40.2	21.3	6212
Atlanta	416474	42010	58.6	25.5	3155
Sacramento	445287	50653	16.3	14.7	4240
Averages	577073	58355	31.3	18.5	5152.8
Unsustainable Cities					
Memphis	642251	40111	63.1	21.1	2327.4
Las Vegas	538653	57471	11.3	9.7	4222.5
El Paso	583653	35562	2.8	23.8	2263
Oklahoma City	515751	49769	14.7	14.9	833.8
Fort Worth	604538	47064	18.4	15.7	1827.8
Charlotte	601598	56960	34.3	10.2	2232.4
Averages	677253	57549	29.3	19	3143.3

* Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, American Factfinder, April 12, 2007.

Another shortcoming of this study is self-selection bias. Because the questionnaire respondents examined in this research do not include all members of a city's governance regime, readers should use some caution in generalizing the results. The respondents in this study had the choice of whether or not to participate. Therefore, it is not guaranteed that an impartial and full representation of the governance regime in each city has been evaluated. Although every attempt was made to avoid selection bias, there is the possibility that the survey responses do not accurately reflect the opinions and attitudes of a city's governance regime as a whole.

Nonetheless, the positions and breadth of respondents analyzed in this study offer an excellent

opportunity to examine the influence of the business community on economic, sustainable, and other areas of policy making in city governments.

Another area in which this study could have been improved was in its sample size. The effort expended in order to obtain sixty-four survey responses was considerable. However, while this effort provided substantial amounts of data, as previously mentioned, sixty-four responses is not enough to conduct significant statistical analysis. Regressions and other statistical correlations were not possible with this amount of responses. Thus, statistical analysis was conducted only through crosstabulations. It would undoubtedly be valuable to increase the response rate for the questionnaires or expand this study to include cities of other sizes. Do the findings represented in this small study sample apply to the entire range of cities in the United States, or are the findings accurate only for cities of this population size? Research on sustainable cities reveals that population size is not an important variable, but expanding the study could still prove valuable in cementing or adjusting these findings.

I would also have liked to differentiate each city within this study by the four governance regimes created by Stone. While Middle Class Progressive regimes and Lower Class Opportunity Expansion regimes do share the pursuit of progressive policies, there are undeniable differences between the characters of the two regimes. The same argument can be applied to the difference between Maintenance and Development regimes. The essence of the characteristics of the four regimes is captured in the Progressive and Traditional divisions, but there is more detail to Stone's regime typology that was not tapped into in this study. A future study could utilize a different set of questions that may better differentiate between the four regime types and delve deeper into the opportunities for analysis afforded by governance regimes.

A final area of research that I would have liked to pursue for this paper centers on Oklahoma City. As evidenced by Tables 13 and 14, Oklahoma City differs greatly from the other cities in its comparison city group. Oklahoma City scored a 5 in the determination of cities with Progressive regimes. No sustainable city scored higher than a 5. According to the data, Oklahoma City demonstrates more characteristics of a Progressive regime than four of the seven sustainable cities. Also, Oklahoma City scored a 1 in the determination of Traditional regimes. Only two of the seven sustainable cities scored a 1 in this regime determination. This leads to me several possible conclusions. One, Oklahoma City has a Progressive governance regime and pursues sustainability, but was not sufficiently reviewed before the study in order to remove it from the comparison cities. Two, Oklahoma City has a Progressive governance regime and does not pursue sustainability, effectively becoming an exception to the rule. Or three, Oklahoma City has a Traditional governance regime and the scoring method utilized to determine the regime type of a city is flawed. I feel that understanding the reasons why the responses from Oklahoma City indicate that it has a Progressive governance regime could be essential to assessing the quality of the survey questions as determinants of regime type and provide greater detail into the machinations of governance regimes in general.

Chapter 8

Conclusions

Common wisdom has long dictated that a strong economy and a healthy environment are mutually exclusive, incompatible goals. Historically worldwide, people have accepted dirty water, smog-filled skies, and polluted lands as the price of progress. Yet, with the arrival and application of ideas like sustainable development, there has been a renaissance in urban areas and the common wisdom is being debunked. Further, because sustainable development focuses on enhancing communities and provides benefits for all segments of a city's population, social equity issues are being reexamined and brought to the fore of public discussion.

It is in urban environments that the essential interconnectedness of the economy and the environment is palpable and most easily observed. Cities have been centers of culture and economy as well as disease and pollution. Centuries and decades of unplanned growth have rendered many urban environments degraded. In fact, many cities have lost their economic vitality as a direct result of a decline in the quality of their air, water, and land. It is increasingly apparent that a move toward the path of sustainable development is not only logical, but indeed *necessary* for urban centers to simultaneously grow economically and maintain their ecological quality. Cities can continue to thrive only by safeguarding the natural resources that are the underpinnings of both their economies and their quality of life. As George Frampton, Jr., chair of President Clinton's Council on Environmental Quality explains, the pursuit of sustainable cities is an attempt to "build strong, healthy, livable cities—where future generations do not feel they must choose between a healthy environment and a strong economy, but understand that without one, we cannot have the other." (Frampton 1999)

Some American cities have already begun to take sustainability to heart and act accordingly in their policy making. City policies are greener than ever before, but the trend is not uniform across municipalities. The vast majority of American cities continue to develop without heed for environmental or sustainability concerns. This study endeavored to elucidate the distinct reasons for which some cities are trying to lessen their impact on the Earth while others are not. Based on Stone's understanding of the relationship between governance regime and the pursuit of progressive policy making, this study hypothesized that the same types of urban governance regimes that promote progressive policy making should also promote environmental sustainability. The corollary attempt of this study was to examine the relationship that Stone alludes to between the influence of the business community on policy making and the pursuit of progressive policy making. This study endeavored to connect Stone's theoretical negative relationship between business influence and progressive policy making to the pursuit of sustainability.

From the survey and interview data collected, it is clear that there is a correlation between the urban governance regime of a city and the pursuit of sustainability. Cities with Progressive urban governance regimes are more likely to take environmental sustainability seriously in their planning, policies, and initiatives than are cities with Traditional urban governance regimes. Further, cities in which the business community exerts a relatively high level of influence on governmental policy making are less likely to take environmental sustainability seriously. The extent of these correlations has not been fully assessed by this research, but the foundation for further study has been laid.

Ann Bowman asks, "How green can a city afford to be, given the need to promote economic growth?" (Bowman 2006) Although it was not a direct focus of this paper, from a

superficial analysis of the study cities, it seems that cities that take sustainability seriously are doing very well economically. It does not appear that the pursuit of sustainability has an overly negative effect on economic development. In fact, it is possible that green policies may even enhance the attractiveness of a city to businesses. Adopting green policies may end up being one of the most economically advantageous development strategies a city can undertake. It is evident that there is a need for additional research on the relationship between governance and sustainability, not just to protect natural resources, but also to encourage and enhance positive economic development.

Works Cited

Books, Journals and Articles

- Aiyar, Shahnaz Anklesaria. 1987. "Singrauli Fall-Out in U.S. Congress." *Indian Express*. 21 April.
- Beatley, Timothy, and Kristy Manning. 1997. The Ecology of Place: Planning for Environment, Economy, and Community. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Bernick, M. Urban Illusions. 1987. New York: Praeger Press.
- Bishop, Greg. 2006 "New Owners Say Sonics Will Stay in Seattle." *The Seattle Times*. 10 Mar 2007
http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/localnews/2003135221_websonicssold18.html
- Bowman, Ann O'M. 2006. "Environmental Issues in Big-City Politics." American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Philadelphia.
- Brunner, Jim. 2007. "Sonics Want \$300 Million; Some Legislators Roll Eyes." *The Seattle Times*. 9 Mar. 2007
http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/localnews/2003531650_sonics19m0.html
- Bullard, Robert D. 1994. Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality, 2nd ed. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- D'Monte, Darryl. 1958. Temples or Tombs? Industry Versus Environment: Three Controversies. New Delhi, India: Center for Science and Environment.
- Dahl, Robert. 1961. Who Governs?. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Daly, Costanza, Prugh. 1999. The Local Politics of Global Sustainability. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Dillman, Don A. 2000. Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method, 2nd ed. NY: Wiley.
- Esty, Daniel C. 2007. "When Being Green puts you in the Black." *Washington Post*.
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2007/03/02/AR2007030202044.html>
- "Fact Sheets." NRDC. 1 April 2007.
<http://www.nrdc.org/buildinggreen/factsheets/cost.asp>

- Frampton, George T. Jr. 1999. "Healthy Cities: Urban Environmental Solutions." White House Council on Environmental Quality.
<http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/itgic/0300/ijge/gj-01.htm>
- "Global Issues: Green Cities." 2000. U.S. Department of State; International Informations Programs. 5 March 2007. <http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/itgic/0300/ijge/ijge0300.htm>
- Jones, Sydney and Mike Jendrzeczyk. 1998. "Memorandum." Human Rights Watch.
<http://www.hrw.org/press98/apr1/memorandum.htm>
- Kahn, Matthew E. 2006. Green Cities: Urban Growth and the Environment. Brookings Institution Press.
- Kohli, Madhu. 1997. "Request for Inspection NTPC Power Generation Project: Cr. 3632" CIEL. <http://www.ciel.org/Publications/sing1.html>
- Kowal, Jessica. 2006. "As Sonics Pack to Leave Town, Seattle Shrugs." The New York Times.
- Levine, Greg. 2006. "Starbucks' Schultz Sells Sonics, WNBA's Storm." Forbes.com. 11 Mar. 2007 http://www.forbes.com/facesinthenews/2006/07/19/sbux-sonics-nbacx_gl_0719autofacescan05.html
- Matthiessen, Lisa Fay and Peter Morris. 2004. "Costing Green: A Comprehensive Cost Database and Budgeting Methodology." 1 April 2007.
<http://davislangdonusa.com/Attachment%20Files/Research/costinggreen.pdf>
- Molotch, Harvey. 1976. "The City as a Growth Machine: Toward a Political Economy of Place." *American Journal of Sociology* Vol.82, No. 2: 309-332.
- Portney, Kent. 2003. Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously: Economic Development, the Environment, and Quality of Life in American Cities. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rees, William E. 1997. "Is 'Sustainable City' an Oxymoron?" *Local Environment* 2, no. 3: 303-310.
- Rees, William E., and Mathis Wackernagel. 1994. "Ecological Footprints and Appropriated Carrying Capacity: Measuring the Natural Capital Requirements of the Human Economy." Investing in Natural Capital: The Ecological Economics Approach to Sustainability, A-M. Jansson, M. Hammer, C. Folke, and R. Costanza (eds.). Washington, D.C.: Island Press, pp. 362-390.
- Rich, Bruce. 1994. Mortgaging the Earth: The World Bank, Environmental Impoverishment, and the Crisis of Development. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- "Sonics, Storm Sold to Group from Oklahoma City." 2006. ESPN.com. 15 Mar. 2007 <http://sports.espn.go.com/nba/news/story?id=2522944>

“State of World Population 1999.” 1999. UNFPA. 1 March 2007.
<http://www.unfpa.org/swp/1999/contents.htm>

Stone, Clarence N. 1989. Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta 1946-1988. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

-----, 1993. “Urban Regimes and the Capacity to Govern: A Political Economy Approach.” *Journal of Urban Affairs*: 1-28.

“SustainLane’s 2006 US City Sustainability Ranking.” 2006. SustainLane. 6 Feb. 2007
<http://www.sustainlane.us/overview.jsp>

Vellinga, Mary Lynne. 2006. “Heavyweight Joins Arena Finance Push.” *The Sacramento Bee*. 17 Feb 2007 <http://www.kingsfans.com/forums/showthread.php?t=12493>

“Villagers Challenge World Bank Role in Thermal Power Projects in Singrauli, India.” 1997. CIEL. <http://www.ciel.org/Publications/prsing.html>

The Brudtland Commission (World Commission on Environment and Development) (WCED). 1987. “Our Common Future.” New York: Oxford University Press.

Personal Interviews

Conlin, Richard. Personal Interview. 8 Aug. 2006.

Conover, Beth. Personal Interview. 10 Aug. 2006.

Gleason, Tom. Tour Guide. 10 Aug. 2006.

Nicholas, Steve. Personal Interview. 8 Aug. 2006.

Ortiz, Cecilia. Personal Interview. 10 Aug. 2006.

Steinbrueck, Peter. Personal Interview. 7 Aug. 2006.

Stevens, Chantal. Personal Interview. 9 Aug. 2006.

Appendix A:
Questionnaire Send to City Councilors

Tufts University

“Governing in Cities” Project

Questionnaire for City Councilors

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project. Please answer the questions below to the best of your ability to do so. We understand that some of these questions may be challenging, but all we ask is that you do the best you can. Your answers will be kept confidential and anonymous. As a token of our appreciation for your time in filling out this questionnaire, we would like to offer you a free copy of Kent Portney’s book *Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously* (MIT Press, 2003), and the chance to receive a free iPod Nano.

(Optional) Would you like to receive a free copy of *Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously* and to be eligible to win a free iPod Nano?

- Please send me a free copy of *Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously*
- Please enter me in the drawing for the free iPod Nano

If you checked either box above, please provide your name and mailing addresses, or simply return the included postcard.

Name _____
Address 1 _____
Address 2 _____
Address 3 _____
City and State _____
Zip Code _____

Email address _____
(for notification only)

First, we have a few questions about your personal background.

1. In what year were you first elected to the City Council? _____
 2. How many total years have you served, including prior terms of office, on City Council?
_____ years
 3. Have you ever held any other elective office in the City? If so, what was that office?
-

4. Have you ever held any other position in the City government? If so, what was that position?

5. Prior to becoming a public official in the City, what was your occupation?

6. If you did not mention this above, have you ever worked in the nonprofit sector? If so, what position did you hold and for what organization?

7. If you did not mention this above, have you ever worked in the private sector? If so, what position did you hold and for what company? _____

8. What is your highest level of education? _____

9. If you have a college degree, what was your undergraduate major? _____

10. If you have an advanced degree, in what subject is this degree? (If you have more than one, please list all degrees) _____

Now we would like to ask you a few questions about how you operate as a member of the City Council.

11. About how many times **over the last year** have you met with the City's business leaders?
_____ times

12. Thinking of **the last time** you met with any business leader, did you request the meeting or did the business leader request the meeting?

I requested the meeting _____ Business leader requested the meeting _____

13. What was the purpose of that meeting? _____

14. Thinking of all the meetings you have had with business leaders **over the last year**, what was the most important specific issue addressed and how was this issues resolved (or how was it addressed if it was not resolved)?

Most Important Issue

Outcome of Issue

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

15. About how many times **over the last year** did an ordinary resident of the City contact you or your office about some issue? _____ times

16. Thinking of **the last time** you were personally contacted by an ordinary resident of the City, what was the purpose of the contact?

17. Considering all the various kinds of citizen, neighborhood, and nonprofit groups that exist in the City, about how many times **over the last year** have you met with a representative from any of these groups? _____ times

18. Thinking of **the last time** you met with a representative from a citizen, neighborhood, or nonprofit group representative, what was the purpose of the meeting? _____

19. Thinking of all the times you have met with citizen, neighborhood, or nonprofit group representatives **over the last year**, what was the most important specific issue addressed and how was this issue resolved (or addressed if it was not resolved)?

Most Important Issue

Outcome of Issue

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

20. Are there any specific citizen, neighborhood, business, or nonprofit groups that have met with you over the last year that have sought to **promote** specific programs or policies consistent with livability, sustainability or sustainable economic development? If so, what were the names of the groups?

21. Are there specific citizen, neighborhood, business, or nonprofit groups that have met with you over the last year that have sought to **oppose** specific programs or policies that are consistent with livability, sustainability or sustainable economic development? If so, what were the names of the groups?

22. What is your personal assessment of the City's efforts to become more livable or sustainable? Do you think these efforts are a good idea, a bad idea, an idea that is too expensive, an idea that must be pursued even if it costs the City more money, etc? Please be candid and provide as much detail as you can.

23. Who, in your view, has been **most responsible** for the City's sustainability efforts? Please provide the names of as many people and organizations as you think appropriate.

24. What would you consider the single most difficult to accomplish aspect or component of the City's neighborhood or citywide planning initiatives? Why is it difficult to accomplish? (We are especially interested in knowing whether there is any political opposition to, or general lack of public support for, the difficult aspect).

Most Difficult aspect: _____

Why is this difficult? _____

25. What would you say is your predominant attitude **with respect to costs** of a specific proposal that arises out of the City’s Comprehensive Development Plan? Would you say you would **rarely favor such a proposal regardless of costs**, you would **favor a proposal only if it promises to reduce the City’s operating costs from the outset**, you would **favor the proposal only if it promises to reduce the City’s operating costs after some specified period of time**, or you would **favor the proposal even if it increases the city’s operating costs by a small amount as long as it promises to contribute to making the City more sustainable**?

Rarely favor such a proposal regardless of costs _____

Favor proposal only if it promises to reduce operating costs from the outset _____

Favor proposal only if it promises to reduce operating costs after some specified period of time (what period of time is required for your support?) _____

Favor the proposal even if it increases the city’s operating costs by a small amount as long as it promises to contribute to making the City more sustainable _____

Please use the space below if your answer to this question needs to be qualified or explained.

26. If a proposal came before City Council to **protect a significant amount of open space** from future development, what do you think your initial response would be? Would it be likely or unlikely that you would favor such a proposal?

Likely favor _____

Unlikely to favor _____

Depends on specific proposal _____

Please use the space below to qualify or explain the reasons for your response above.

Finally, we have a few questions concerning Economic Development policies and programs in the City over the last five years or so.

27. Overall, who would you say exercises the most control over Economic Development in the City? Would you say that it is largely the **city government** that controls Economic Development, the **private sector**, a true **partnership** between city government and the private sector, or **someone else**?

City government _____

Private Sector _____

True partnership _____

Someone else (please explain) _____

28. What is your assessment of the prevailing attitude toward Economic Development in the City today? Would you say that the attitude would **accept just about any kind of Economic Development** proposed by the business community as long as there was not significant public opposition, or would **accept Economic Development only under specific conditions**?

Accept just about any kind of proposed Economic Development _____

Accept proposed Economic Development only under specific conditions _____

Proposed economic development **MUST:** (Check any that are absolute requirements)

- be consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Development Plan
- promise to generate significant new tax revenue for the City
- improve the quality of life for an identifiable segment of the City’s population
- promise to improve the quality of life for the residents of the City as a whole
- be **cost-effective** for the City as a whole

(Please describe any other conditions under which Economic Development proposed by the business community would be considered acceptable)

29. Over the last five years or so, how involved has the **business community** been in formulation of the City’s Economic Development policies and strategies? Would you say that the business community has been **highly involved** in the formulation of the City’s Economic Development policies, the business community has **operated at arms length**, or has been **largely uninvolved**?

Highly involved _____ Arms-length involvement _____ Largely uninvolved _____

30. What is your **personal** political party affiliation or identification? Do you consider yourself a Republican, a Democrat, a member of another political party, or an Independent?

Republican _____ Democrat _____ Independent _____ Other party (specify) _____

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this questionnaire.

Please place the questionnaire in the postpaid return envelop and drop in the mail.

Return address is: Professor Kent Portney
Department of Political Science
Tufts University
Medford, MA 02155

**Appendix B:
SAMPLE COVER LETTER**

June 13, 2006

The Honorable Rick Garcia
Denver City Council
2785 Speer Blvd., Suite 246
Denver, Colorado 80211

Dear President Garcia:

We write to you in the hope that you would be willing to assist us in our efforts to promote the impressive job that Denver has done to pursue environmental sustainability. As you may know, our research has identified Denver as the city that takes sustainability more seriously than any other in the entire country. We are now engaged in an effort to take our research a step further, exploring some of the governance issues surrounding the sustainability programs in Denver and elsewhere. As we travel around the country and talk to officials in other cities, we have discovered that there is a serious need to know how it is that Denver and other cities have been able to reach a high level of prominence on issues of sustainability.

In order to begin to address some of the specific issues that we encounter in other cities, we have put together a short questionnaire. We sincerely hope that you will take a few minutes and do your best job of answering the questions. You can be assured that your answers will be kept confidential and anonymous, as we are required to do so by our University's committee that oversees research integrity. In other words, we will never attribute any of your answers to you by name.

We understand that you are extremely busy, and that we are asking a lot of you. As a token of our appreciation for participating in this project, we would like to offer you a free copy of Kent Portney's book *Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously*, published by MIT Press. In order to claim your free copy, simply include your name and preferred mailing address on the bottom of the questionnaire and return it in the postpaid envelop, or if you prefer, return the enclosed postcard. Additionally, we will randomly choose one of the 50 or so participants to receive a **free Ipod Nano**.

If you have any questions about the questionnaire or the research project, please do not hesitate to contact us at one of the email addresses below. Thanks in advance for deciding to participate in this project by filling out the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Kent E. Portney, Professor
kent.portney@tufts.edu

Zach Cuttler, Summer Research Scholar
zachary.cuttler@gmail.com

**Appendix C:
Cities “Taking Sustainability Seriously” ***

Rank	Taking Sustainability Seriously Index	City
1	30.00	Seattle
2	29.00	Denver
3	27.00	Albuquerque
3	27.00	Los Angeles
3	27.00	Minneapolis
6	26.00	Boulder
6	26.00	San Jose
6	26.00	Scottsdale
6	26.00	Chicago
10	25.00	Portland
10	25.00	Santa Monica
10	25.00	San Diego
13	23.00	San Francisco
14	22.00	Kansas City
15	21.00	New York
15	21.00	Sacramento
17	19.00	Tampa
18	18.00	Chattanooga
18	18.00	Tucson
18	18.00	Anchorage
18	18.00	Washington
22	17.00	Austin
22	17.00	Baltimore
22	17.00	Buffalo
22	17.00	Grand Rapids
26	15.00	Cambridge
26	15.00	Jacksonville
26	15.00	Phoenix
29	14.00	Boston
29	14.00	Brookline
29	14.00	Cleveland
29	14.00	Atlanta
29	14.00	Pittsburgh
34	12.00	St. Louis
35	11.00	Orlando
36	10.00	Santa Barbara
37	9.00	Indianapolis
37	9.00	Milwaukee
39	8.00	New Haven
40	7.00	Lansing

* Updated as of January 1, 2006, from Kent E. Portney. *Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously: Economic Development, the Environment, and Quality of Life in American Cities*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003. The “Index” is based on assessment of the 35 specific city government policies, programs, and activities listed separately. Oakland and Salt Lake City will be added to the next release.

The “Index” is based on assessment of 35 specific city government policies, programs, and activities.

Smart Growth Activities
1. Eco-industrial park development
2. Targeted or cluster economic development
3. Eco-village (urban infill housing) project or program
4. Brownfield redevelopment (project or pilot project)
Land Use Planning Programs, Policies, and Zoning
5. Zoning used to delineate environmentally sensitive growth areas
6. Comprehensive land use plan that includes environmental issues
7. Tax incentives for environmentally friendly development (only where zoning is not permitted)
Transportation Planning Programs and Policies
8. Operation or sponsorship of public transit (buses and/or trains)
9. Limits on downtown parking spaces
10. Car pool lanes (HOV or diamond lanes)
11. Alternatively fueled city vehicle (green fleet) program
12. Bicycle ridership program
Pollution Prevention, Reduction, and Remediation
13. Household solid waste recycling
14. Industrial recycling
15. Hazardous waste recycling
16. Air pollution reduction program (i.e. VOC reduction)
17. Recycled product purchasing by city government
18. Superfund (non-brownfield) site remediation
19. Asbestos abatement program
20. Lead paint abatement program
21. Pesticide reduction program
Energy and Resource Conservation/Efficiency
22. Green building program
23. Renewable energy use by city government
24. Energy conservation effort (other than Green building program)
25. Alternative energy offered to consumers (solar, wind, biogas, etc.)
26. Water conservation program
Sustainable Indicators Project
27. Indicators project active in last five years
28. Indicators progress report in last five years
29. Does indicators project include “action plan” of policies/programs?
Organization/Administration/Management/Coordination/Governance
30. Single government or nonprofit agency responsible for implementing sustainability programs
31. Sustainability an explicit part of a citywide comprehensive or general plan
32. Involvement of city/county/metropolitan council
33. Involvement of mayor or chief executive officer
34. Involvement of the business community (e.g. Chamber of Commerce, Sustainable Business organization)
35. General public involvement (public hearings, visioning process, Neighborhood groups or associations, etc.)

Appendix D: The Power of a good “Business Case”

In March 2007, two of America’s largest private equity firms, Kohlberg Kravis Roberts and Texas Pacific Group, announced their purchase of the Dallas-based utility TXU. This purchase made headlines for more reasons than its \$45 billion price tag; incorporated into the mega-deal was a significant environmental dimension. The announcement declared that TXU would be scaling back construction of new coal power plants, increasing efforts to pursue wind and solar power, support mandatory controls on greenhouse gas emissions, and promote energy efficiency. Henry Kravis, the prominent financier and engineer of the deal is by no means an eco-warrior or environmentalist. Rather, after a lifetime of buying and gutting companies for enormous profit, he is known as a ruthless investor and developer of the concept of the leveraged buyout. He is a smart businessman who wants nothing more than to make money. So why is he suddenly interested in the environment?

While it may seem like a paradox, the environmental component of the TXU deal speaks to the changing nature of business and the environment in America. It is no longer economical to pollute or waste resources. Instead, traditional businesses realize that in the new world economy of rising energy prices and forthcoming environmental regulation to combat climate change, it is in their best economic interests to be energy efficient and reduce pollution. At the recent World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, CEOs focused their efforts on the issue of climate change and seemingly tried to outdo one another in promising a green future. (Esty 2007) Companies of all sizes, even including Wal-Mart, have begun to emphasize energy efficiency.

This deal shows that we are in the midst of a revolution. The traditional economic system, a system that often benefited at the expense of the environment, is undergoing a fundamental evolution. Environmental progress no longer depends on bureaucrats at the Environmental Protection Agency mandating the specific pollution-control equipment needed on every smokestack. While the government must continue to set standards, the burden of innovation and technology development is shifting to the private sector.

While examples like the TXU deal do demonstrate the beginning of an environmental evolution in traditional economic models, the vast majority of business in America and worldwide is still conducted without regard to environmental impact. So how do entities striving for environmental progress, such as a progressive minded city council or mayor, press businesses to adopt green practices? My interviews with elected and appointed city government officials, in conjunction with comments from chamber of commerce people and others in the standardized questionnaire, elucidate that a strong “business case” is paramount to the success of any sustainable development. Essentially, the key to sustainable development lies in the power of the purse. Henry Kravis would give environmental issues no thought at all if there were not an economic incentive to do so. Policies like green building, urban villages, rebuilding the physical environment, brownfield redevelopment, multimodal transportation, and others are all elements of sustainable development. However, in order to secure the backing, or at least passive allowance, of the business community, a compelling economic argument must be made. While all sustainability initiatives are worthwhile and would have a beneficial impact on the urban environment, it is necessary to realize that for only some of them can a strong, traditional business model be made.

The business community has historically been the realm of conservative and traditional interests who view a healthy bottom line as their bible. With profit as the ultimate goal, a marketable, economically practical push for a sustainable city is one that makes a solid “business case.” Through the pocketbook is the most logical and feasible way to market sustainable cities to the business community. The idea seems very simple, but must be framed correctly. If the case can be made that sustainability does not hurt, but actually helps the bottom line and attracts customers, then business will lose its allergic reaction to the catchphrase “sustainability” and will begin to view the concept as a feasible, economical, and logical step in the money making process. However, even within cities in the sustainable group, this mindset transformation did not come easy. It often took a slow, concerted effort to finally convince the business community that being more sustainable does not necessitate sacrifices or higher costs. The way in which many sustainable cities finally began succeeding in this effort was by making the business case for green building.

Green Building: The Gateway to Sustainability

Green building is one method by which the construction industry, government, and environmentally conscious consumers are attempting to combat energy and water consumption, greenhouse gas production, pollution, and other urban environmental issues. Green building, also known as green architecture, attempts to combat the mounting impact of human population growth on the natural environment by utilizing a variety of technological solutions in the construction process.

A green building utilizes strategic design, construction, and maintenance practices to significantly reduce or eliminate the negative impact of buildings on their occupants and the

environment. In essence, green buildings are really *resource efficient buildings*. They use water and energy efficiently and utilize construction materials wisely—including recycled, renewable, and reused resources to the maximum practical extent. Green buildings are designed, constructed and commissioned to ensure that they are healthy for their occupants, have lower operating and owning costs than traditional buildings, and are not damaging to the planet.

In addition to the environmental benefits accrued from constructing a green building as opposed to a traditional building, there are minimal or no supplementary costs to building green. A 2004 study by Davis Langdon Adamson, a construction cost, planning and management company, found that the initial costs of constructing a green building tend to match or only slightly exceed those of comparable non-green buildings. (Matthiessen 2004) The National Resource Defense Council (NRDC) asserts that constructing a LEED certified¹² green building costs an average of 2% more in upfront costs, but can often even be below standard market construction costs. Further, upfront costs above standard market costs can be recovered through rental premiums, increased market valuation, and energy savings. (Fact Sheets—NRDC)

Seattle city councilor Richard Conlin says that there are three main costs associated with a building: capital costs, maintenance costs, and employee salaries. The figures provided by the NRDC and Davis Langdon Adamson focus on the hard construction costs and savings of a green building as compared to a traditional building. Yet, according to Conlin, employee salaries comprise around 80% of the costs of a building over its lifetime. It has been found that the biggest monetary gain of a green building is in the productivity of employees. Employees are

¹²LEED stands for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design. The U.S. Green Building Council accredits green buildings Certified, Silver, Gold, or Platinum. LEED accreditation is awarded through a credit system based on six broad categories of performance: sustainable building sites, energy and atmosphere, water efficiency, indoor environmental quality, materials and resources, and innovation in design.

more motivated, want to come to work, take less sick days, and are generally more productive. (Conlin, Richard. Personal Interview. 8 Aug. 2006.)

In 1998, with a strong business case based on figures like these, Conlin, groups like the Urban Land Institute and other progressive development groups in conjunction with a regional sustainable building policy panel, brought these studies to the local Seattle business community and pitched their case. Though Conlin admits it was still, “a long, hard struggle to rid business of the idea that green building costs them money,” the business community did eventually buy into the idea. The key was that they began to see green building as very “marketable.” (Conlin, Richard. Personal Interview. 8 Aug. 2006.) Not only does a business with a green building reap energy savings, it also gets to advertise itself as “green” to consumers. According to Seattle city councilor Peter Steinbrueck, Seattle businesses see “green” as a marketing tool. Green building is cost effective, lifecycle costs are becoming an expectation in planning and design, particularly because of rising energy costs, and consumers want to buy environmentally friendly products. Steinbrueck emphasizes that a good business case for sustainability drives home the economic benefit of green initiatives rather than care for the environment. As a result, there has been in recent years a rapid transition from old-school traditional economic mentality to sustainable development. The green building policy for the state of Washington was even based on Seattle’s green building policy. (Steinbrueck, Peter. Personal Interview. 7 Aug. 2006.)

According to Steve Nicholas, Seattle’s Director of Sustainability, the single best way to get business to buy into sustainability and green building is to “articulate the business case.” During our discussion, Nicholas emphasized that those interested in promoting environmental sustainability must make it clear to the private sector that sustainability is a “business case too,” and not just the “next phase in treehugging.” This point is particularly cogent. On initial contact

with sustainability, traditional business communities often flinch at perceived costs to industry as well as the notion that environmental issues are not business concerns. This is a bias that must be overcome in order to be successful.

One of the most successful ways that cities taking sustainability seriously have been able to reach out to the business community is by convincing particularly influential individuals within the private sector. In Seattle, Nicholas' Office of Sustainability has helped to create the Seattle Climate Partnership that gets different businesses together to facilitate "peer to peer contact" to discuss which sustainability initiatives work. He finds that this format is much more convincing than government-private sector dialogue. According to Nicholas, it is better if businesses can hear what works in the realm of sustainability from each other rather than from the government because the government is always viewed with distrust. For this reason, his office facilitates these contacts and does not try to drive them. (Nicholas, Steve. Personal Interview. 8 Aug. 2006.)

The city of Denver also utilizes "peer to peer contact" to develop the idea of sustainability within the business community, but the method by which this contact occurs is slightly different than in Seattle. The success of sustainability in Denver is largely due to Mayor Hickenlooper. As a longtime figure in the private sector and the owner of several small businesses, Hickenlooper *himself* is the peer leader that spreads the message of sustainability. Because he is a powerful force in the business community, the mayor wields special influence and his advice and direction are trustworthy in the eyes of other business leaders. Thus, Denver has been able to avoid the vocal and organized opposition to its sustainability efforts that other municipalities have encountered. In fact, the business community is one of the strongest supporters of the mayor's sustainability initiatives because they trust the strong business cases he

presents. I asked Denver's Director of Sustainability how the business community initially buys into sustainability. She responded that, "It takes a respected business person to buy into it before others do." For example, the mayor urged prominent business leaders to attend a peak oil conference and those ideas have now begun to circulate in the business community. Mayor Hickenlooper is that respected businessman and business peer and he has used his position to focus the attention of the business community on sustainability issues.

Essentially, when a city government adopts sustainability policies, it must put itself in the shoes of the private sector. Mayors and city councilors must envision the concerns that the business community might have in regards to a specific policy and be prepared to address those concerns. As evidenced in many cities that take sustainability seriously, one of the most effective ways to partner with the business community is to provide a solid business case for the policy and be able to educate the private sector about the issues that do not have direct or immediate economic ramifications.