

# Public Policy Challenge 2010

## Background Materials

## Contents

I.	Letter of Introduction	Page 2
II.	Event Details and Plan Component Deadlines	Page 3
III.	Metropolitan Philadelphia – A Brief Historical Overview <i>Andrew Biroš – Penn College of Arts &amp; Sciences – Class of 2010</i>	Page 9
IV.	Metropolitan Philadelphia – The Current Landscape <i>Andrew Biroš – Penn College of Arts &amp; Sciences – Class of 2010</i>	Page 11
V.	Philadelphia Metropolitan Regional Organizations and Actors	Page 17
VI.	General Resources – Regionalism and Metropolitan Philadelphia	Page 18
VII.	Metropolitan Philadelphia Policy Issues and Resources (by topic)	Page 19
VIII.	Additional Reading	Page 22

## Letter of Introduction

Congratulations again on being selected to participate in the inaugural Public Policy Challenge! These materials are meant to be a primer for you as you prepare for the competition. They include:

- Additional details about events,
- Information about plan component deliverables and deadlines,
- A brief overview of regionalism and its impact on policy in Metropolitan Philadelphia,
- A list of regional policy organizations with links to extra information about each,
- A sample of potential regional initiatives that covers a wide range of issues, and
- Additional reading recommendations on regionalism.

Please pay special attention to the Round Robin event description. Because we decided to increase the initial number of participants, this will be an intermediate judging event. A total of 5 teams will advance to the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of the competition.

Remember, each team will be asked to come up with both a policy proposal and elements of a civic campaign plan that will impact the Philadelphia region – not only what ought to happen, but how to build the leadership and political support necessary to get it done. The workshops (February 2<sup>nd</sup> and March 2<sup>nd</sup>) will focus on the skills and steps of a civic campaign, but you will need to do most of the regional policy research on your own. We encourage you to look to proposals that are already out there – a lot of them are just sitting, waiting for a group of people with the political will to see them through. Many of these proposals are included as links in this document. You can also look at policy initiatives that have succeeded in other metropolitan areas.

These materials are a starting point. They provide some background on regional policy making: why it matters for certain issues, how people and organizations work across borders in certain situations, and what limitations they face when doing so. The materials also provide some information about regional actors in Greater Philadelphia, plus a few ideas about what has been proposed in the past. Read through them and look for what interests you. Pay attention to the goals for each event and think about what you will need to prepare ahead of time. Communicate with your teammates and start narrowing down an initiative, understanding that the details will inevitably change as you learn more about how to make it happen.

Feel free to send any questions to [thechallenge@sas.upenn.edu](mailto:thechallenge@sas.upenn.edu). We're looking forward to seeing you on January 19<sup>th</sup>. Good luck!

The Public Policy Challenge Planning Team

## Event Details and Plan Component Deadlines

The Challenge is made up of 5 competition events, plus individual team work and meetings that each team plans for itself.

Each event is described in the following pages – 1 page per event. The complete list of events is as follows:

### Phase 1

- Kick-off / Team Building – Tuesday, January 19<sup>th</sup> (5:30-8:30pm)  
Houston Hall – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor – Golkin Room
- Workshop #1 – Tuesday, February 2<sup>nd</sup> (5:30-8:30pm)  
Houston Hall – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor – Ben Franklin Room
- Round Robin – Tuesday, February 16<sup>th</sup> (5:30-8:30pm)  
Houston Hall – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor – Golkin Room and several breakout meeting rooms

### Phase 2

- Workshop #2 – Tuesday, March 2<sup>nd</sup> (5:30-8:30)  
Houston Hall – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor – Golkin Room
- Finals – Saturday, March 20<sup>th</sup> (afternoon)  
Exact time and location TBD

Please pay special attention to the Round Robin event description. Because we decided to increase the initial number of participants, this will be an intermediate judging event. A total of 5 teams will advance to the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of the competition.

Some event details and deliverables may be refined by Workshop Leaders and the Planning Team in the initial weeks of the competition. Final details will be given to teams at the Kickoff and Workshops.

Kick-off / Team Building – Tuesday, January 19<sup>th</sup> (5:30-8:30pm)

Houston Hall – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor – Golkin Room

Plan Components Due:

- Teams don't need to prepare anything ahead of time, but we encourage all team members to communicate about their own interests and backgrounds. Teams may also want to start discussing potential initiatives before the event.

Description:

This evening functions primarily as a team-building opportunity. Penn Organizational Dynamics will facilitate a portion of the program. After some general activities, each team will work on establishing consensus around a particular policy area of focus.

Speakers / Facilitators:

David Thornburgh, Executive Director, Fels Institute of Government

<https://www.fels.upenn.edu/person/david-b-thornburgh>

William Wilkinski, Faculty, Organizational Dynamics

[http://www.organizationaldynamics.upenn.edu/od.cgi/review/faculty.html?faculty\\_id=100060](http://www.organizationaldynamics.upenn.edu/od.cgi/review/faculty.html?faculty_id=100060)

Team Goals (by end of the event):

- Agree on an outcome statement: Choose an issue and describe the results that you want your policy initiative to have.
- Agree on an initiative statement: Write a preliminary description (short paragraph) of your policy initiative. This should be a thumbnail sketch of a new program, additional funding for an existing program, policy reforms, cooperative agreements, statutory changes, etc.
- Agree on a team name.
- Begin work plan in preparation for next event / deadline.

## Workshop #1 – Tuesday, February 2<sup>nd</sup> (5:30-8:30pm)

Houston Hall – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor – Ben Franklin Room

### Plan Components Due:

- Draft Initiative Summary: Teams will be asked to bring a rough draft (executive summary-type) policy proposal, which they will complete in the 2 weeks between the kick-off and the workshop. More information will be given at the Kickoff event.

### Description:

This workshop will give teams an overview of the civic campaign concept and will help them to understand some components of a policy campaign: identifying and utilizing lines of influence and conducting practical policy analysis. A portion of the time will be set aside for the teams to begin work on plan component deliverables and to prepare for the next event.

### Workshop Leader:

Rick Stafford, Distinguished Service Professor, Carnegie Mellon Heinz College  
[http://www.heinz.cmu.edu/faculty-and-research/faculty-profiles/faculty-details/index.aspx?faculty\\_id=95](http://www.heinz.cmu.edu/faculty-and-research/faculty-profiles/faculty-details/index.aspx?faculty_id=95)

### Team Goals (by end of the event):

- Understand the basic elements described above and begin to apply them to your specific initiative.
- Begin work plan in preparation for next event / deadline.

## Round Robin – Tuesday, February 16<sup>th</sup> (5:30-8:30pm)

Houston Hall – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor – Golkin Room and several breakout meeting rooms

### Plan Components Due:

- Revised Initiative Summary (executive summary-type policy proposal)
- Elevator Pitches: Teams will need to prepare a few short narratives (30 second version, 3 minute version, 5 minute version) describing their proposed initiatives. More information will be given at Workshop #1.

### Description:

The Round Robin is a preliminary judging event and an opportunity for teams to test out their ideas on real regional actors. Each team will give several preliminary pitches, in private, to different panels of stakeholders from the Philadelphia region who are working in different sectors on various policy issues. We'll ask these stakeholders to have a little fun with it – they may be brutally honest – but this should be a good way for teams to practice building those coalitions of support. It will also be a good warm-up for the finals. Based on feedback from the panelists, 5 teams will advance to the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of the competition (Workshop #2 and Finals).

### Panelists:

Various to be announced

### Team Goals:

- Explain your policy initiative clearly and concisely, making a strong argument for why these regional leaders should support it.
- Gather feedback from panelists' reactions so that you can further hone your campaign plan.
- Refine work plan in preparation for next event / deadline.

## Workshop #2 – Tuesday, March 2<sup>nd</sup> (5:30-8:30)

Houston Hall – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor – Golkin Room

Plan Components Due (final details TBD):

- Written campaign planning narrative (approx 5 pages)
  - Influence map (similar to a logic model or family tree for lines of influence)
  - Draft letters to 3 potential supporters identified in influence map
  - Communications plan (op eds, social media strategies, website initiatives, etc.)
- (More details on all components will be given at Workshop #1.)

Description:

This workshop will focus on the legislative “inside game”: drafting legislation (if applicable), and navigating formal political processes. Again, part of the time will be set aside for the teams to actually work on these initial plan components, getting individualized feedback from workshop leaders.

Workshop Leader:

Joe McLaughlin, Director, Temple University Institute for Public Affairs

<http://www.temple.edu/ipa/mclaughlin/index.htm>

Team Goals (by end of the event):

- Understand the basic elements described above and begin to apply them to your specific initiative.
- Begin work plan in preparation for Finals.

## Finals – Saturday, March 20<sup>th</sup> (afternoon)

Exact time and location TBD

Full Planning Report Due (final details TBD):

- Final versions of previously submitted components:
  - Initiative Summary
  - Elevator Pitches
  - Written campaign planning narrative (approx 5 pages)
  - Influence map (similar to a logic model or family tree for lines of influence)
  - Draft letters to 3 potential supporters identified in influence map
  - Communications plan (op eds, social media strategies, website initiatives, etc.)
- New components (developed after Workshop #2):
  - Lobbying plan narrative (2-3 pages)
  - Legislative drafting plan summary (2-3 pages)
  - Implementation plan narrative (2-3 pages)
  - 10-minute PowerPoint presentation summarizing the proposed initiative and all key campaign components

Description:

Teams will get a break (spring break) between Workshop #2 and the Finals, which will take place on March 20<sup>th</sup>. This will be a 1-afternoon event during which each team will present its plan to a panel of judges – elected officials and other leaders representing various constituencies in the Philadelphia metropolitan region. They will judge the plans based on how compelling and feasible they are. As public officials who are faced with policy choices and priority setting on a regular basis, they will be asked to view the plans as if each team was asking for its initiative to become a higher priority on the political agenda.

Team presentations (10 minutes each) will be followed by a short break and a reception, at which the winning team will be announced.

Panelists:

Various to be announced

## **Metropolitan Philadelphia – A Brief Historical Overview**

*Andrew Biroš – Penn College of Arts & Sciences – Class of 2010*

William Penn founded Philadelphia on land purchased by the Lenape Indians in 1682, laying out the city in two square, flat miles between the Delaware and Schuylkill rivers. The Delaware River's port, with its relative proximity to rich farmland, was ideally located for the export of agricultural goods. By the middle of the eighteenth century, the city had evolved into a thriving market center.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Philadelphia and its surrounding counties enjoyed greater prosperity and a higher standard of living than almost any other comparable agricultural region in the world. In order to avoid the city's overcrowding, large numbers of residents began expanding outward, establishing new towns such as Narberth, Media and Ardmore. Each of these towns set up a small, self-governing local administrative body, independent from the growing government of the central city.

By the 1840s, the majority of the Philadelphia region's population was no longer inside the two-square-mile boundaries established by William Penn – more people lived in the areas just north of Vine Street than in the original city proper. Partly in response to increasing lawlessness in outlying neighborhoods, the state legislature consolidated all of Philadelphia County into one large city – patrolled by one large police force – in 1854. Almost overnight, the City of Philadelphia increased from two square miles to approximately 130 square miles, engulfing communities in West Philadelphia, Northern Liberties, Germantown, Kensington, Frankford and Southwark.

Following the Civil War, a new wave of industrialism drove the region's economy toward industrial manufacturing. It was during this period that Philadelphia became known as the 'Workshop of the World.' Thousands of factories employed hundreds of thousands of workers, making almost every product imaginable. Some large companies, like the Pennsylvania Railroad, were thriving at that time, but the region was particularly rich in small craft businesses. In contrast to the dominant industrial giants in many other cities, Philadelphia was characterized by large numbers of smaller firms, producing high-quality goods at relatively low volume.

The growth of Philadelphia's industrial economy gave birth to a population of skilled workers, managers and small business owners – the new "middle class." This growth contributed to further changes in the city's physical layout. Thousands of brick row houses were built each year, creating workplace-oriented neighborhoods throughout the city. For the upper-middle class, train and streetcar lines radiated from the downtown hub, transporting residents to the new "streetcar suburbs" in West Philadelphia, Spring Garden, and Mount Airy. Others moved

even further outside of the central city to expanding suburban communities in Bucks, Chester, Montgomery and Delaware counties.

Philadelphia's diversified manufacturing base allowed it to withstand the forces of the Great Depression better than many other cities, but the economy was still hit hard. The Second World War helped the city's industries spring back in full force with a booming Navy Yard and busy textile mills. But the post-war years saw the beginning of a gradual decline for the country's old industrial cities. Philadelphia saw a rapid decline in manufacturing, as some industries died out and others moved to less expensive, more spacious locations outside of the city limits. The region's population also continued to move even further from the city's center. Movement to the suburbs was reinforced by federally subsidized mortgages for new homes and funding for extensive highway construction. Middle-class communities began to sprawl ever more rapidly into kidney-shaped streets, cul-de-sacs and access roads. Racial and economic disparities worsened in many areas as discriminatory housing practices excluded most African-Americans and immigrants from the new federal programs.

Many new suburban developments became insulated from adjacent communities, in some ways keeping true to the region's long history of small, individualized government. Each community dealt with issues like tax revenue, education and public works in its own particular way.

As the region moved further into the 1950s and 1960s, Philadelphia's industrial economy continued to suffer. The city's major railroad companies, at one time an economic force, began a steady decline. No other major economic player stepped into their shoes. The population of the City of Philadelphia peaked in 1950 at just over two million residents. After losing approximately 500,000 residents in the second half of the twentieth century, Philadelphia's population has only recently started to rebound.

But the region as a whole did not experience the same sort of dramatic decline – many of Philadelphia's former residents now live in its outlying suburbs. Many businesses have also left the city, but remain in the metropolitan area.

Today, Philadelphia's regional policy leaders are beginning to recognize that the economic, social and environmental problems of the inner city affect the region as a whole. They are also acknowledging that almost any significant urban policy initiative requires suburban support in order to receive vital state and federal funding. But the mechanisms for regional collaboration are still evolving. The process and the "region" itself vary from issue to issue.

## **Metropolitan Philadelphia – The Current Landscape**

*Andrew Biroš – Penn College of Arts & Sciences – Class of 2010*

### Defining the Region

As with all metropolitan areas, there is no clear border that delineates the Philadelphia region. Several different names are even used to describe it. Some intentionally refer to “Greater Philadelphia” in order to assert the centrality of the region’s largest city. Others use the more inclusive and impartial “Delaware Valley.” Even those who can agree on a name recognize that the question of what the Philadelphia metropolitan region is can be answered in a variety of ways.

A 1995 Philadelphia Inquirer report by Neal Peirce describes the region as a “citistate” and attempts to define it this way:

The citistate is what the economy does. It’s how far The Inquirer can reach readers and advertisers. It’s the market for the local evening newscasts. It’s the circle of attraction of the Philadelphia Orchestra, the Museum of Art and the Franklin Institute. It’s the fan base for the Phillies, Eagles, Flyers and 76ers. It’s the target markets of the region’s top hospitals.

The report goes on to point out that none of these boundaries are exact, and they are always in flux. And this economic point-of-view is only one way to think about the region.

The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) is a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) that was created in 1965 by an interstate compact. The coordinated planning provided by the DVRPC is required under Federal law in order to secure funding for long-range regional transportation initiatives. Other than transportation, the Commission conducts regional consulting on issues like land use, environmental protection and economic development. DVRPC defines its membership as the city of Philadelphia and the surrounding eight suburban counties in Pennsylvania (Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery) and New Jersey (Burlington, Camden, Gloucester, Mercer). Some of its tasks are very specific, like a transportation corridor study along route 611 / 263 in Montgomery County. They also conduct broad studies like their Regional Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and their Greater Philadelphia Food Systems Study.

DVRPC Executive Director Barry Seymour is the first to tell you that the commission’s membership doesn’t necessarily encompass the entire Philadelphia region as defined by economic function. The initial plan for the DVRPC actually called for the inclusion of Wilmington and northern Delaware, which are often considered part of the “natural region.” But Seymour explains that with each acting organization and issue, the boundaries are defined differently.

“There are a dozen different definitions of this region,” he states. “We do air quality planning and the EPA defines the air quality district, which is different than our MPO boundary. The regional definition, as defined by the census bureau, [the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)] has two different definitions, neither of which is exactly our region. The aviation planning region also has a slightly different definition.”

Because the defining regional lines depend on specific issues and initiatives, Fels Executive Director David Thornburgh describes Greater Philadelphia as an “issue-shed.” In the same way that a watershed crosses jurisdictional boundaries, an issue-shed is fluid, defined by each particular initiative. Mr. Seymour states that this is true even for the DVRPC, despite its federally recognized boundaries. “For the purposes of certain specific plans and programs, we’ll work with our neighbors and partners to broaden or shrink the definition depending on what the issue is.”

### Regional Decision Making

Mechanisms for regional decision making are beginning to emerge in the Philadelphia region. The Metropolitan Caucus is a coalition of elected officials that was established in early 2009 to foster cooperation among local elected officials in Southeastern Pennsylvania. Laurie Actman, the Caucus’s Director, sees increasing awareness of regional issues and efforts to work across local boundaries, but is realistic about the challenges. “There are some good collaborative efforts around certain decisions, but the operating and policy entities don’t always collaborate... The different organizations – the Chamber [of Commerce], DVRPC, Center City District – I think they’re making an effort to get to the point where we have a common agenda to advocate for in Harrisburg and DC. I think that’s a good sign, but it takes time.”

One limiting factor for the Greater Philadelphia is the fact that the region has no obvious dominant economic player with the ability to rally the business community to set and execute a regional agenda. Whereas Pittsburgh thrived on the steel industry and large corporations such as Heinz, similar corporate leadership has not existed in the Philadelphia region since the decline of the big railroads. A large number of small and medium-sized corporations are left jockeying for political capital.

### Fragmented Local Interests

The sense of local self-determination remains a strong characteristic throughout much of metropolitan Philadelphia. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is notorious for its fragmented system of local government. It can claim a grand total of 2,566 municipalities, 239 of which can be found in the Philadelphia metropolitan region. Each of these municipalities has some degree of self-governing power. The New Jersey portion of the region poses a similar challenge, claiming a total of 125 empowered jurisdictions.

Valuable public resources are spent by each jurisdiction in a constant effort to compete for everything from tourism to corporate development. Some people might argue that this is a good thing – businesses and residents should be able to choose from different mixes of local laws, taxes and conditions based on what they want, and what they can afford. As the argument goes, competition will eventually lead to better overall policies and services for everyone. But it has some serious downsides.

The state and local landscape of small, self governing townships is one of the reasons major corporations are reluctant to locate in the region. The Philadelphia metropolitan area is the fourth largest in the country, but the largest for-profit employer within it is Merck & Co, which employs only about 10,000 people. Compare that to the Seattle metropolitan area, which has a population roughly half that of Greater Philadelphia. It is home to corporations like Boeing and Microsoft, which employ roughly 76,000 and 30,000 of the region’s residents, respectively.

With such a fragmented set of governing bodies, the opportunities for rapid regional economic growth are limited. “In an electronic age, instant gratification is what [businesses] are looking for,” explains Andrew Warren, Director of the regional business advocacy organization, PenJerDel. “People want to invest their money, build their business, and sell their product. And they want to do it in six months.”

### The Role of State Government

When one is talking about the “state” government within the region, they are really alluding to the three capitals of Harrisburg, Trenton and Dover. In Laurie Actman’s assessment, the state governments are far from being metro-oriented, and often fail to make decisions that would benefit metropolitan areas. In terms of funding allocations, she contends that Pennsylvania “feels obligated to spread the money around everywhere” instead of taking a long-term strategic approach to funding its municipalities.

Mr. Thornburgh defines the traditional allocation of state dollars as “the path of least resistance,” and admits that, when a state legislature has to play to so many constituents, its funding decisions are driven by political logic. That said, “if a region can get its act together and articulate an agenda that people have bought into, and if they show up in Harrisburg and say, ‘look here’s what we want, we’ve all agreed on it,’ that’s music to the ears of the legislators. They have cover. They don’t have to negotiate between squabbling children about who wants what.”

While the “path of least resistance” seems to determine much of the Pennsylvania’s appropriations, the state government does have a variety of agencies that distribute funds based on the states own regional definitions. With half of DVRPC’s work being done on transportation issues, Barry Seymour is thankful for the Pennsylvania Department of

Transportation's regional district definition. The Southeastern Pennsylvania PennDOT district is made up of the same five Pennsylvania counties that the DVRPC includes in its MPO boundary. These are also the same counties represented in the Metropolitan Caucus. In this case, the boundaries are nicely aligned.

But, as current Executive Director of the Greater Philadelphia Economy League Steve Wray explains, often times "the state government defines the region differently than [Philadelphia regional actors] do. Some of their initiatives, depending on which department you're working with, may include Berks and Lancaster County in our region."

### Federal Incentives

The recent creation of the White House Office of Urban Affairs and metropolitan regional incentives in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act send the message that the federal government is now playing a more active role in fostering metropolitan regional cooperation. "They're trying to change things to facilitate more of a metro policy approach," says Laurie Actman. "They're trying to realign funding streams to make them more flexible, to blend them and focus on more local needs."

The Obama administration has indeed changed the tone regarding regional cooperation on the federal level. "Certainly, the talk so far is more supportive of regional planning," Barry Seymour acknowledges. "HUD for the first time in decades is now talking about looking at their programs on a metropolitan scale. In the 70s they had a regional metropolitan program that they sort of went away from in the 80s. Now they're sort of back to that. HUD, EPA and DOT are talking about a partnership that will be based on a regional scale. Some of the talk about climate change and planning for greenhouse gasses is looking at regional organizations to be involved."

But Mr. Seymour admits that within the federal government, regional funding and agenda setting is not always consistent. "The feds have their own agenda," he explains. "We're naturally a two state region if not a three state region, but there are different federal offices. New Jersey is subject to a different region than Pennsylvania, and they don't naturally coordinate. Just the way that the feds have divided up the country they didn't necessarily look at metropolitan boundaries, they looked at state boundaries. So New Jersey went with the Northeast, Pennsylvania went with the mid-Atlantic, and we're kind of left with one foot on each side."

Legislative earmarks may further complicate federal involvement in regional initiatives. Andrew Warren believes that there is too little money in the federal system for the kinds of large-scale, multi-jurisdiction projects that would lead to true regional competitiveness. "An elected official must show his or her local community the money." And that's easier to do with simple, local projects than with complex regional collaborations.

Laurie Actman is a little more optimistic about the potential of ARRA funding. Her major goal as Director of the Metro Caucus is to forge regional relationships and capitalize on opportunities in the federal package. “We are trying to collaborate on a big energy application across the region through the Caucus,” she explains. “Everyone feels like there are not enough resources. The key is to get [the counties and city] not to fight over existing resources, but to work together to go after additional resources.”

Some of these “additional resources” are the grants that reward regionally cooperating bodies. “We received almost \$700 million in transportation funding on a formula basis that came to this region,” says Barry Seymour of the DVRPC. This increased their federal funding by about 50 percent for the year. “So the counties and the cities had to work together to identify priority projects. It all came at a frantic pace.”

Steve Wray points to the time sensitivity of the ARRA funds as a limiting factor. “Since the stimulus was designed to be short term – get the money out fast –they had to go through existing delivery systems, most of which are state based. And if the state based system isn’t designed around regions very well, then that creates the same balkanization.” Mr. Wray contends that the effects of the stimulus haven’t hit the Philadelphia region yet. Furthermore, in order to assure long term regional cooperation, “what you have to look for are reauthorizations [of ongoing Federal programs].” The question remains: Is the Federal government’s commitment to a regional approach temporary or permanent?

### Less Talk, More Tangible Results

If you wanted to, you could fill a library with all that has been written on the necessity for regional cooperation. But, in the Philadelphia region, where interests and priorities vary widely from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, regional cooperation will not become a reality without evidence of tangible gain for everyone at the table. “I think where they participate is when they see the benefits for themselves. When they can see that working regionally helps them, there’s a real opportunity,” Mr. Wray asserts.

The first step is to acknowledge that the Philadelphia region is not simply county versus city. “I’m not sure you can paint the counties all with the same brush,” says Barry Seymour. “Delaware County probably feels a much closer relationship to the city than Bucks County does, for example. And that has to do with the proximity and the form of development...Delaware County has older row house communities in its eastern half that kind of blend in seamlessly with West Philly.” Other counties are bound to Philadelphia in other ways, like a shared transit system and ecology.

Some initiatives are likely to happen because regional actors can anticipate tangible benefits, like the savings that could be realized by coordinating the region’s municipal purchasing

departments. Mr. Thornburgh notes that the likelihood of collaboration is much higher “when people can focus on saving money, because it’s tangible, modifiable – it’s concrete.” Regional leaders have to see those concrete results in their own backyards.

### Regional Challenges and Opportunities

There are many challenges facing the Philadelphia metropolitan area, and many opportunities to be found in regional collaboration. The list of priorities changes depending on whom you ask, but a common theme is the necessity to utilize the many assets that the region already possesses.

Barry Seymour points out that the region must work more towards fortifying its transportation system, better connecting jobs and housing. “Right now, the vast majority of funding for both SEPTA and any other transportation highway improvement comes from either federal or state dollars,” Mr. Seymour explains. “So the region made up of the city and the counties put up very little of their own money. Look at other areas around the country that have put up new transit lines or expanded their systems, there has been a considerable contribution that comes from the locals either from a local sales tax or some sort of bond structure, or some sort of local assessment. So far this region has not sort of stepped up to that.”

Once depending on the vibrancy of the port system, Philadelphia has seen its freight transit diminish. Mr. Warren champions the dredging of the Delaware, claiming, “We don’t have a river that’s going to attract ships that are going to be hauling the freight in the near future.” In the same vain of capitalizing on existing entities, Mr. Wray asserts that educational attainment and quality are often overlooked as regional issues, but that they are coming to the forefront lately. “I think there’s starting to be some realization in some of the suburban communities that the city’s challenges can hold back [suburban] chances for growth.” The list of challenges facing the area that require a regional perspective continues to grow. These issues include housing development, workforce development, energy sustainability, immigration, emergency preparedness and public health. While each holds a different set of variables, through concentrated regional cooperation, substantial gains for all of those in the Philadelphia metropolis can be realized.

## **Philadelphia Metropolitan Regional Organizations and Actors**

### Governmental / Quasi-governmental

DVRPC <http://www.dvrpc.org/>

Philadelphia City Planning Commission <http://www.philaplanning.org/>

Center City District / CCDC <http://www.centercityphila.org/>

SEPTA <http://www.septa.com/>

Philadelphia Regional Port Authority <http://www.philaport.com/main.htm>

The Metropolitan Caucus

[http://www.philly.com/dailynews/hot\\_topics/Rethinking Philadelphia The Metropolitan Moment.html](http://www.philly.com/dailynews/hot_topics/Rethinking_Philadelphia_The_Metropolitan_Moment.html) & <http://philadelphia.bizjournals.com/philadelphia/stories/2009/05/25/story5.html>

### Foundations

William Penn Foundation [www.williampenfoundation.org](http://www.williampenfoundation.org)

The Pew Charitable Trusts [http://www.pewtrusts.org/our\\_work\\_category.aspx?id=578](http://www.pewtrusts.org/our_work_category.aspx?id=578)

Brookings <http://www.brookings.edu/metro.aspx>

The Philadelphia Foundation <https://www.philafound.org/default.aspx>

### Think Tanks / Educational / Media

The Economy League of Greater Philadelphia <http://economyleague.org/>

Temple MPIP – Metro Philly Indicators Project <http://mpip.temple.edu/>

Fels Research & Consulting Group <http://www.fels.upenn.edu/consulting>

Penn IUR (Institute for Urban Research) <http://www.upenn.edu/penniur/>

Plan Philly <http://www.planphilly.com/>

### Business

The Reinvestment Fund <http://www.trfund.com/>

Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce <http://www.greaterphilachamber.com/>

Greater Philadelphia Hispanic Chamber of Commerce <http://www.philahispanicchamber.org/>

Select Greater Philadelphia <http://www.selectgreaterphiladelphia.com/>

PenJerDel <http://penjerdel.org/>

Science Center <http://www.sciencecenter.org/>

Innovation Philadelphia <http://www.innovationphiladelphia.com/>

Innovation Partnership <http://innovationpartnership.net/>

Sustainable Business Network

[http://www.sbnphiladelphia.org/events/greencollarjobs/document\\_view?portal\\_status\\_message=Your%20contents%20status%20has%20been%20modified](http://www.sbnphiladelphia.org/events/greencollarjobs/document_view?portal_status_message=Your%20contents%20status%20has%20been%20modified)

## General Resources – Regionalism and Metropolitan Philadelphia

- Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program  
<http://www.brookings.edu/metro.aspx>
- Pew Philadelphia Research Initiative  
[http://www.pewtrusts.org/our\\_work\\_category.aspx?id=244](http://www.pewtrusts.org/our_work_category.aspx?id=244)
- William Penn Foundation  
[www.williampenfoundation.org](http://www.williampenfoundation.org)
- The Economy League of Greater Philadelphia  
<http://economyleague.org/>
- MPIP – Metro Philly Indicators Project  
<http://mpip.temple.edu/>
- Penn IUR (Institute for Urban Research)  
<http://www.upenn.edu/penniur/>
- Plan Philly  
<http://www.planphilly.com/>
- Next American City / Penn Future  
<http://americancity.org/> <http://www.pennfuture.org/>
- State of the City 2009 (Pew)  
[http://www.pewtrusts.org/our\\_work\\_report\\_detail.aspx?id=50478](http://www.pewtrusts.org/our_work_report_detail.aspx?id=50478)
- Citizens Agenda (Knight, Lenfest, Penn Project for Civic Engagement, etc. 2007)  
<http://www.greatexpectationsnow.com/content/the-citizens-agenda>
- Regional Stewardship and Boundary Crossers: How Does Philadelphia Measure Up? (Alliance for Regional Stewardship, 2005) <http://www.publicpolicychallenge.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/RegionalStewardshipPhila.pdf>
- Back to Prosperity (Brookings, Economy League, etc. 2003)  
[http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2003/12metropolitanpolicy\\_pennsylvania.aspx](http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2003/12metropolitanpolicy_pennsylvania.aspx)
- Roadmap to Harrisburg (Economy League 1997)  
<http://www.publicpolicychallenge.org/roadmap-to-harrisburg/>
- Peirce Report (Philadelphia Inquirer 1995)  
<http://www.publicpolicychallenge.org/peirce-report-philadelphia-inquirer-1995/>
- Philly.com Metropolitan Moment Series  
[http://www.philly.com/dailynews/hot\\_topics/Rethinking\\_Philadelphia\\_The\\_Metropolitan\\_Moment.html](http://www.philly.com/dailynews/hot_topics/Rethinking_Philadelphia_The_Metropolitan_Moment.html)
- The Pennsylvania Convention Center: A Civic Campaign Case Study (Fels 2009)  
<http://www.publicpolicychallenge.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/Convention-Center-Case-Study.pdf>

## Metropolitan Philadelphia Policy Issues and Resources

The following ideas and links are just a sample. Use them as a starting point, but by no means do you need to limit yourselves to items on this list.

For additional information on basic policy and program research, including a list of topic-specific promising practices websites, see the Fels Promising Practices Research Manual: [https://www.fels.upenn.edu/sites/www.fels.upenn.edu/files/Fels\\_Promising\\_Practice\\_vol.1\\_1.pdf](https://www.fels.upenn.edu/sites/www.fels.upenn.edu/files/Fels_Promising_Practice_vol.1_1.pdf)

### Workforce Development

- Green Jobs (ARRA program implementation, weatherization agency coordination, workforce training programs, small business development for sub-contractors and material manufacturers)
- Regional Workforce Development (a more general, comprehensive approach – bringing the business community, public schools, training agencies, universities, etc. together across jurisdictional lines to expand opportunities for mutual benefit)
- Links:  
<http://www.pwdc.org/>  
[http://www.sbnphiladelphia.org/events/greencollarjobs/document\\_view?portal\\_status\\_message=Your%20contents%20status%20has%20been%20modified.](http://www.sbnphiladelphia.org/events/greencollarjobs/document_view?portal_status_message=Your%20contents%20status%20has%20been%20modified.)

### Housing / Community Development / Economic Development

- Regional Smart Growth (commercial corridor development, coordinated brownfield redevelopment, vacant property reuse – building on some “Back to Prosperity” recommendations)
- Regional property information data sharing
- Delaware Waterfront (master planning, casinos and gaming revenue, etc.)
- Links:  
[http://www.williamspennfoundation.org/news\\_keywords3559/news\\_keywords\\_show.htm?doc\\_id=853156](http://www.williamspennfoundation.org/news_keywords3559/news_keywords_show.htm?doc_id=853156)  
[http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2003/12metropolitanpolicy\\_pennsylvania.aspx](http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2003/12metropolitanpolicy_pennsylvania.aspx)  
[http://www.publicpolicychallenge.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/WP\\_Affordable\\_Housing.pdf](http://www.publicpolicychallenge.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/WP_Affordable_Housing.pdf)  
<http://www.publicpolicychallenge.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/To-Move-Ahead.pdf>  
[http://www.publicpolicychallenge.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/WP\\_Preserving\\_Housing.pdf](http://www.publicpolicychallenge.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/WP_Preserving_Housing.pdf)  
<http://planphilly.com/actionplan>

### Transportation / Other Infrastructure

- Regional Transportation (highway tolls – 422 / Turnpike, revitalizing old rail routes – R-6 to Valley Forge / Wyomissing, airport coordination)
- Green Transportation Corridors (multi-modal transportation system development, including rails to trails, pedestrian and bicycling plans, e.g. Schuylkill River Trail)
- Water and Wastewater Infrastructure (coordinated stormwater, wastewater, water quality initiatives)
- Links:
  - <http://www.planphilly.com/brrokings-lahood-gets-regional-transportation-spending>
  - <http://www.schuylkillrivertrail.com/index.php?>
  - <http://www.riverparkalliance.org/drupal/>

### Education

- School funding formulas (arguments that all schools in a given region should be funded equally in an effort to equalize opportunities, higher teacher pay in "combat zones" subsidized by suburban districts)
- School cost consolidation (school districts sharing busses, athletic facilities, upper management...makes more sense between smaller municipalities, but might have some parallel for a major metropolitan region)
- Regional teacher education / prep programs
- Regional approach to strengthening community colleges (expanding access to community colleges and ensuring that they provide an appropriate level of education across the region)
- Links:
  - <http://www.thenotebook.org/>
  - <http://www.collegiateconsortium.org/default.asp>
  - <http://www.campusphilly.org/>

### Sustainability / Energy

- Sustainable Energy Authority (combining environmental, operational, legal, financial and political considerations into a comprehensive plan)
- Regional Cap & Trade (some sort of RGGI participation, or development of a mini-RGGI for southeastern PA – considerations similar to SEA)
- Links:
  - <http://www.phila.gov/green/greenworks/>
  - <http://www.greenplanphiladelphia.com/>
  - <http://www.ecasavesenergy.org/>
  - <http://www.pecpa.org/>
  - <http://www.peco.com/>

## Food

- Local Food Networks (urban farming, farmers markets, fresh food deserts in low-income areas, role of the port and food imports, etc. – There is also a green jobs angle here in the expansion of for-profit sustainable farming, especially in the suburbs where land is more available and affordable.)
- Links:
  - <http://www.dvrpc.org/food/>
  - <http://www.thefoodtrust.org/>
  - [http://www.philly.com/philly/business/20091211\\_New\\_Philadelphia\\_food\\_center\\_urges\\_state\\_to\\_free\\_up\\_funding.html](http://www.philly.com/philly/business/20091211_New_Philadelphia_food_center_urges_state_to_free_up_funding.html)

## Immigration

- Regional coalitions of service providers, funding for regional organizations with branches throughout
- Federal USCIS / ICE offices serve entire regions, coordination at local level, negative impact on local resources of 287g, etc.
- Small business licensing, access to language classes, libraries as resource centers
- Links:
  - <http://welcomingcenter.org/>
  - <http://www.phila.gov/globalPhiladelphia/>
  - [http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2008/1113\\_immigration\\_singer.aspx](http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2008/1113_immigration_singer.aspx)
  - <http://www.trfund.com/resource/downloads/creativity/Migrant.pdf>

## Health

- Hospitals serve the region - coordination of branches in smaller localities
- Regional insurance plans, co-ops
- Public health and emergency response
- Links:
  - <http://www.cphi.upenn.edu/>
  - <http://www.ppha.org/>
  - [http://www.mlive.com/business/detroit/index.ssf/2009/07/regional\\_health\\_care\\_coalition.html](http://www.mlive.com/business/detroit/index.ssf/2009/07/regional_health_care_coalition.html)

## Arts

- Links:
  - <http://www.sp2.upenn.edu/SIAP/>
  - <http://www.trfund.com/resource/creativity.html>
  - <http://www.trfund.com/resource/downloads/creativity/Migrant.pdf>

## **Additional Reading**

Boundary Crossers: Case Studies of How Ten of America's Metropolitan Regions Work. Bruce Adams and John Parr, eds. College Park, MD: Academy of Leadership, 1998.

The Geography of Opportunity Race and Housing Choice in Metropolitan America. William Julius Wilson and Xavier de Souza Briggs, eds. Brookings Institution Press, 2005.

Downs, Anthony. New Visions for Metropolitan America. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1994.

Katz, Bruce. Reflections on Regionalism. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Brookings Institution Press, 2000.

Nivola, Pietro S. Laws of the Landscape: How Policies Shape Cities in Europe and America. Brookings Institution Press/Inter-American Development Bank, 1999.

Orfield, Myron. Metropolitix: A Regional Agenda for Community and Stability. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution/Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 1997.

Peirce, Neal R., Curtis Johnson, and John Stuart Hall. Citistates: How Urban America Can Prosper in a Competitive World. Washington, DC: Serve Locks Press. 1993.

Rusk, David. Inside Game/Outside Game: Winning Strategies for Saving Urban America. Brookings Institution Press, 1999.