

Bringing Place-Based Tools to Policy Development in the Federal Government:

Connecting Knowledge, Analysis, and Decision Making

“The U.S. Experience in Place-Based Policy, and the RUPRI/CARES Contribution”

February 22, 2010

Ottawa, Ontario

Charles W. Fluharty

Rural Policy Research Institute (RUPRI)

German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Fellow

cfluharty@rupri.org



Five Considerations

- I. The Historical Background for U.S. Place-Based Policy
- II. The Place-Based Policy Commitment of the Obama Administration
- III. Concerns & Considerations Regarding This Dynamic
- IV. The RUPRI/CARES Contributions to U.S. Place-Based Policy
- V. Concerns & Considerations: Final Thoughts

I. The Historical Background for U.S. Place-Based Policy

- ▶ Commitments During Continental Expansion
- ▶ An Evolving Federalism During the 19th Century
- ▶ The Great Depression and the New Deal
- ▶ The Johnson Administration and the Great Society
- ▶ State and Community Block Grants /Enterprise Zones and Enterprise Communities
- ▶ Bush Administration Regional Competitiveness Agenda

II. The Place-Based Policy Commitment of the Obama Administration

- ▶ Transition Team Composition / Early Foreshadowing
- ▶ The Brookings Institution: Metropolitan Policy Center, RUPRI Center for Regional Competitiveness, OECD Territorial Development Policy Committee
- ▶ August 2009 White House Memo

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

August 11, 2009

M-09-28

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

FROM: Peter R. Orszag, Office of Management and Budget
Melody Barnes, Domestic Policy Council
Adolfo Carrion, Office of Urban Affairs
Lawrence Summers, National Economic Council

SUBJECT: Developing Effective Place-Based Policies for the FY 2011 Budget

This guidance memorandum outlines policy principles meant to advance the Administration's domestic and fiscal priorities and to increase the impact of government dollars by leveraging place-conscious planning and place-based programming.

The guidance outlined here is preliminary. It supports an important interagency process focused on investing in what works by evaluating existing place-based policies and identifying potential reforms and areas for interagency coordination. Our immediate objective is to develop proposals for the FY2011 Budget that advance this Administration's policy priorities in the most effective ways whether by improving place-based strategies already operating or by adopting such strategies where there is significant potential for impact on a problem(s).

Place-based policies leverage investments by focusing resources in targeted places and drawing on the compounding effect of well-coordinated action. Effective place-based policies can influence how rural and metropolitan areas develop, how well they function as places to live, work, operate a business, preserve heritage, and more. Such policies can also streamline otherwise redundant and disconnected programs.

White House “Place-Based” Policy

Specific Actions Requested (Before OMB Budget Submission)

1. Identify 3 to 5 programs or initiatives:
 - Outcomes
 - Indicators
 - Options for Improving Coordination/Effectiveness
 - Knowledge-Building Strategies

2. Principles for Place Policy

- Clear, measurable, and carefully evaluated goals should guide investment and regulation:
 - Economic Competitiveness
 - Environmental Sustainability
 - Community Health and Access to Opportunity
 - Safety and Security
- Change comes from the community level and often through partnership; complex problems require flexible, integrated solutions.
- Many important challenges demand a regional approach.

“...Many important challenges demand a regional approach. The Nation is increasingly a conglomeration of regional economies and ecosystems that should be approached as such. Federal investments should promote planning and collaboration across jurisdictional boundaries. Given the forces reshaping smaller communities, it is particularly important that rural development programs be coordinated with broader regional initiatives. Programs in neighboring zones and within larger regions – some of which connect rural communities to metropolitan regions – should complement each other. Federal programs should reflect better the Nation’s economic and social diversity, both in rural and metropolitan areas. To the extent possible, programs should allow for communities to identify distinct needs and address them in appropriate, strategic ways...”

Current Departmental Responses

- ▶ Sustainable Communities Partnership (HUD, EPA, DOT, USDA{?})
- ▶ Promising Neighborhoods Initiative (Dep't. of Ed.)
- ▶ Choice Neighborhoods (HUD)
- ▶ Energy Regional Innovation Clusters (Commerce, Labor, Energy, SBA)
- ▶ Regional Rural Innovation (USDA)

IV. The RUPRI/CARES Contributions to U.S. Place-Based Policy

- ▶ 20-year history in Place-Based framework
- ▶ Collaboration with most federal departments, many states, regions, and local governments
- ▶ New Obama Administration engagement
 - ▶ Sustainable Communities Initiative
 - ▶ Regional Strategic Planning
 - ▶ Rural Regional Innovation
 - ▶ Great Regions

V. Concerns & Situations: Final Thoughts

1. Federal, state, and local fiscal crisis is already redefining these alignments
2. There will be winners and losers, and governance, leadership, & culture will be the prime determinants
3. Federal, state, and local budget challenges could either accelerate or delimit these dynamics
4. All existing path dependencies must be overcome: political, bureaucratic, jurisdictional, sectoral, and cultural

V. Concerns & Situations: Final Thoughts

5. The rural-urban dialectic in all this may be the most critical factor
6. The need for rigorous decision support, technical assistance, and *ex ante* & *ex post* evaluation has never been greater



Charles W. Fluharty

German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Fellow

cfluharty@rupri.org

President and CEO

Rural Policy Research Institute

214 Middlebush Hall

University of Missouri

Columbia, MO 65211

(573) 882-0316

<http://www.rupri.org/>