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Introduction

Researchers looking at metropolitan or regional issues frequently intend to study winning or exemplary case studies. For instance, Minneapolis-St.Paul, Portland (Oregon), and Toronto are generally referred to as prototypes for metropolitan solutions. In comparison with those case studies, Baltimore is unquestionably not an eminent model for regionalism in America. When you think about Baltimore, you prefer to think about urban renaissance, downtown redevelopment, old port renewal, or tourist industry expansion rather than regionalism. Nevertheless, this city region remains a relevant example for debates and theories on regionalism. First of all, Greater Baltimore has to deal with a profound problem of social and economic spatial segregation at the regional level. Moreover, Greater Baltimore has been a case study for several specialists of regional problems like for example: Peter Szanton (1986) with the publication of *Baltimore 2000*, David Rusk (1993; 1996) for *Baltimore Unbound*, Neil Peirce and al. (1993) for *Citistates*, and Myron Orfield (1996) for *Baltimore Metropolitics*.

These authors have inspired a rich debate on regionalism and have urged to take a metropolitan approach in order to solve Baltimore’s social problems along with region’s economic competitiveness on a long term basis. These studies have come to similar conclusions: within the current structure and trends of metropolitan development, the central city and the suburbs are still interdependent; the central city is not likely to solve its social problems by itself under the current regional development patterns; sooner or later, the earlier suburbs will be affected in the same way that the central city has experienced urban decline; and the well being of the entire region is jeopardized by the fragmented and low-density scenario of metropolitan development. Ultimately, each study suggests a series of policy implications in order to create a more acceptable and sustainable urban growth.

These reports focusing on the Greater Baltimore area are using what we call the new regionalism framework as a theoretical corpus. This recent paradigm, based on the interdependence of central cities and suburbs, states that the problem of urban change is shaped according to a regional instead of a local, municipal or undetermined spatial perspective. In this view, central
cities and suburbs are linked by a functional relationship that makes economic regions work. This viewpoint also propounds that in the context of globalization, city regions are increasingly engaged in economic competition with other regions and that macro-economic policies and welfare states have lost some of their ability to generate an equitable and widespread rise of wealth within nations. A more sociological perspective suggests that the low-density pattern of development which has been occurring in America for the last half century is not sustainable. Despite the fact that suburban sprawl produces benefits for a large portion of metropolitan populations, it appears that this model has generated continuous social and often racial segregation patterns. Suburbanization patterns also tend to generate environmental costs. Traffic congestion, air, water and solid waste pollution, excessive losses of open space, etc. are some of the numerous environmental growth related problems induced by unlimited low-density development. Finally, it is argued that the political context of fragmented metropolitan areas doesn’t correspond to the true economic and social realities of cities and, above all, the lack of regional co-ordination might have negative effects on city regions.

This new paradigm corresponds to a widespread reaction within most industrialized countries. The post-industrial era corresponds to a questioning period regarding economic patterns and development policies at the regional level. After several decades of continuous industrial growth, many old industrial regions like Baltimore are looking for the best solutions to create attractive and desirable places, to improve urban management and to make cities more effective and capable of evolving within the new rules of globalization.

However in this report, we are not interested in suggesting new archetypes for practical metropolitan solutions. The various works of reference which already exist regarding this question suggest enough theories which anticipate the consequences of unconstrained urban growth and suggest a multitude of alternatives. Hence, we do not want to pursue this aim. We are more curious about the process of metropolitan governance. In other words, the social and political forces which are likely to engender a renewed vision of the future for metropolitan areas and ultimately innovative urban strategies on a regional scale. This is where we find a relative convergence between theories and specific actions. In that respect, Baltimore becomes a
valuable case study.

The main purpose of this research is to study how public, private and civic actors are replying to the social, economic and spatial transformations of cities and how these predicaments give rise to the creation of new urban strategies addressing the region as a whole. In other words, this research examine how metropolitan or regional visions are created and what the nature of interorganizational arrangements is among the various institutions and actors that make up a metropolitan area. Our first premise is that the political fragmentation and local competition is primarily unfavorable to regional cooperation. In fact, the current political structure within metropolitan areas—characterized by the relative independence of multiple local jurisdictions—tends to favor the status quo and conservatism regarding innovative urban policies which address the region as a whole. Thus, in that inherent context, what are the factors favoring metropolitan interdependence instead of internal regional competition? To answer this question, we argue that, despite a context of political fragmentation and local competition, there is a new form of interaction between central cities and suburbs. This interaction would be motivated by the urban restructuring process but carried out by a modernistic form of public action supported by the emergence of business and civic actors along with a relationship redefinition between local and central governments.

Therefore, the primary goal of this study is precisely to illustrate the process of contemporary metropolitan governance initiatives. The methodology relies on a case study approach supported by the *metropolitan governance* concept. This notion designates the capability to adapt the governance structures of a specific city region to the new urban form. This aptitude refers to the new forms of public action and depends on the interorganizational dynamics of regional actors including not only public but also civic and business actors. To describe this process, we will look at three constituents of metropolitan governance to describe the process: (1) the regional impulses; (2) the development of a regional vision; and (3) the design and implementation of metropolitan governance strategy.
In this report, Baltimore is used as the principal focus to support our arguments. This city region is subject to a political analysis based on existing metropolitan planning documents or reports whether they are commanded or produced by public institutions or civic, business and philanthropic organizations. This relevant documentation may include annual reports, planning documents, issues papers or any other type of report on metropolitan issues or regional projects. These reports and documents are our landmarks. We postulate that these productions are not only technical tools but also the product of a vision, a culture or a specific regional atmosphere. Metropolitan planning documents or reports is our basic research material of course, but this kind of material generally does not say much about the conception and production processes. The research work is thus completed by press review analysis along with complementary interviews with metropolitan actors.

In the first chapter of this report, we address the main problems and concepts regarding the contemporary context of city regions. Several urban problems divided in two main concepts are discussed in this section. First, the urban restructuring concept defined by the structural transformations of city regions like the economic restructuring, the globalization process and the spatial expansion of urbanized areas is approached. Secondly, the reconfiguration of political power as defined by institutional factors related to the interplay between local governments, central governments and the emergence of social capital in urban affairs tackled. In the second chapter, we attempt to design a contemporary theoretical framework for metropolitan governance integrating these problems and concepts. In this section, we attempt to provide a better definition of what we call the new regionalism paradigm.

Chapter three seeks to describe the context and definition of Greater Baltimore. Chapters four through seven aim to describe the passing from one phase of regionalism to another in Greater Baltimore. In chapter four, we begin with an historical analysis and political evaluation of the earlier phase of regionalism in Greater Baltimore. Chapter five looks at regional impulses in

---

1 The present report is part of a larger comparative research project that incorporates other revitalizing city regions including Montréal and Toronto in Canada, and Boston, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Milwaukee and Minneapolis-St. Paul in the United States. This comparative research is carried out by a team of researchers in urban studies at Montréal’s National Institute for Scientific Research (INRS-Urbanisation). Montréal and Pittsburgh will eventually be combined in a more comprehensive analysis in the context of a doctoral dissertation to be completed by the year 2000.
Greater Baltimore, which are the preconditions which can favor regionwide initiatives as well as other factors that influence the creation of metropolitan governance. In chapter six, we study the development of a regional vision within Greater Baltimore. The development of a regional refers to how regional actors change the way they think about urban development and what strategies are applied to foster the development of a relative consensus about the future of the city region. In chapter seven, we focus on the latest economic development strategies to describe the process of design and implementation of metropolitan governance in Greater Baltimore. In the concluding chapter, we look at the convergence between the new regionalism paradigm and concrete actions over regionalism. In other words, how different actors interpret the principles of new regionalism and what are the strategies implemented to support regional solutions, from theory to practice?

Throughout this report, the term *city region* is use as a concept which could be interchangeable with the notions of metropolitan area, citistate, or region. In the Canadian context, to characterize the metropolitan territorial configuration, we commonly use the *city region* concept in order to describe the interaction between the central city and the suburbs (Collin, 1995; Sancton, 1994). This concept is semiologaly meaningful and especially useful because it doesn’t necessarily refer to a formal administrative or statistical definition unit, like, for instance, a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). The *city region* concept simply means that, as a geographical definition, we consider at least one central city and its surrounding suburbs. Although the city region might occasionally correspond to the MSA, the precise definition of the metropolitan area is depending on the problem definition as interpreted by regional actors.
1. A Portrait of Industrial City Regions: Problems and Concepts

The starting point of this research is related to urban transformations and especially with the ability of socio-political actors to find adaptable strategies to deal with urban transformations. From Second World War to nowadays, the cumulative effect of economic restructuring, globalization, changes in spatial patterns and the transformation of the role of local and central governments gave rise to a relatively profound mutation for cities and regions, particularly industrial cities which are the focus of this report.

Therefore, this research undertake side by side two contemporary dimensions that have had a determinant impact on cities. First, the factors related to the structural transformations of city regions, what we call urban restructuring. Economic restructuring, globalization and the spatial transformations of urbanized areas are among the factors that contributed the most to the mutation of city regions today. The second dimension of the research problem is related to institutional factors, or the new configuration of political power. Along with the suburbanization process and the decentralization of residential and economic activities, city regions have experimented an intensification of local competition which has in return tightened up the conflicting values between central cities and suburbs. Concurrently, in a context of globalization where the national borders no longer induce the economic future of local communities, central and local governments are forced to redefine their role and policies. Finally, it seems that for most of the new public initiatives occurring in the current context, the general principle relies on more community and less government. This give rises to the emergence of business, civic, and nonprofit actors in urban affairs.

These contemporary urban circumstances are discussed in terms of what are their prevalent implications for city regions. Those dimensions are also the primary concepts used to design the
theoretical framework of this research. In order to describe these concepts, we compare the historical trends of Baltimore with ten other industrial cities.

1.1 The Urban Restructuring Process (structural factors)

1.1.1 Economic restructuring

Before the industrial era, the main economic purpose of cities was its function as a market place. The pre-industrial period was in fact characterized by an industrial location trend toward peripheral places. Urban centers were avoided to the profit of smaller areas where energy sources were more readily available, where labor cost was cheaper and where the regulations were not as strict (Bairoch, 1985). It is only later, concurrently with the industrial revolution, that cities added manufacturing goods to their commercial function. Industrial cities are thus characterized by their development in the second half of the 19th century and by a rapid expansion associated with industrial and manufacturing growth. If industrial cities display severe signs of decline nowadays, this is mainly due to a building and unbuilding process which is generally cyclic for most of those cities.

For scholars like Anthony Orum, there is one model of urban and industrial growth and decline. In *City-Building in America* Orum (1995) uses Milwaukee as his main case study and suggests five stages of development for old industrial cities in America:

1. the pre-industrial period (1820-1870);
2. the early industrial period (1870-1900);
3. the mature industrial period (1900-1930);

Some of the data used in the next sections come from a benchmark produced by the Center for Economic Development, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. *The Economic State of Milwaukee: The city and the Region* was published in 1998 and includes over 350 indicators of cities and metropolitan areas, some going back as far as 1950. We have selected 10 city regions that we thought were the most comparable in both size and in term of historical economic conditions with Baltimore. We wish to express our debt to Marc V. Levine for his indispensable collaboration in our work.
4. the reshaping industrial period (1930-1950);

5. the industrial declining period (1950-1990).

History teaches us that cities are always in transformation and that the rise and fall of industrial cities is not a perfect linear and continuous occurrence. In this report, we are more interested at the latest phase of development which gave rise to the urban predicaments we know today.

Since the Second World War most of these cities have experienced a continuous deindustrialization and economic restructuring process characterized by the shift from an economy driven by manufacturing to an economy dominated by the service sector; a transformation of their roles as economic metropolises due to the shrinking of their immediate hinterlands; fierce external competition coming from other parts of the continent or from other regions of the world; and increasing internal competition within metropolitan areas between the oldest parts including central cities and first rings of suburban development and the newest parts of the suburbs. Due to these post-industrial forces, most of older industrial cities had and still have to deal with socio-economic problems and physical deterioration that characterize the process of economic restructuring. (Beauregard, 1989; Bluestone & Harrison, 1982; Castells, 1989; Fainstein, 1990; Judd & Parkinson, 1990; Noyelle & Stanback, 1983; Lamonde et Martineau, 1992; etc.) The major challenge which industrial cities are facing today is their transformation and transition towards a renewed economic structure.

Comparing Greater Baltimore with ten comparable industrial city regions in the U.S. shows similar patterns regarding the structural evolution of their economies (table 1.1). Except for Minneapolis, all industrial cities have witnessed an important decrease in manufacturing employment between 1967 and 1992. This decline was sometimes radical, especially for city regions specialized in the steel industry like Baltimore. In the most recent period, Greater Baltimore has continued to show some signs of manufacturing decline. Between 1987 to 1992, the city region was still loosing an average of 3.68% of its manufacturing jobs per year when other metropolitan areas like Cleveland, Milwaukee and Pittsburgh started recovering from industrial decline. Table 1.1 also shows that the deindustrialization process is accompanied by the growth of the service sector. Indeed, especially between 1977 and 1987, the service sector
has contributed to the process of conversion from a manufacturing to a services-based economy for all of those city regions.

**TABLE 1.1**

**METROPOLITAN AREAS MANUFACTURING AND SERVICE INDUSTRIES EMPLOYMENT, 1967-1992**

(Percent change in various years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Areas</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th></th>
<th>Services Industries*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>-20.8%</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
<td>-18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>-15.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>-11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>-20.5%</td>
<td>-42.6%</td>
<td>-12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
<td>-5.1%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>-13.6%</td>
<td>-23.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
<td>-15.3%</td>
<td>-11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
<td>-19.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>-21.2%</td>
<td>-17.0%</td>
<td>-13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>-19.9%</td>
<td>-48.5%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>-15.7%</td>
<td>-11.0%</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, County and City Data Book; U.S. Bureau of the Census, State and Metropolitan Area Data Book. Adapted from: Center For Economic Development, UWM, 1998. * The service sector does not include the retail trade employments.

But, why does economic restructuring matter for the new regionalism? In fact, many intellectuals seem to agree that we are living in a period of changes inside which the local or regional levels are more active for the well being of their citizens (Logan and Swanstrom, 1990; Goetz and Clarke, 1993; Ohmae, 1995; Clarke and Gaile, 1998). These authors suggest that the impact of globalization and economic restructuring combined with the decentralization of higher governments and the wearing away of welfare state drive the local or regional communities towards more autonomy and responsibility. Economic restructuring creates a pressure on local or regional levels to create economic development policies in order to adjust to the contemporary economic context.

Moreover, several aspects of economic restructuring are essentially regional. For instance, the shift from a manufacturing economy to a service economy involved revolutionary changes in
human capital and technical infrastructure. Developing the region's workforce, establishing new telecommunications facilities, improving intermodal transportation system, upgrading airport capabilities, implementing strategies to protect and improve the environment, are all regional tasks by nature.

1.1.2 Globalization process

Along with deindustrialization, city regions are witnessing the impact of the emerging global economy in two ways. First, industrial regions have been directly affected by the expansion of competition as well as the geographical changes in the global system of production induced by economic integration to the world economy and the international division of labor. Secondly, as city regions are facilitating regional and international economic interactions and keep concentrating most of their resources on the production of services and goods, they continue to play a crucial role in the world economy today.

**FIGURE 1.1**

1997 Export Value (Thousand $; Merchandise Only)

Globalization is essentially the strengthening of trade links between countries or specific parts of the world. This phenomenon is stimulated by various free trade agreements, by the global mobility of capital, the progress in telecommunication technology, the rise of international production networks, the global reduction of transport costs, etc. Figure 1 shows how the volume of trade between the United States and the rest of the world has increased over the last decade. Exportations from the U.S. to the world have gone up from $244 billion per year in 1987 to $688 billion in 1997.

### Table 1.2
**International Export Sales of U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1993-97**
**Ranked by 1997 Value (Thousand Dollars)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baltimore</strong></td>
<td>1 783 407</td>
<td>1 868 968</td>
<td>2 209 168</td>
<td>2 110 417</td>
<td>2 171 305</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>6 472 471</td>
<td>7 095 349</td>
<td>7 902 660</td>
<td>8 715 804</td>
<td>9 570 608</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>1 135 153</td>
<td>1 569 651</td>
<td>2 295 800</td>
<td>2 262 228</td>
<td>2 667 262</td>
<td>135.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>3 898 151</td>
<td>4 056 506</td>
<td>4 256 653</td>
<td>4 784 140</td>
<td>5 674 148</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>3 582 759</td>
<td>4 093 323</td>
<td>4 706 991</td>
<td>5 075 165</td>
<td>5 510 954</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>16 780 889</td>
<td>27 469 655</td>
<td>27 314 657</td>
<td>27 531 231</td>
<td>25 967 413</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>2 337 305</td>
<td>2 913 545</td>
<td>3 506 904</td>
<td>3 717 211</td>
<td>3 837 641</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>9 003 818</td>
<td>8 863 531</td>
<td>11 071 822</td>
<td>12 383 979</td>
<td>12 006 701</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>5 869 148</td>
<td>6 545 836</td>
<td>7 896 893</td>
<td>7 727 940</td>
<td>8 027 797</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2 989 745</td>
<td>3 150 610</td>
<td>3 982 169</td>
<td>3 933 687</td>
<td>4 352 159</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>3 399 997</td>
<td>3 673 337</td>
<td>3 997 678</td>
<td>4 497 447</td>
<td>4 711 500</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro areas Total</strong></td>
<td>57 252 843</td>
<td>71 300 311</td>
<td>79 141 396</td>
<td>82 739 249</td>
<td>84 497 487</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Total</strong></td>
<td>464 858 412</td>
<td>512 415 609</td>
<td>583 030 524</td>
<td>622 827 063</td>
<td>687 597 999</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although its direct impact on cities is difficult to measure, globalization is certainly an essential variable to understand the present urban evolution and one of the main issues for city regions today is to find its place in the world economy. The world system theory (Friedmann & Wolff, 1986; Sassen, 1994) depicts the global organization of contemporary capitalism as a global hierarchical urban system. This urban classification refers to the strategic and specific role of certain cities in the economic world order. Some great cities might play a role as financial centers like New York; others can play a fundamental role in Research and Development like Boston; some can assume an important part in manufacturing production as Detroit or Silicon Valley.
Valley; and one may specialize in international trade like Miami. World Cities are shaping the network of globalization.

A closer look at metropolitan areas (table 1.2) reveals that city regions are effectively sharpening their participation in international trades. At the same time, city regions are becoming more and more dependent on exportation for their development. For the eleven metropolitan areas included in the sample, the average increase in exportation from 1993 to 1997 is similar to the total for the U.S. (48%). However, Baltimore cut a sorry figure compared to other metropolitan areas with only a 21.8% of increase in exportations during the most recent period.

The world system theory envisions the urban hierarchy with different roles for great cities. Some cities are more likely to play a role at the international level while other cities become regional centers. Baltimore remains indisputably a major economic player at both, the regional and national levels. If we consider the Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA), which combined Baltimore-Washington, this is the fourth most important region in the U.S. with a population of more than 7 million, just behind Chicago-Gary-Kenosha with 8.6 million, Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County with 15.5 million and of course New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island with close to 20 million (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1997). The Gross Metropolitan Product Index\(^3\) (GMP) shows that the Baltimore metropolitan area has maintained a relatively consistent economic growth rate compared to other industrial metropolitan areas with an average annual rate of 2.03% between 1980 and 1992 (figure 1.2). This indicates that the economic health of Greater Baltimore is still improving as a whole.

Although the Baltimore city region plays an important economic role at the regional and national levels, table 1.2 demonstrates that this metropolitan area still has a lot of work to do to improve its international competitive position. If one thing is certain, that is the fact that the world market logic is strengthening the competition between great cities, nationally and internationally. The global forces are pushing simultaneously in the direction of an international level of economic organization and toward a regional level of economic integration. Since the nation-state and the

---

\(^3\) The Gross Metropolitan Product (GMP) is an index produce by the Center for Urban Policy Research at Rutgers University to calculate the average growth in each metropolitan areas. This indicator is the equivalent of the GDP but at the regional level instead of the state or national level.
Macroeconomics policies have lost part of their efficiencies to ensure economic wealth throughout the nation, each city region's ability to produce and compete increasingly matters for carrying through economic development and growth.

**Figure 1.2**

**Gross Metropolitan Product, Average Annual Growth Rate, 1980-1992**

As Porter (1998) suggests, competitiveness is intrinsically connected to the business environment offered in nations as well as in regions. Moreover, in order to be a winner in the world market today, Kanter (1995) affirms that a good international and local network as well as a good collaborative regional environment is required. For her, world class regions will be those that will seek to strengthen the infrastructure for collaboration:
Communities must open their connections to the world. Success for locals in the global economy will derive from their ability to become more cosmopolitan, to forge linkages to the rest of the world. And local communities must exert leadership to develop these links, with or without the help of national governments. In the global economy of the future, national opportunities will be led by world class metropolitan centers within nations. (...) Cities and surrounding regions must work together to foster world-ready businesses, workplaces with employability security, communication and learning within and across industries, civic engagement, more inclusive community leadership, and regional bodies that look across jurisdictions to create larger benefits for the whole. (Kanter, 1995: 353-354)

In short, a significant segment of the arguments favoring the new regionalism perspective depends on how city regions could meet the challenge of global economic competitiveness. More and more assumptions from different contributors plead in favor of the regions—not individual cities or suburbs—as the essential and integral units of global competition. According to Hersberg (1996:25), “only regions have the necessary scale and diversity to compete in the global market place. Only regions have an asset profile capable of projecting overall strength to compensate for the clearly less attractive profiles of individual counties or cities which lack either essential infrastructure or a sufficiently skilled pool of labor”. The belief here is that if this is true, then central cities and suburbs should have an interest in adopting economic strategies in a regional and cooperative form instead of competing against each other’s.

1.1.3 Spatial transformation of city regions

Economic restructuring and globalization have contributed in the creation of a new geography of economic development. But, even if the rising of new transportation and communication technologies make the long distance interactions easier, it doesn’t sound the death knell for great cities. On the contrary, metropolitan areas of all sizes continued to concentrate populations, wealth, knowledge, production resources, etc. Even city regions with a history of manufacturing decline have in general continue to gain population at an average close to 50% in the last half of the century as is shown in table 1.3. The population increase within these eleven metropolitan areas has reached more than 9 million of population. The Baltimore metropolitan area, with a growth rate of 85% is one of the fastest population growing metropolitan area of this sample,
closely following Minneapolis with a remarkable 147% increase.

### Table 1.3
**Total Metropolitan Areas Population, 1950-1996**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>1,337,373</td>
<td>1,727,023</td>
<td>2,070,670</td>
<td>2,199,497</td>
<td>2,382,172</td>
<td>2,474,118</td>
<td>1,136,745</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>2,369,986</td>
<td>2,589,301</td>
<td>2,753,800</td>
<td>2,805,911</td>
<td>3,227,707</td>
<td>3,263,060</td>
<td>893,074</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>1,089,230</td>
<td>1,306,957</td>
<td>1,349,211</td>
<td>1,242,826</td>
<td>1,189,340</td>
<td>1,175,240</td>
<td>86,010</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>904,402</td>
<td>1,268,479</td>
<td>1,384,851</td>
<td>1,401,491</td>
<td>1,526,090</td>
<td>1,597,352</td>
<td>692,950</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>1,465,511</td>
<td>1,909,483</td>
<td>2,063,729</td>
<td>1,898,825</td>
<td>2,202,069</td>
<td>2,233,288</td>
<td>767,777</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>3,016,197</td>
<td>4,050,840</td>
<td>4,554,266</td>
<td>4,488,072</td>
<td>4,266,654</td>
<td>4,318,145</td>
<td>1,301,948</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>871,047</td>
<td>1,278,850</td>
<td>1,403,884</td>
<td>1,397,020</td>
<td>1,432,149</td>
<td>1,457,655</td>
<td>586,608</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>1,116,509</td>
<td>1,482,030</td>
<td>1,981,951</td>
<td>2,137,133</td>
<td>2,538,776</td>
<td>2,765,116</td>
<td>1,648,607</td>
<td>147.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>3,671,048</td>
<td>4,342,897</td>
<td>4,824,110</td>
<td>4,716,559</td>
<td>4,922,257</td>
<td>4,952,929</td>
<td>1,281,881</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2,213,236</td>
<td>2,367,827</td>
<td>2,347,611</td>
<td>2,218,870</td>
<td>2,394,811</td>
<td>2,379,411</td>
<td>166,175</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>1,681,281</td>
<td>2,060,103</td>
<td>2,363,017</td>
<td>2,376,998</td>
<td>2,492,348</td>
<td>2,548,238</td>
<td>866,957</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total metro</td>
<td>19,735,820</td>
<td>24,383,790</td>
<td>27,097,100</td>
<td>26,883,202</td>
<td>28,574,373</td>
<td>29,164,552</td>
<td>9,428,732</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The difference between the initial and the current urban growth development is the new geographic distribution of populations and jobs within metropolitan areas. Indeed, since mid-century, suburban zones have drained a huge percentage of the population and received most of the new population and jobs inside metropolitan areas. A lot of researchers have documented the suburbanization process, which is essentially an infra-metropolitan movement of spatial decentralization of both economic and residential activities. Consequently, a low-density, decentralized and multinodal metropolitan region now characterizes the general American urban form. (Collin, 1994; Downs, 1994; Fischmann, 1987; Orfield, 1996; Rusk, 1996; Stanback, 1991; etc.).

This movement, sometimes called urban decentralization, sometimes urban sprawl, is associated to several factors. First of all, the effects of economic restructuring and globalization combined to the general location patterns and the rise of the inner city’s socio-economic problems have negatively affected the central cities while the suburbs have continued to flourish for several decades. The rapid transportation innovation and the widespread usage of individual car and
trucking as prominent means of transportation combined with central government subsidies to
build highways have stimulated urban sprawl throughout the years. The influence of land
developers on planning practices and the availability of peripheral cheap land and inexpensive
building methods supported by governmental housing politics favoring new detached houses,
encouraged property access in the suburbs. (Jackson, 1985; Downs, 1994) The result is that most
of the urban growth in metropolitan areas for the last fifty years or so took place in the
surrounded zones of central cities. Table 1.4 shows this continuous period of central city
population decline and suburbanization growth during the second half of the XXth century while
table 1.5 shows the central city continued weakening in regards to employment from 1967 to

### Table 1.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central cities</th>
<th>Suburbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Growth</strong></td>
<td><strong>% change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>-274 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>-243 050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>-269 584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>-158 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>-416 562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>-849 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>-46 889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>-162 933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>-593 603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>-326 443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>-505 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Metro areas</strong></td>
<td>-3 846 078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, County and City Data Book. Adapted from: Center For Economic

The suburbanization process also tends to engender a changing socio-spatial order inside
metropolitan areas. According to Harvey's classic work *Social Justice in the City* (1988), this
phenomenon is a "case of the inflexibility of a city's spatial form generating almost permanent
desequilibrium in the city social system" (p. 63). This desequilibrium can be briefly
summarized as the following:

1. The predominantly low-income inner city area has a decreased opportunity to tap new sources of employment since these are mainly located in suburban areas. As a result there is a trend towards a high and growing incidence of unemployment in inner city areas.

2. Because of inelasticity and locational inflexibility in the supply of low-income housing, the low-income household has little opportunity to migrate into suburban areas, and faces rising housing prices in the inner area.

3. If the low-income housing household of the inner city does obtain employment in the suburbs, it is faced with greater outlays on transport costs than it should theoretically be able to withstand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1.5</th>
<th>CENTRAL CITIES PROPORTION OF METROPOLITAN AREAS MANUFACTURING AND SERVICE INDUSTRIES EMPLOYMENT, 1967-1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, *County and City Data Book: State and Metropolitan Area Data Book*. Adapted from: Center For Economic Development, UWM, 1998. * The service sector does not include the retail trade employments.

Thus, concurrently with the middle class migration toward the periphery, these internal mutations involve an increasing impoverishment of the central cities' populations as well as a concentration of poverty within the oldest part of the regions. As table 1.6 indicates, the central cities’ percent of suburban per capita income has continuously declined or stagnated in all industrial city regions.
studied from 1970 to 1990. These trends also lead the metropolitan areas toward a form of spatial demographic specialization where most parts of the underprivileged classes get very isolated and constrained inside very limited parts of the central city or the oldest parts of the suburbs. This process of urban isolation is stressed by an ethnic or racial residential segregation, especially in the U.S. Table 1.7 attests that the demographic specialization process is not only a problem of underclass but also a racial segregation problem. If the proportion of black people living in poverty in Baltimore City is 2.3 times more important than the white population, it is almost 4 times more for cities like Milwaukee and Minneapolis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1.6</th>
<th>CENTRAL CITIES PERCENT OF SUBURBAN PER CAPITA INCOME, 1970-1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Theses tendencies of spatial concentration of poverty combined to the racial issues spawned by the current patterns of growth in metropolitan areas are of a great attention for the new regionalism perspective. The social deterioration of central cities represents an inequitable situation with enormous social and financial costs. In *Cities Without Suburbs* (1993), David Rusk is concerned with the so-called, *point of no return*: a critical threshold which would imply the continuous decline of central cities economically, socially, and fiscally. According to Rusk, Baltimore City—along with other old industrial cities—has already crossed this threshold, which

---

4 In chapter 4, we elaborate more about David Rusk’s theoretical approach and his solutions.
also means that this city is not likely to close the gap with its suburbs in the years to come relying solely on its own resources.

**Table 1.7**

**Proportion of Population in Poverty within Central Cities, 1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>White population</th>
<th>Black population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The new regionalists maintain that, without a more equitable share of regional economic growth or at least a better social integration to the rest of the region, the central cities’ decline is not inclined to be reversed. Moreover, when the common sense would suggest public intervention in order to correct the desequilibrium in the housing market—for instance in building public low income housing in the suburbs where there are more employment opportunities—the current regional spatial and political setting seems generally incompetent to implement metropolitan equilibrium solutions.
1.2 The New Configuration of Political Power (institutional factors)

1.2.1 Fragmentation of local politico-institutional power

In contrast to recent trends, the beginning of the century witnessed a period when metropolitan areas were dominated by strong and wealthy central cities and when most of the fortunes and populations were concentrated in the core. At the time, governance was overpowered by the central cities, which could achieve projects or strategies on behalf of the whole region. Hence, annexation or consolidation of new suburbs was more common and less restricting than today. In the Southern and the Western parts of the United States, this practice still occasionally takes place nowadays. However, in the Northeast and Midwest parts of the country, those days are gone. For Baltimore, a city with a Southern location but a Northern style of development, the last consolidation has occurred in 1918 and the city’s territory has not been modified since then. As the middle class fled central city, suburbs became stronger and restrained annexation and consolidation projects.

In fact, the spatial structure of metropolitan regions has been radically modified but the political configuration has not changed in the same direction. This situation has created a context of political fragmentation and local competition inside metropolitan areas among the several regional components. Since the main direct fiscal resources of municipalities rely on property taxes, and since local autonomy—or home rule—is taking place almost everywhere, suburban municipalities are fiercely competing among themselves and with the central cities for new economic and financial resources. Beside, the local democratic structures generally do not accommodate a regional vision. Elected officials are named to be primarily responsible to local democratic jurisdictions, not directly to regional structures.

One school of thought is supporting the idea according to which, municipal competition is engendering a more efficient city management. Among the most influential theory for urban policies supporting the fragmentation of local politico-institutional power is the school of Public
Choice. This paradigm rests on the postulate of **methodological individualism** in order to apply the methodology of economics to the study of politics (Mueller, 1997). Generally speaking, literature on public choice is regarding spatial models of electoral politics and aims to understand the performance of governments.

Even though the public choice approach is not exclusively tied to the conservative ideology, the neo-liberal interpretation of the public choice perspective can be summarized as an approach centered on the preferences of individuals for urban public goods. The metropolitan area is thus considered as a market within which, individuals tend to maximize their satisfaction regarding the level of taxation and the services provided by local governments. Personal resources along with individual preferences will thus be the determinants of the urban framework. The fragmented system of metropolitan areas—based on a competitive structure of small local governments—allows to provide service packages from different municipalities that metropolitan inhabitants could choose. (Lefebvre, 1992) In a context of local politico-institutional fragmentation, people who are not satisfied with the services offered or the level of tax they are paying just have to *vote with their feet* and move out.

The public choice theory is in fact a widespread political philosophy in America in order to preserve municipal autonomy as a matter of urban planning authority. Especially during the 1980s, the neo-liberal interpretation of public choice has been strongly supported by a wave of conservatives politicians such as Ronald Reagan (Dunleavy, 1991). As a consequence, the local political structure has never been profoundly reformed in America and the current structure of metropolitan regions is generally characterized by a politico-institutional fragmentation. This local governments structure is seen and understood as encouraging political participation as well as a safeguard for the individuals against the tyranny of the majority (Inman and Rubinfeld, 1997). And more specially, competition among local governments is perceived as a positive factor of rational and effective public finance management.

---

5 Methodological individualism is a primary concept in economics. The individual agent is taken as the fundamental building block for all economic analysis. Agents are assumed to have certain objectives or preferences and to interact in the markets. Aggregate outcomes are discovered and characterized by examining the consequences of the assumed behavior of individual agents and the markets constraints on that behavior. (Mueller, 1997)
On the other hand, political fragmentation has a lot of perverse effects and the negative impacts of spatial decentralization and internal competition are numerous. For instance, rivalry between cities will often transform municipal boundaries in social borders via the zoning process which will make the class and racial segregation process even worse in confining residential mobility. The insufficient measures of growth control also lead to long term ecological problems. Low-density suburban decentralization leads to substantially higher energy consumption if there is no planning coordination between the components of the region. Neither can it be forgotten that local autonomy leave the regions with a lack of economic coordination, an increase in infra-metropolitan competition for economic resources and, above all, the weakening of central cities along with the oldest suburban zones of the regions.

| TABLE 1.8 |
| CENTRAL CITIES PROPORTION OF METROPOLITAN AREAS POPULATION, 1950-1996 |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Baltimore | 71.0 | 54.4 | 43.7 | 35.8 | 30.9 | 27.3 |
| Boston | 33.8 | 26.9 | 23.3 | 20.1 | 17.8 | 17.1 |
| Buffalo | 53.3 | 40.8 | 34.3 | 28.8 | 27.6 | 26.4 |
| Cincinnati | 55.7 | 39.6 | 32.6 | 27.5 | 23.9 | 21.6 |
| Cleveland | 62.4 | 45.9 | 36.4 | 30.2 | 23.0 | 22.3 |
| Detroit | 61.3 | 41.2 | 33.2 | 26.8 | 24.1 | 23.2 |
| Milwaukee | 73.2 | 58.0 | 51.1 | 45.5 | 43.9 | 40.5 |
| Minneapolis | 46.7 | 32.6 | 21.9 | 17.4 | 14.5 | 13.0 |
| Philadelphia | 56.4 | 46.1 | 40.4 | 35.8 | 32.2 | 29.8 |
| Pittsburgh | 30.6 | 25.5 | 22.2 | 19.1 | 15.4 | 14.7 |
| St. Louis | 51.0 | 36.4 | 26.3 | 19.1 | 15.9 | 13.8 |
| Total Cities | 52.5 | 40.2 | 33.1 | 27.7 | 24.1 | 22.3 |


If we look at the city regions' governance today, we see fragmented governance throughout numerous jurisdictions. With the continuous strengthening of suburbs and weakening of central cities, the city portion of the metropolitan areas' population represent nowadays less than 40% for most of the city regions included in our sample, for an average of 22.3% (table 1.8). In 1950, the population of Baltimore City represented 71% of the metropolitan population, in 1996 it represented merely 27%. In terms of political importance and governance capacity, this means that central cities have lost substantial authority and influence on the regional destiny.
Nowadays, suburbs generally aggregate more population than central cities and own an advantageous political power over state and federal legislatures. Consequently, local fragmentation and competition may represent a resistance for metropolitan reform. There are some exceptions however. For instance, Minneapolis-St.Paul—a metropolitan area made up of seven counties including 189 cities and townships—has been successful in developing a large range of metropolitan governance tools and structures. We conclude that fragmentation itself is not the main factor obstructing regional cooperation. A context of absolute local autonomy combined with the competition and rivalry between jurisdictions is often more crucial in explaining ineffective regional coordination.

1.2.2 Transformation of the role of central governments

Three remarks might be considered about the role of American central governments in urban policies. First, they tend to respect the principle of home rule or local autonomy. Secondly, they play a supportive role rather than a directly active role in local public policies. Finally, only a very few real comprehensive urban planning programs or policies are implemented via state governments in the U.S.

At the federal level, one main concern about regional coordination is related to roads. Since the Highway Act adopted in 1956, the Federal government requires a regional body in order to determine the transportation needs of each region. Most of the regional planning agencies in the U.S. were created to fill this requirement. However, this mechanism has been often used to provide a maximum of roads in each region instead of a measure for growth control. Since the roads are among the most structuring urban development infrastructure, this urban policy has somewhat contributed to stimulate suburban development (Wallis, 1993).

---

6 The Twin Cities' Metropolitan Council, created in 1967, is a nationally unique governmental body in the seven county area around Minnesota's Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St.Paul. The Metrocouncil operates the region's bus system, collects and treats waste water, a housing and redevelopment agency and plans parks and trails. The Council also prepares long-range plans for the development of vital regional services - aviation, transportation, parks and open space, water quality and water management - and a comprehensive plan for how the region should grow in the future. Minneapolis/St.Paul is also renowned for how this region deals with fiscal disparities following the achievement of a tax base sharing system.

7 The concept of central governments refers to both the states and the federal governments.
The Reagan/Bush conservative agenda of the 1980s has indisputably had an important impact on local governments. This administration was characterized by the reassessment of the role of central governments favoring the private sector to promote economic and social development along with the diminution of the public administration. According to Hula (1991:23), “the most obvious elements of this retrenchment consisted of reductions in federal expenditures targeted either directly to local governments or to programs designed to address policy issues of particular interest to local governments”. Figure 3 shows the direct impact of federal cutbacks on counties and cities budgets. The cutbacks have been substantial since the federal contribution to city budgets has decreased by 7% for the Counties and by up to 9% for the Cities’ budgets. Considering that the local governments’ revenues are based on property tax, these circumstances have undoubtedly increased the regional internal competition.

Since 1991, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) aims to encourage more comprehensive and integrated development of transportation system along with land use
and environmental quality. In order to have access to federal transportation funds, Metropolitan Planning Organizations must meet the requirements and intents of public participation as defined in the ISTEA planning regulation. Other federal mandates, like the Clean Act Amendments of 1990, also aim to foster regional coordination. And, very recently, vice-president Al Gore has showed interest in regionalism throughout the vague concept of Livable Community (Peirce, 1998).

Like the federal level, the state level rarely challenges the local autonomy principle although constitutionally they hold the power. However, state legislatures seems to be more and more interested by regional issues as it is testified by the flourishing amount of states that have adopted regional growth management principles. But, in general, those initiatives avoid being coercive or top-down enforced.

Central government policies have profoundly shaped local and regional land use patterns. Since they hold constitutional power over municipal structures, the action or inaction of central governments (federal and states) is decisive for the duty of local government. This is why the redefinition of the role of central governments or the refashion of their urban policies plays an essential role in regional issues. Traditionally, central policies have tended to generate sprawl and enormous public costs. Since central governments seem increasingly conscious of the negative impact of old-fashioned policies, they seem more inclined to adopt some policies which encourage at least some form of metropolitan governance (Blumenauer, 1998).

1.2.3 Continuous rise of social capital in urban affairs

Nowadays, researches pay a great deal of attention to the idea of social capital. It seems that the new public initiatives depend increasingly on civic groups, business actors and community and less on governments. Salamon and Anheier (1996), looking at the rise of the nonprofit sector throughout the world, came to the conclusion that a new paradigm is required to understand how non-governmental but not-for-profit organizations have seeped through the private and public sectors in contemporary social and economic life. Accordingly, in a paper entitled The Age of Social Transformation, Drucker (1994) emphasized the increasing role of what he calls the
“social sector” in the context of the emerging knowledge society. For him, the knowledge society leans on three sectors: the public sector (governments), the private sector (business) and intensively the third sector (nonprofit sector) “those organizations that increasingly take care of the social challenges of a modern society” (p. 14). Moreover, according to Drucker, nonprofit organizations are engaged in special purposes and will become more and more partners with governments in managing several aspects of society.

In Planning and the Rise of Civil Society in a Global Age, Douglas and Friedmann (1998) argue that we have reached a new planning era in which claims for citizen rights is gaining importance along side political and corporate interests. And, at the economic level, the facts prove to be correct Robert Putnam (1993a:3) when he asserts that “social capital is coming to be seen as a vital ingredient in economic development around the world”.

We thus use the “social capital” concept to examine the interplay between public, private, and other civic agents—including nonprofit—which are involved in the transformation of their regional community. Social capital is more than just civic engagement. It may include civic engagement but it refers more directly to the systems of social actors—public, private and civic—who work with each other to accomplish projects or to make things work. Putnam (1993a:1) defines the social capital as: “features of social organization, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit”.

Looking at the Italian’s nation-wide establishment of regional governments in the 1970’s Putnam (1993b) has observed that, although these institutions were identical in form, they differ substantially in their social, economical, political and cultural contexts. Some were inefficient and corrupt while others were efficient and innovative. According to Putnam, what best explains the variation of metropolitan governments between regions is the “civic engagement” variable. Civic regions, which value solidarity, civic participation and integrity, as opposed to “uncivic” regions where disharmony, inefficiency and corruption dictate the regional politics. Likewise, in a recent paper in which she attempts to explain the resurgence of interest for regionalism, Kathryn Foster (1997) exposes the crucial role of non governmental players—private, nonprofit, civic and academic—what she calls “civic regionalism”. And Wallis (1993) talks about the
“regional civic infrastructure” to designate the concomitant involvement of the public, private and civic sectors in order to provide a regional governance capacity.

The network and involvement of non-governmental actors in the process of metropolitan governance is an aspect that we pay special attention to in this research. Since the creation of a region-wide economic development strategy depends on collaboration and coordination, this concept is particularly relevant. It does not mean that city regions with rich social capital will automatically be more effective in drawing a metropolitan governance strategy. In some circumstances, social capital might be pro-regionalist and anti-regionalist in other circumstances. However, social capital is undoubtedly at work in the metropolitan governance process.
2. A Contemporary Theoretical Framework for Metropolitan Governance

2.1 The New Regionalism School

As we have seen in the previous chapter, Baltimore's problems are common to older American city regions. The context of a constantly changing world and city mutation has now crossed a threshold that forces politicians, planners and researchers to look for new paradigms regarding regional economic development and urban planning. In this quest for a new paradigm, there is an idea that has had a substantial impact on urban theories along with current regional politics. Since Jane Jacobs maintained in *Cities and the Wealth of Nations* (1984) that to understand the structure of economic life, nations are not the salient entities but city regions are, there has been a renewed interest for theory and advocacy over regionalism.

The central theory underlying new regionalism is strongly associated with the metropolitan interdependence hypothesis. This hypothesis rests on the fundamental principle that the well-being of suburbs is linked to the well-being of cities and vice versa. A number of statistical studies have found a positive correlation between central cities and suburbs to support this argument. Parallel to the statistical logic, the new regionalism increasingly encompasses the normative policy implications of metropolitan interdependence, which in return brings up the necessity for regional vision and leadership in order to achieve metropolitan reforms.

2.1.1 The metropolitan interdependence hypothesis

The new regionalism addresses the problem of city adaptation in a regional instead of a local, municipal or undetermined spatial perspective. This paradigm looks at the city regions as agglomeration economies that share integrated labor markets. For the economist, the principle of agglomeration economies is the internal logic of cities' economic efficiency. The concentration of economic activities generates diversity, availability, as well as complementary for suppliers, services providers and economic exchanges. In that perspective, central cities and suburbs are
interrelated in a complementary and functional relationship. Economic activities requiring high density and diversity tend to concentrate in downtown, while those requiring more space and inferior land costs tend to locate in the suburbs. Thus, the unique social and economic agglomeration economy corresponds to the total metropolitan area including central city and suburb (Persky and al., 1991).

Several researchers have contributed to demonstrate the statistical evidence on the interdependence of central cities and suburbs. Ledebur and Barnes (1992, 1993), Voith (1992) and Savitch and al. (1993), have notably revealed statistical correlation's between suburbs and central cities regarding population, economic and income growth. Rusk (1993) for his part has establish via numerous social and economic indicators, that elastic cities (cities that capture suburban growth) are performing significantly better than the inelastic cities (cities that do not expand their city limits).

However, most of these studies have failed to reveal a formal causal dependent relationship between suburbs and central cities. Indeed, Hill and al., (1995) after examining Ledebur, Voith and Savitch’s works have established that these studies are unsuccessful to prove that “economic health of suburbs depends on the vitality of their central cities”. Likewise, Blair and al. (1996) after scrutinizing Rusk’s works concluded that elasticity by itself is not the only mechanism for enhancing metropolitan economic welfare.

In fact, it is conceivable that these correlations “are more reflective of factors affecting regions as a whole rather than of a causative relationship between city and suburban economic health in each individual region” (Weinstein, 1998). These correlations give evidence not necessarily to a direct dependence but rather to a metropolitan economic integration of suburbs and central cities (Savitch, 1995). In that respect, a metropolitan area is fundamentally an economic region that includes inextricable, cohesive and interdependent components. Stanback (1991:1) describes this relationship as follows:

"In spite of their high visibility, central city economies do not stand alone. City and suburb, linked in a symbiotic yet competitive relationship, together constitute an economic system: the metropolitan economy. (...) Each subeconomy supplies the other with services and goods."
In this view, central cities and suburbs are linked by a functional relationship that makes the economic regions work. The economic region is a diversified regional labor market, a regional network of physical infrastructure, transportation and communication facilities, a regional organization of non-physical services like education, health, safety, financial systems, intergovernmental linkages, human resources, etc. And, the central cities still play a crucial role as economic, social and institutional centers as well as symbolic and tourist spaces which shape the image of the city regions (Ihlanfeldt, 1995). Concurrently, central cities need their suburbs to generate new economic growth region-wide. This emphasizes the fact that the interdependence rests on historical functional relationships between central cities and suburbs where each play a complementary role.

2.1.2 The global market argument: toward more competitive regions

Another important argument that frames the new regionalism school is the current conditions induce by the global market economy. This viewpoint suggests that in the context of globalization, city regions are increasingly engaged in economic competition with other regions and that macro-economic policies and welfare states have lost some of their ability to generate an equitable and widespread rise of wealth across the countries. The central argument maintained by many authors is that "the national economy is spatially differentiated and that local economic regions are the crucial unit for focusing analysis and policy" (Barnes and Ledebur, 1998). In other words, "national economies are in fact, constellations of regional economies, each with a major city at its core, each requiring specific and customized strategies" (Peirce and al., 1993). As components of an extensive global network of "natural economic zones" (Ohmae, 1995), city regions must face competition coming from other parts of the integrated economic system. Following the logic of those arguments, regional economic competitiveness is one of the major challenges for every nation.

Accordingly, the political context of fragmented metropolitan area does not correspond to the true economic and social reality of cities and above all, the lack of regional coordination might have negative effects on city regions. According to Barnes and Ledebur (1998:90), "policies and uncoordinated investment patterns that are driven by narrowly construed jurisdictional interests
can erode economic linkages and functional relationships, diminishing the productivity of the economic system as a whole”. Numerous intellectual contributors agree that regional governance is critical to insure economic competitiveness in the future (Peirce, 1993, Dodge, 1992; 1996; Thompson, 1995; Barnes and Ledebur, 1998).

Therefore, the fundamental question of this report is about how cities and regions respond simultaneously to the challenge of the global economic restructuring as well as the changes in spatial patterns resulting in a new urban form for metropolitan areas. This perspective emphasizes the importance of renewing the scale of territorial planning as well as economic development in a regional perspective that gives prominence to the interrelationship (or interdependence) between central cities and suburbs.

2.1.3 The sustainable development argument: a new vision for growth

In New Visions for Metropolitan America, Anthony Downs (1994) proposes one of the most recent syntheses regarding growth -management planning from a perspective that encompasses central city problems and regional issues. Downs first acknowledged that the current patterns of metropolitan development are fundamentally the successful realization of an American ideal of urban life. This is what he calls the dominant vision associated to (p. 6):

1. Ownership of detached single-family homes on spacious lots;
2. Individual ownership of automotive vehicles;
3. Preference for low-rise workplaces—offices or industrial building or shopping centers—in attractively landscaped, parklike settings;
4. Residential preference for small communities with strong local governments to control land use decisions;
5. An environment free from the signs of poverty.

Downs—along with an increasing number of people—is doubtful about the sustainable character of this low-density pattern of development occurring for the past 50 years. At the sociological level, despite suburban sprawl has produced benefits for a large part of metropolitan populations, this model tended to create continuous social and often racial segregation patterns. In this
system, areas of new growth provide insufficient affordable housing for low and moderate-income households, which creates unequal qualities of urban environments between the poor and the nonpoor. To decentralize regionally the housing for the poor is not likely to be solved without regionalized planning and control over land uses. Suburbanization patterns also generate important environmental costs. Traffic congestion, air, water and solid waste pollution, excessive loss of open space, etc. are as many environmental growth related problems that are induced by unlimited low-density development along with fragmented land use powers.

Furthermore, the attitude called “not in my back yard” (NIMBY) is counterproductive with the welfare of the entire region. NIMBY consist in the difficulty to find “a politically acceptable location for a needed but locally undesirable facility. Within the metropolitan area, residents near every potential site pressure their local governments to oppose putting it there, and those governments have the power to reject the facility because controls over land use have been divided among myriad local entities” (Downs, 1994:13). Elected officials are obliged in some respect, to follow the will of their local residents instead of being responsible for the entire region since they are elected locally, not regionally. Infrastructure finance is also a main interest for Downs. The current fragmented local structure tends to create fiscal disparities among localities in accordance with distinct types of land uses and in different zones. Small self-governed communities are more and more reluctant to pay for old, new and future urban infrastructures. And the question remains: who should pay for the regionally used infrastructures?

The roots of these metropolitan problems are imputed to the low-density shape and to the unplanned growth standard of the dominant vision. Following this understanding of the problem, Downs suggests a new vision for urban growth. Since these growth-related problems are fundamentally regional, not purely local, achievement of a high-density vision would first require a centralized metropolitan governance along with a radical transformation in individual behavior and institutions regarding land use, transportation, housing, and employment location. Looking at new forms of governance and a new vision for urban development, Downs suggest several alternatives for growth which all have the same target: organize growth on a regional level to be more compact, providing a mix of housing types in every part of the region and encouraging smaller new housing units and higher residential density; encouraging public transit, bicycles,
walking and ride sharing for commuters; concentrating new jobs within specific employment nodes (designated jobs centers) linked by public transit and combined to a commercial and industrial regional tax base sharing policy; and finally, creating a new form of governance within metropolitan areas whether it would be a regional government, a metropolitan agency, a regional planning structure within a state-mandated framework, etc.

Theorizing about the principles for an alternative vision is rather easy in comparison to turning this new vision into reality. However, Downs says that “the major shortcoming of local governments in metropolitan areas is that their failure to take account of the welfare of each area as a whole is undermining the long-run viability of American society. Unless Americans confront this reality by creating institutions that operate at the same scale as their major problems, their problems will only get worse.” (Downs, 1994:182). Therefore, what can be the process by which to determine a new vision for growth? Downs maintains that the answer to this question is in the hands of metropolitan citizens and civic groups’ attitude over regionalism, government mechanisms favoring the adoption of growth related policies and a consensus building over an effective growth strategy.

2.1.4 The new regionalism: a socially constructed process

In this report, we suggest a different approach to apprehend metropolitan interdependence. The statistical approach of new regionalism, as developed to establish the interdependence hypothesis, is very useful to demonstrate the empirical nature of urban development and to emphasize the fact that central cities and suburbs are parts of the same economic region. It also helps to illustrate the common interests between central cities and suburbs within city regions and therefore to justify the imperative of regional planning. The global market perspective is meaningful to explain the new rules of regional competitiveness and is supportive of a metropolitan approach for economic development strategies. Nevertheless, the development of a new vision for growth is a rather provocative issue. In fact, the new regionalism perspective is a wealth of new ideas (Swanstrom, 1996). We can demonstrate with economic arguments the interdependence mechanism and the functional environment of cities, “but in the context of
regional planning, regions are primarily defined by political circumstances” (Wannop, 1995).

In *Urban America in Transformation. Perspectives on Urban Policy and Development*, Benjamin Kleinberg (1995) is dissatisfied with the two dominant theoretical perspectives on contemporary urban policy and development: the ecological and the neomarxist perspectives. Both primarily focus on economic aspects of urban development and tend to neglect the cultural level and the conscious role of institutions in shaping the social, physical and economic environment of city regions. In short, “despite their differences, contemporary ecology and marxism tend to converge toward a view of the role of public policy as supporting and reinforcing the decisions of capital” (p. 54). Instead, Kleinberg introduced an interorganizational/policy perspective emphasizing the political economy of development. Since the fortune of urban civilization relies nowadays on a diversity of political, quasi-public, civic and economic, organizations, the interorganizational relationships are among the key elements to comprehend contemporary society. For Kleinberg, “the modern city can be viewed in terms of a complex of relationships involving the exchange of political and economic resources among different urban organizations linked together in networks of interdependency” (p. 57).

---

8 According to the classic ecologic perspective, the industrial city could be understood as a series of concentric zones of different land uses surrounding the central business district. In short, in classic urban ecology the structure of the city is viewed as the product of the operation of the market in land interacting with demographic characteristics of its various social and economic groups. The life and growth of the city are ultimately governed by supposedly unconscious biotic processes of competition, out of which there evolves in an unplanned, spontaneous way a spatial mosaic of culturally and economically segregated natural areas representing the placement of each group into its appropriate ecological place. In the contemporary ecological theory, the force of competition are still at work, but the spotlight now shifts toward several other factors, primarily to the forces of technological innovation (such as automotive technology and electronic communication) that enable the integration of vastly enlarged urbanized areas and secondarily to cultural tastes and biases as expressed in the market for land both inside and outside the central city. The result is basically a technological-economic theory of urban development, modified by the influence of certain cultural and ideological factors, such as concern for maintaining ethnic homogeneity in local community life. (Kleinberg, 1995:10-15).

9 For the marxists the critical factors that underlie contemporary urban development and its problems are connected with a fundamental economic process that they refer to as the process of capital accumulation. In their view it is the capital accumulation process, rather than technological or related developments emphasized by the ecologists, that explains the trends toward metropolitan expansion that have affected so seriously the situation of older central cities. Above all, what has changed the shape of urban America has been the economic activities of powerful entities such as corporate business firms interlocked with financial institutions and acting with the support of government agencies, shifting investments in manufacturing and commerce to the suburbs and concentrating investments in administrative functions and services in the central cities (Kleinberg, 1995:28).
Accordingly, Swanstrom, (1996) mentioned two aspects of the new regionalism which limits its potential:

1. Too much emphasis on economic forces, and not enough preoccupation with political and social values.
2. Tendency to frame the debate as a choice between political and economic liberalism while ignoring the institutions of civil society that mediate between state and market.

Thus, new regionalism is not only about economic facts but it is also about leadership since regional reforms are essentially the fruit of social and political forces which can carry out a renewed vision of the future. As Peirce and Johnson (1997:28) maintain in the Boundary Crossers’ project10, “there is no magical leadership structure, just people and relationships”. This suggests that, via statistics, we can see metropolitan interdependence almost everywhere, but each metropolitan area is not likely to develop precisely the same form of regional arrangement. In other words, metropolitan planning is not of a consistent occurrence because it is related to the specific regional socio-political culture. This also suggests that the metropolitan governance process relies on the behavior, attitude, values and initiatives of socio-political actor. Metropolitan governance is also a tangible empirical evidence of metropolitan interdependence when it occurs. The modeling process of coalitions, collaborations or economic development strategies at the city region scale reveals it and is the central research preoccupation of this report.

One of the central questions explored by new regionalism is thus: how can we create a better fit between the regional governance (political circumstances) and the actual metropolitan region (economical and sociological circumstances)? The new regionalism might also be seen as a turnaround. In a different context, Henderson (1993:333) would use the term “turnaround” to illustrate the “heightened consciousness among citizens of what needs to be done to turnaround the community, and what they can actually accomplish by doing this”. New regionalism

10 The Boundary Crossers’ project is the result of a comparative analysis looking at ten American major metropolitan areas as a means of better understanding emerging patterns of collaboration and community leadership. Neal Peirce and Curtis Johnson took the raw material of these ten case studies and turned it into an essay entitled Boundary Crossers, Community Leadership for a Global Age.
suggests that there is a transformation regarding how a critical mass of citizens or actors in the region is looking at urban problems. Therefore, new regionalism refers here to the development of a regional vision favoring metropolitan governance.

To understand metropolitan governance, we suggest examining the interplay between public, private and civic actors (the institutional factors) as well as the impact of economic pressures coming from globalization, economic and spatial restructuring (the structural factors). More specifically, we want to know how a system of actors able of producing a metropolitan vision for the whole region as well as regional strategies can be put together. Like Swanstrom and Kleinberg, we think that the dimension of interests, values, motivations, regional culture and politics within the interorganizational dynamics affect critically the social, spatial and economic patterns of city regions. We also believe that the metropolitan governance process is likely to reveal it.

In a global perspective, new regionalism is often presented as a new-fashioned economic organization as a matter of reaction to the reassessment of Nation State and Welfare State (Peirce, 1993; Ohmae, 1995; Barnes and Ledebur, 1998). It is also viewed as a normative issue when a series of logical arguments is employed to envision a list of solutions to solve urban and metropolitan problems (Rusk, 1993; Downs, 1994). Also, economists regularly prioritize the statistical approach in order to prove the metropolitan interdependence hypothesis (Ledebur and Barnes, 1992, 1993; Voith, 1992; Savitch and al., 1993). In this report we wish to approach new regionalism with a different viewpoint. With a more bottom-up perspective. Therefore, keeping with the philosophy of new regionalism, we want to focus on institutions, organizations and other actors that are critical for the success of renewed governance in city regions. Contrasting with previous approaches, we do not try to prove the metropolitan interdependence existence otherwise than via the collective consciousness of regional actors over regionalism.
2.2 The Metropolitan Governance Process

2.2.1 The current use of the term governance

The term *governance* is a priori imprecise. It may refer to its traditional meaning associated to the action of official governments, but the current use of the term governance is not a synonym for government action anymore. According to Rhodes (1996:652), “governance signifies a change in the meaning of government, referring to a new process of governing; or a changed condition of ordered rule; or the new method by which society is governed”.

The term governance is more and more popular because it allows to observe the new forms of public action. In fact, with the relative transformation of local and central governments and the emergence of social actors in public affairs, it is said that the latest form of public action is more inclined to rely on a complex of actors rather than exclusively on formal governments at all levels. Thus, by opposition to the concept of *government*—which refers to the formal structures of power and institutions—the *governance* concept considers simultaneously the actions of public, civic and private actors in order to carry out governing initiatives. Christian Lefèvre (1998:18), in a recent synthesis of the concept of governance, described the context of public action as follows:

“The new forms of public action that we see emerging in most western countries are characterized by more complex systems of actors. This complexity is due, over and above the factors already highlighted, to the disappearance of central government as the holder of supreme legitimacy and capable, by itself, of imposing, or at least shaping, a particular idea of public action. Today, the government's weakness has found its corollary in the emergence of new actors who appear just as legitimate as the government and who act as equals. This is why the new forms of public action are developing under the sign of partnership and negotiation between the territorial authorities, the private sector, the associations, interest groups and the populations themselves.”
2.2.2 The metropolitan governance concept

In this research, we are interested in studying the "making of" metropolitan governance which we conceive as being a set of processes mainly based on interorganizational dynamics of regional actors. The goal of this research is clearly oriented towards the process more than towards the evaluation of metropolitan strategies. Although these new interactions between central cities and suburbs are relatively new, we can see the evidence of these interactions as a cumulative process characterized by regional environment as well as the complexity and dynamics of social actors (Le Galès, 1998; Lefèvre, 1998; Dodge, 1992). We call this cumulative process: the metropolitan governance process.

The metropolitan governance concept refers to the capability to adapt the governance structures of a specific city region to the new urban form. The metropolitan governance is thus a form of collective action that depends on the aptitude of creating consensus, collaboration and, ultimately, the capacity for tangible action. According to Lefèvre (1998:18): “metropolitan governance highlights values of negotiation, partnership, voluntary participation and flexibility in the constitution of new structures. In doing so, it presents us with a radically different idea of the institution. It is no longer presented as the start, created in advance, ready-to-use, but appears as the result of a constitutive process. (...) Thus the process has its own dynamic, fed by the actors themselves.”

In this research, we argue that the process of metropolitan governance reposes on three basic stages.

1. Regional impulses for metropolitan governance
   Preconditions that can favor regionwide initiatives (proregional factors); factors that influence the creation of metropolitan governance; significant studies, seminar, conference, public consultation, etc. that help define the problem.

2. Development of a regional vision for metropolitan governance
   Means and strategies applied to help the development of a relative consensus among the metropolitan actors about the future of the city region; process solution finding.
3. **Design and implementation of a metropolitan governance program**

Mechanisms developed to address regional issues and determine which would satisfy acceptability, efficiency, and effectiveness criteria regarding economic development; means employ to make the strategy effective; political or interorganizational arrangements by which coalition of actors are brought together to achieve cooperation; creation of new metropolitan institutions, etc.

### 2.2.3 The conceptual framework of metropolitan governance

The new regionalism approach agrees that regional coordination is critical to insure the well being of metropolitan areas as well as regional economic competitiveness in the future. According to this approach, city regions should be likely to create a better fit between the regional governance and the social and economic region. But in a context of political fragmentation and local competition unfavorable to regional cooperation:

- What are the factors that influence the metropolitan governance process? In other words, what are the factors that favor metropolitan interdependence instead of internal regional competition?
- What is the role of the different actors involved in the process of metropolitan governance?
- What urban strategies are developed to adjust to the new urban form? What institutional forms are more likely to be implemented for contemporary metropolitan governance?

To answer these questions, we have elaborated a conceptual framework of the metropolitan governance process supported by the two dimensions and the six variables used to describe the contemporary context of city regions in chapter 1. Following our definition of the concept, we suggest that metropolitan governance (the dependent variable) is the result of a process based on three fundamental stages: the regional impulses; the development of a regional vision; and the

---

11 Since our research angle is taking an economical and sociological direction, our theoretical framework is naturally oriented toward the social and economic aspects of metropolitan governance. For instance, we could have added the environmental factors or transportation planning aspects to our model (Figure 2), but we do not tackle these questions directly within this report.
implementation of a regional strategy. The question is thus what are the factors (the independent variables) that will influence the development of these three phases. First of all, it is clear for us that metropolitan governance is determined by economic, political and social regional and national practices. And secondly we think that the factors related to the urban restructuring and the institutional factors play two different roles in the formation of metropolitan governance. When the urban restructuring factors tend to influence the necessity for regional solutions, the institutional factors will rather influence the form of metropolitan governance (Figure 2.1). The metropolitan governance process is in sum, the political or interorganizational arrangements by which a coalition of actors are brought together to achieve cooperation.

FIGURE 2.1
THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF METROPOLITAN GOVERNANCE PROCESS

When we talk about the new regionalism paradigm, we conceive it as a shifting movement in how we think about cities and urban development. The land use practices and policies remained unchanged for a long time since the Second World War. Despite the situation did not change entirely yet, we can observe that values of new regionalism are increasingly gaining recognition within numerous social groups as well as an enlarging public support. It is therefore in this spirit that this research was conceived. According to our conceptual framework, we undertook this study with three hypothesis:
• We first argue that despite a context of political competition among local jurisdictions—essentially unfavorable to regional cooperation—there is a new form of interaction between central cities and suburbs.

• Secondly, we argue that this new form of interaction is motivated by the urban restructuring process but carried out by a modernistic form of public action supported by the emergence of private and civic—including nonprofits—actors along with a relationship redefinition between local and central governments.

• Thirdly, we argue that non-governmental actors are increasingly predominant in shaping innovative urban strategies and metropolitan governance structures in a new regionalism era.
3. Political and Statistical Picture of Greater Baltimore

This chapter offers a profile of Greater Baltimore in its historical and regional contexts. In order to describe Greater Baltimore’s contour, we use secondary sources (statistics, press review, official documents, maps, etc.) to summarize the social, economic and political environment of Baltimore city region throughout the time.

3.1 Greater Baltimore Local Government Structure

Since there is no trace of local government in the U.S. constitution, local governments in Maryland as everywhere in the country are systematically creatures of the state. In Maryland, the county\(^\text{12}\) is the primary unit of local government. The state incorporates 23 counties and Baltimore City\(^\text{13}\) which altogether covers the entire territory. The counties serve two duties in the context of Maryland. At first, counties do what a local government is generally meant to do: provide municipal services to local populations. Secondly, counties are the administrative level for providing statewide services. In general, counties incorporate some municipal corporations and special districts within their territory. There are 156 municipal corporations in Maryland, which are rather created to satisfy parochial needs\(^\text{14}\), as well as 223 special districts, which are established to provide complementary and specific service in a region. Among these special districts, some of them are regional agencies established to address issues on a regional basis (Department of Legislative Services, vol. VI, 1998).

Contrary to many city regions, the political definition of Greater Baltimore is relatively simple and consistent. Since Maryland operates at the county level for its local duties and since the number of local jurisdictions is relatively limited in this state, the structure of local governments

---

\(^{12}\) Article XIII, Section 1 of the constitution of Maryland establishes that a county may not be established in an area that is less than 400 square miles or that includes less than 10,000 inhabitants. And, although the General Assembly is vested with the authority to established new counties or modify county boundaries, these changes require the approval of the majority of the voters residing within the affected area. (Department of Legislative Services, vol. VI, 1998) The formation of a new county in Maryland appears unlikely and so is the modification of the current local structure of government in general.

\(^{13}\) Although Baltimore City is an incorporated municipality, it is treated as a county for most purposes under state law.
is rather simple. Some metropolitan regions, especially those located up north to the Mason-Dixon Line have in general much more complex local government structures. The perimeter of Greater Baltimore almost takes on the exact shape of Baltimore Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). As define by the Bureau of Census, Baltimore MSA incorporates seven jurisdictions, six counties and Baltimore City. But for geographic, socio-economic and historic motives one of these counties—Queen Anne’s county—is not included within the Greater Baltimore political structure. Although its population has maintained a sustained growth during the last 50 years, its population (39 900 in 1998) and population density (100/Sq.Miles) remains very low compared to others counties of the MSA. This is largely due to the fact that this Queen Anne’s county has principally conserved an agricultural economy instead of an urban or suburban pattern of development. Moreover, Queen Anne’s County is geographically separated from the rest of the region since this is the only Baltimore MSA county located on Maryland’s Eastern Shore.

Since the 1960’s, Greater Baltimore’s political definition includes Baltimore City and five counties: Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Harford and Howard (Figure 3.1). From its incorporation in 1796 to its last annexation in 1918, Baltimore City has enlargeed from a small territory of less than 5 sq. miles to a still relatively small territory compared to the size of surrounding counties of 80 sq. miles. At the geopolitical level, Baltimore City is a small enclave, constrained to a limited and built-out territory that has been impoverished by former manufacturing industry or the desertion and degeneration of its foregoing or current population. As a consequence, Baltimore City and its surrounding counties present major differences at the demographic, socio-economic and fiscal levels.

14 98 out of 156 municipal corporations have less than 2500 inhabitants.
15 The Mason-Dixon line is the traditional separation of the north and south. Like other states south of this line, Maryland has depended on county government as the primary provider of local government services. States of the Northern states have traditionnaly relied more on townships. (Department of Legislative Services, vol. VI, 1998)
3.2 A statistical picture of Greater Baltimore’s jurisdictions

As a whole, Greater Baltimore has witnessed a constant growth throughout the last half-century. Almost one million new people have been added to this 2,260 square-mile territory which represents a 68% change in about 50 years (table 3.1). The Greater Baltimore area is the most important urban agglomeration within Maryland and still accommodates nearly half of the population of the state. However, the population growth remained relatively moderate in the context of Maryland since the population growth in the entire state has more than duplicated in the same period of time. This indicates that other parts of Maryland have undergone a tremendous period of growth as it is the case with the Montgomery and Prince George’s counties—located within the Baltimore-Washington DC metropolitan corridor—which are the most densely populated counties of the state and among the most affluent. This emphasizes the latest drift for the development of the Baltimore region. The enlarging influence and the growing
interaction with the Washington DC metropolitan area has become a positive location factor for Greater Baltimore. Especially for the Southern counties like Anne Arundel and Howard. This interaction was revealed in the 1990 census and officially recognized in 1992 when the Federal Office of Management and Budget merged both regions in the same Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA).

Table 3.1 reports that Greater Baltimore' suburban counties have all experienced a constant population expansion since 1950. From 914% population increase for Howard County to 168% for Baltimore County. Although suburbs are the commonly preferred life style of young families, the birth rate factor alone is not satisfactory to explain these population trends. As table 3.1 indicates, one of the most important engines of suburban growth is still the migratory process from the central city to the suburbs. Available data for the period of 1980 to 1995 confirms that the net negative intrastate migration from Baltimore has been to some extent captured by suburbs via a positive intrastate migration. Considering the build up environment and the spatial confinement of Baltimore City, it is not surprising that most of the new demographic growth in Greater Baltimore has occurred in the suburbs instead of within the central city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City and counties</th>
<th>Land Area Sq. Miles</th>
<th>Total population 1950-1998</th>
<th>Net population migration 1980-1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>117 392</td>
<td>-6 900 23 300 16 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>949 708</td>
<td>-14 700 -109 700 -124 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>270 273</td>
<td>-20 300 12 600 -7 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>44 907</td>
<td>-8 200 41 000 32 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>51 782</td>
<td>-6 600 35 700 29 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>23 119</td>
<td>14 800 35 400 50 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Baltimore</td>
<td>2 260</td>
<td>1 457 181</td>
<td>--- --- ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>10 467</td>
<td>2 343 001</td>
<td>--- --- ---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


And lastly, table 3.1 also reveals that for the same period Baltimore City has experienced a completely different process characterized by a radical demographic decline as a result of a significant negative net migration throughout the last decades. The consequences of these steady
development patterns have been critical for the central city socio-economic conditions as well as for the availability of new fiscal resources. Table 3.2 displays some prevailing socio-economic differences between Baltimore City and the suburb counties. Just like population growth in the suburbs has been the foundation for prosperity, it appears that decades of population decline in Baltimore City have induced socio-economic distress. Nowadays, the median household income which is around $30,500 in Baltimore City is way below its suburbs counterparts which range between $46,100 and $66,300. Another way to measure affluence is the assessable base of each jurisdiction on a per capita basis. This indicator also reveals a significant difference between Baltimore City and the suburbs when the property value of the central city hardly represents the half of the property value of the lowest suburbs counties.

**TABLE 3.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City and Counties</th>
<th>Household Income Median 1997 $</th>
<th>Assesable base per capita FY 1998 $</th>
<th>Poverty rate of total population in 1990 %</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Black</th>
<th>% Total pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>55 100</td>
<td>28 781</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>30 500</td>
<td>12 984</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>46 100</td>
<td>24 088</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>52 600</td>
<td>22 999</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>50 200</td>
<td>22 038</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>66 300</td>
<td>31 534</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The table 3.2 also pictures the migration patterns which tend to produce an increasingly segregated society. Not only Baltimore City presents a situation of exceptional poverty, but this concentration of poverty goes side by side with a ghettoization of poverty by race. For the rest of the region the poverty rates are rather low (5.5% or less), more than one out of five inhabitants of Baltimore City are living below the poverty level. But the distribution of people living below the poverty level in Baltimore City is over two times more important within the African American population (28%) than inside the white population (13%).
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TABLE 3.3
GREATER BALTIMORE PROPERTY AND INCOME TAX REVENUES INCREASE, 1989-1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City and Counties</th>
<th>Property tax revenues $</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Income tax revenues $</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>191871 404</td>
<td>317634 083</td>
<td>65,5</td>
<td>122094 770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>415563 534</td>
<td>472788 931</td>
<td>13,8</td>
<td>111549 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>314081 519</td>
<td>476519 145</td>
<td>51,7</td>
<td>215531 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>40952 233</td>
<td>92276 544</td>
<td>125,3</td>
<td>31076 425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>65621 063</td>
<td>128220 788</td>
<td>95,4</td>
<td>44063 732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>106854 154</td>
<td>199447 857</td>
<td>86,7</td>
<td>67600 285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE 3.4
GREATER BALTIMORE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS SOURCES OF REVENUES, 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City and Counties</th>
<th>Property Taxes</th>
<th>Income Taxes</th>
<th>Other local Taxes</th>
<th>Federal Grants</th>
<th>State Grants</th>
<th>Services Charges</th>
<th>Other Revenues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>31,6</td>
<td>19,3</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>21,2</td>
<td>13,1</td>
<td>5,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>22,7</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td>34,2</td>
<td>11,6</td>
<td>6,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>32,0</td>
<td>21,0</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>9,5</td>
<td>5,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>30,2</td>
<td>18,8</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>30,2</td>
<td>8,4</td>
<td>5,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>29,0</td>
<td>17,3</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>30,6</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>35,4</td>
<td>20,4</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>17,6</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td>7,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This segregated situation becomes a fiscal problem when property and income taxes are among the largest revenue resource for each local jurisdiction. Table 3.3 indicates that Baltimore City is not obtaining so much of the new revenues generated by property and income taxes inside the region. The percentage change of the central city has been relatively flat (around 13%) when on the other hand the percentage change in property and income taxes in the suburbs has increased significantly. One consequence of this is the variance within the structure of revenues between Baltimore City and the suburbs. Table 3.4 attests that the lack of new resources coming from property and income taxes brings Baltimore City to be much more dependent on central governments to balance its budget. In 1997, over 49% of the Baltimore City budget was coming from the federal and state governments. This shows that historically, Baltimore City has been a champion in winning state and federal grants (Arnold, 1990). As a consequence, Baltimore City
obtains significantly more federal grants and also much more state grants than its suburb counterparts. In return, suburbs are relying much more on increasing revenues generated by urban growth.

### Table 3.5
**Total Employment by Place of Work (Full and Part-time Jobs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>135 900</td>
<td>172 500</td>
<td>253 200</td>
<td>262 200</td>
<td>126 300</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>479 200</td>
<td>466 700</td>
<td>516 200</td>
<td>458 700</td>
<td>-20 500</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>247 300</td>
<td>352 200</td>
<td>402 400</td>
<td>409 600</td>
<td>162 300</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>24 000</td>
<td>30 500</td>
<td>53 100</td>
<td>57 800</td>
<td>33 800</td>
<td>140.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>48 000</td>
<td>48 700</td>
<td>76 000</td>
<td>81 300</td>
<td>33 300</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>27 300</td>
<td>59 200</td>
<td>107 800</td>
<td>125 300</td>
<td>98 000</td>
<td>359.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Baltimore</td>
<td>961 700</td>
<td>1 129 800</td>
<td>1 408 700</td>
<td>1 394 900</td>
<td>433 200</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1 678 000</td>
<td>2 051 000</td>
<td>2 774 000</td>
<td>2 790 000</td>
<td>1 112 000</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>89 753 000</td>
<td>112 257 000</td>
<td>139 891 000</td>
<td>149 290 000</td>
<td>59 537 000</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Some may argue that the major cause of urban distress is the lack of economic growth or job creation in the Baltimore region. Table 3.5 tends to contradict this argument since between 1970 and 1995 the Baltimore region as a whole has generated more than 433 200 new jobs, a 45% increase. The real problem is not directly the lack of job creation within Greater Baltimore but rather the distribution of new jobs, which tends to locate almost exclusively in the suburbs, outside the central city. While the central city has lost more than 20 500 jobs since 1970, the average job growth in the suburb counties has been way above those of Maryland and the country. But despite its difficulties in generating a substantial number of jobs, Baltimore City remains the most important employment center of the region with more than 458 700 jobs which still represent 33% of the region. In terms of number of jobs, Baltimore still remains the economic engine that drives the regional economy.

Those pictures shows the jurisdiction’s dichotomous reality within Greater Baltimore. In the first place, the suburb constituencies with a constant demographic and economic growth that brings in
a relative affluence. In the second place, a central city spatially and socially isolated that saw its resources absorbed by a development pattern for which Baltimore City has no control over. These structural circumstances have created a disproportionate share of inequality within Greater Baltimore which is likely to sign away one’s future of the whole region in a long-term perspective. And, since the socio-economic differentiation between central city and suburbs are to some extent related to the regional patterns of development, reversing the social decline of the oldest parts of the region should be more conceivable to find its sources in the larger regional society. In that respect, the need for linked development between central city and suburbs, regional coordination and redistribution of wealth in Greater Baltimore seems manifest.
4. Earlier Stage of Regionalism in Greater Baltimore

Since we argue in this report that there is a new form of regional governance in Greater Baltimore, it implicitly means that there was an earlier stage of regionalism. This section begins by looking at the initial phase of regionalism in Greater Baltimore, which started after the Second World War. Was there some form of regional planning prior to the Second World War? This report does not address this question. We rather investigate the context which has led to the creation of the first multifunctional metropolitan planning agency in Greater Baltimore and its transformation throughout the time.

4.1 The Regional Planning Council - RPC (1963-1987)

In the early 1950s there was already a certain anxiety regarding regional problems within Greater Baltimore. Some regional planning studies have been undertaken during this period but real regional coordination did not occur before 1956, the year that the Baltimore Regional Planning Council (BRPC) was formed (Westerfeld, 1969). This organization began as an unofficial meeting for planning staff from the state and from some local governments. It evolved in 1956 into an informal advisory body formed of directors of planning and elected officials including Baltimore City and four counties: Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Harford, and Howard. Carroll County joined the five other local governments in 1959 to make up afterwards the political definition of Greater Baltimore, as we know it today. This advisory body was also included the director of the Maryland State Planning Department who was acting as the Chairman of the BRPC. It was clear that the organization was essentially advisory and did not have power over local governments. The BRPC was notably liable for transportation, land use, sewage disposal, water supply as well as miscellaneous other metropolitan problems. But one of the main objectives and benefits of this regional relationship was the aptness to qualify for federal planning grants.

However, this organization had no legal base and no explicit assignments. Neither did they have adequate financial structure to support the organization and the professional resources were
rather minimal. This is why in 1961 the National Municipal League proposed a model of a regional planning law that has been submitted to the legislature of the State of Maryland. The proposed law failed the first time in 1961 and after some cogitation between sessions, it was unsuccessful again in 1962 (Westerfeld, 1969). Meanwhile, J. Millard Tawes, the Governor of Maryland at the time, created the Baltimore Metropolitan Area Study Commission "dedicated to an impartial forward thinking study of the need for some cohesive and cooperative form of governmental control or administration to knit the separate units of local government together so that the entire metropolitan Baltimore area might act in unison in solving mutual problems" (Baltimore Metropolitan Area Study Commission, 1963:1).

The final report of the Commission—chaired by Hooper S. Miles former president of the Maryland National Bank—proposed two distinct and independent recommendations. First of all, the so-called Miles Commission recommended the creation of a metropolitan governmental unit to administer the following functions: transportation and mass transit, regional planning to guide the future growth, water and sewer operations, facilities for refuse disposal and a regional jail system. Services like civil defense, education, fire, health, libraries, police, welfare as well as recreation and parks were said adequately administered by the local governments and consequently, no regional modifications were recommended for those services. The second recommendation concerned a tax revision. The report emphasized the problem related to Baltimore City's tax situation and suggested that the importance of property tax on local governments budgets should be reduced. After an analysis of the fiscal structure, the report proposed the following solution:

"We propose therefore, that 1¢ be added to the State sales tax, and 1% to income taxes, both to be applicable solely within the metropolitan area and to be collected by the State and remitted, less the cost of administration by the State, to the jurisdiction of the sale or where the income was earned, as the case may be" (Baltimore Metropolitan Area Study Commission, 1963:13).

In March 1963, after two failures, the Maryland State Legislature finally adopted a new metropolitan planning law for Greater Baltimore by Chapter 753, Act of the Maryland General
Assembly, Article 78D. Although the initial Governor’s proposal\textsuperscript{16} was considering the creation of a metropolitan government as an option (Baltimore Metropolitan Area Study Commission, 1963), the ultimate form of the metropolitan services organization was rather based on a cooperative regional multi-purpose agency with only advisory powers along with some of the recommended tax revision (Westerfeld, 1969). The design of this organization was elaborated after an interim report, which suggested the creation of an inter-governmental planning organization labeled the Regional Planning Council (RPC). The Interim Study Board was chaired by James W. Rouse, a prominent developer for the downtown renaissance of Baltimore, and under the auspices of the Greater Baltimore Committee, an influential group of business leaders. The Interim Study Board retained the services of Walter H. Blecher — a nationally renowned planner — and aimed to examine the metropolitan planning problem and make recommendations about the power, the duties, and the legal base of the new organization. The article of law creating the new metropolitan policy finally approved the creation of the RPC in accordance with the recommendations of the interim committee.

Although the RPC is formally a state agency, the control of this organization is principally in the hands of local governments. The membership of the Council consists of nineteen representatives including twelve coming from the six major local jurisdictions, five from the state and two from the citizenry. Every local jurisdiction has two members each, one elected official and one planning commission delegate. One member of the House of Delegates and one member of the Senate represent the State of Maryland from the Greater Baltimore region, each appointed by the Governor. The State is also represented by the Chairman-Director of the State Roads Commission, the Director of the State Department of Planning, and one member appointed by

\textsuperscript{16} In his proposal for the Baltimore Metropolitan Area Study Commission, the Governor believed that any metropolitan plan should preserve a high degree of local autonomy. But at the same time, he was equally concerned with the necessity to assure citizens of a voice in the decisions which affect them. This is why he was considering having provision for direct election by the voters of the entire metropolitan area of certain members of the metropolitan agency (which rather correspond to the definition of a metropolitan government), as well as elected officials from local jurisdictions represented on the same metropolitan agency. And finally, the Governor wanted to make sure that the metropolitan authority is given adequate powers to carry out those tasks which are assigned to it: “The main reason for the creation of metropolitan government is to provide for areawide control of areawide problems. Problems which the component governments are unable to handle of finance effectively... Therefore, the powers which are granted to the metropolitan government should be granted in a decisive and affective manner.” (Baltimore Metropolitan Area Study Commission, 1963:13)
and from the Metropolitan Transit Authority. Finally, the Governor appoints two citizens. (Westerfeld, 1969; Baltimore Metropolitan Area Study Commission, 1963).

The RPC is also endowed with an explicit structure of revenue raising capabilities. The financing leans on two principal sources of revenues. First of all, an equitable contribution by the local jurisdictions and the state. Secondly, the RPC may accept services, funds, gifts, or grants from private sources, from other units of governments, and especially from the Federal government for the conduct of its activities. In its first year, the RPC had an operating budget of $300,000 and the State of Maryland contributed one-third of the total. Baltimore City and the five counties contributed two-thirds of the operating budget in proportion to their respective assessable bases. Based on the assessments of the time, the 1964 budget was originally divided as indicated in table 4.1. However, as table 4.1 also illustrates, the budget structure of the original agency has changed radically throughout the time. In 1991, Baltimore City was no longer the major contributor and the Federal government was by far the principal financial contributor of the organization. We will come back to it later in this report.

### Table 4.1

**REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL**

**SOURCES OF REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1964 AND 1991**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governments and others</th>
<th>FY1964*</th>
<th>FY1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Contribution</td>
<td>$ Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>15 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>105 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>61 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Maryland</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>300 000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The functions of the RPC comprise notably to:

1. Conduct research required for regional planning purposes;
2. Advise all units of government regarding regional cooperation and coordination;
3. Prepare and make available recommended standards for building, zoning, and other regulations;
4. Prepare and recommend capital improvement programs and priority for regional projects;
5. Prepare, publish and distribute an annual report and other reports and plans.

But the first major function of the Council is the preparation and adoption of a comprehensive plan for the development of the Greater Baltimore area. The RPC has the responsibility to conduct the necessary researches regarding land use, transportation, public utilities, governmental and economic factors, demographic trends that are relevant for the entire region. Afterwards, the RPC has to develop the plan in cooperation with the local planning agencies and in taking into account the planning activities of Federal, State or other agencies operating on its territory. The RPC must ultimately adopt the entire plan after public hearings by a majority of at least eleven members out of nineteen. The comprehensive plan of the Regional Planning Area is known as the Suggested General Development Plan and is a five-yearly process so the Council has to re-examine, revise and re-adopt the plan regularly.

Although the RPC is formally charged by the Maryland State Legislature to prepare and adopt a comprehensive plan, the article 78D do not provide to this organization a decisional power on the implementation of the recommendations. The status of the Suggested General Development Plan—as its name indicates—is only advisory. Once adopted, all members of the RPC must, in principle, conform their own plans or projects to the General Development Plan. All new plans and projects, which are regional in nature, must be submitted to the RPC for their evaluation and approval. In case of disapproval, the Council has to communicate its reasons to the State, the local agencies or other bodies. But the Council has not the authority to prevent such a plan or a project from being executed. It is assumed by the principle of the law “that the pressure of public good, public necessity, and public opinion will be sufficient to assure a high degree of conformity with the General Development Plan” (Baltimore Metropolitan Area Study Commission, 1963:21). But the Council’s mandate is to advise and orient the urban development of Greater Baltimore, not to control it.

---

17 The Article 78D enjoin the RPC to hold at least one public hearings in each of the six jurisdictions before adopting the General Development Plan.
In early 1967, a few months before the adoption of the first General Development Plan, article 78D was amended to enlarge the membership and increase the local representation of the agency from 19 to 25 members. The number of local elected officials expanded from two to three per jurisdiction. In the future, the mayor of Baltimore City, the county executives and the presidents of the Board of Commissioners were going to be appointed automatically.

It took several years for the Council to complete the plan. But on September 15, 1967, after more than three years of studies, consultation and deliberations, the first Suggested General Development Plan was adopted (Westerfeld, 1969). The plan is truly embracing a comprehensive approach to regional problems. It first aims to look about twenty years ahead to anticipate trends, possible problems and potential solutions over that interval. In a shorter range, the general content of the plan addresses several major areas of concern: Transportation, Economic Development, Employment, Housing, Land Use, Water and Wastes issues, Energy, Environment, Health, Education, Safety, and Human Resources. Each area is first scrutinized to identify the critical problems and priorities. From this point, the plan suggests ways, policies or programs by which those problems should be addressed. Finally, the plan also contains the framework to implement the recommendations. Since the RPC has little authority to implement the General Development Plan by itself, the implementation strategy must lean on a flexible working relationship with local and state agencies as well as with the Federal government and the private and civic sectors. The plan has been revised and re-adopted four times after its first approval in 1967: in 1972, 1977, 1982 and 1986.

The RPC has obviously played a very important role in the identification and comprehension of all sorts of regional problems. Since its creation, the activities of this organization have continuously stretched out throughout additional studies and researches, more plans for actions or the creation of new committee addressing metropolitan issues. During the elaboration process of the plan, it also surely played a notable role in regional coordination and cooperation.

But one of the most important functions of the Council was unquestionably its aptness to fulfill the requirements of Federal legislation which required areawide cooperative planning as a prerequisite for public grant. During the 1960's and 1970's, several federal programs regarding
transportation, economic development, environmental protection, health and social services, and other purposes have been implemented and designated areawide agencies to review and comment over the application of public grants. Federal programs were representing a huge amount of new external financial resources for urban projects and the RPC suited this perfectly this duty. This also explains why table 4.1 indicates that in 1991, more than 68% of the sources of revenues for the Council came from the Federal government. During the same period, the RPC experimented a continual period of expansion in its budget, tasks as well as in its staff (Thomas and al., 1991).


In 1987 however, the name, the status and the mission of the RPC were modified. In fact, the federal funding process depended largely on the evaluation of the RPC. Some local elected officials were conceiving that the RPC’s uses of federal grants were an intrusion into local affairs. For instance, federal programs regarding metropolitan housing subsidies were occasionally a source of disputes. Likewise, since the RPC had to review and comment each project as a federal grant imperative, a negative evaluation of a project could become source of conflict between the Council and some of its members. Finally, following the presidential election of 1981, a conservative era has been enacted in United States which, as a consequence, resulted in direct cut backs for city and county budgets as well as severe financial diminution for most Federal programs. Reagan’s “New Federalism” approach had practical consequences for all Regional Councils throughout the country. Also, the strong reliance of the RPC on Federal subsidies had definitively something to do with its first organizational transformation. (Thomas and al., 1991)

The aim of the New Federalism reform is notably to limit governmental action and to increase the role of the private and civic sectors in the collective service delivery. It also exhorts a policy of non-interference of the central government in urban affairs supporting in that by the home rule maxim. In accordance with these new standards, about a hundred programs affecting urban affairs have been cut down, diminished or altered following the reform (Ghorra-Gobin, 1987;
Thomas and al., 1991). This had affected the RPC in two ways. First of all, the Federal cutbacks diminished significantly the financial resources for the local governments that used to be accessible via the Council as an intergovernmental subsidies system. Secondly, it diminished the regional emphasis for Federal grants, which in return depreciated the role of the Council. From that moment on, the organization was looking for a new identity.

This period of duty adaptation was also marked by a lack of continuity in leadership. Indeed, the 1980’s are an era of frequent change at the direction of the Council. Three different directors and three different chairpersons of its executives have succeeded to the direction in a relatively short period of time. In 1987, with the nomination of a new chairperson—the Baltimore County Executive at the time, Dennis Rasmussen—and shortly after a new executive director, the RPC decided to modify the mission and the name of the Council for the Baltimore Regional Council of Governments (BRCOG). The BRCOG’ new mission was to:

"focused on improving the quality of life in the Baltimore region. This was to be accomplished by promoting the Baltimore region as an attractive community for economic and business development, by strengthening regional cooperation in addressing social, economic, and governance issues, by expanding the level of technical assistance given to local jurisdiction, by conducting public policy research, and by serving as a regional information and resource center. " (Thomas and al., 1991:23).

The new name suggested a stronger role for the six local government members within the new-fashioned Council. Concurrently with the loss of resources coming from Federal programs, the intent of the reform is also to make the Council more self-sufficient and more entrepreneurial. In the general context of intergovernmental fiscal pressures, the Council would have to market and sell its products and services to local jurisdictions or to any other agencies. By and large, the mission of the Council has progressively changed from a rather traditional regional planning organization to a rather technical and consulting regional organization.

However, the fulfillment of this new role was not unconstrained because there was already some private, nonprofit organizations as well as some quasi-governmental organizations competent to take on such services like the Greater Baltimore Committee, Maryland Association of Counties, Maryland Municipal League, Baltimore Economic Development Corporation, local Chambers of
Commerce, and Maryland Economic Growth Association, BWI Airport, Maryland Port Administration, Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority, etc. (Thomas and al., 1991). With the expanding influence of the Washington Metropolitan Area, the state of affairs became different. Southern counties like Anne Arundel and Howard are increasingly integrated to the Baltimore-Washington metropolitan area rather than only Baltimore, which raises the question of regional identity. And not to mention that there are just a few local governments in the region with already independent planning authorities. All these factors made the attainment of the new mission rather fastidious for the BRCOG.

4.3 The Baltimore Metropolitan Council - BMC (Since 1992)

Even though the chairperson at the time, Baltimore County Executive Dennis F. Rasmussen, had participated in the transformation of the Council, he was known as a supporter of the organization (Thomas and al., 1991). His defeat in 1991 as a County Executive and his departure as the chairperson of the BRCOG combined to the arrival of three new County Executives following the local elections seriously jeopardized the future of the Council (The Sun, 11/30/1991). Priorities and energies of all the executives were by all means directed toward balancing their local budgets during the recession time (Peirce and al., 1991). Furthermore, the agency was without a permanent chairman for one year after Rasmussen’s departure. At this point there was a sense on the part of some elected officials that they did not have enough direct power in matters of regional policy since the former structure had 23 members. Despite the fact that 73% of the BRCOG budget was coming from the federal (68.4%) and from the state (4.6%) levels in 1991 (table 4.1), the city and the county executives wanted more cost effective organization regarding their direct financial contributions (Interview 6, 1999).

This breaking in organizational continuity concurred at the same time as the publication of a report contracted by the Maryland Office of Planning but carried through the Schaefer Center for Public Policy of the University of Baltimore. The Evaluation of the Baltimore Regional Council of Governments (1991:3) report seeks to examine the “role and functions of BRCOG in meeting the needs of the Baltimore Metropolitan area, assess the internal and external managerial operations of the agency, and evaluate the perceived effectiveness of BRCOG programs and
services”.

The report’s conclusions were rather severe. Observations of the report, based on survey, interviews, and secondary data revealed that BRCOG was perceived as being fragmented, ineffective and powerless. The Council was also described as not being responsive enough for local governments. But the results contained in the report are not so unanticipated considering the methodology\(^\text{18}\) applied for the study and more especially since the legal and prevailing status of the Council was more advisory and cooperative than decision-making oriented.

Consistent with its conclusions, the report also suggested a new regional agency oriented toward more emphasis on providing technical services to local governments or other constituencies and less emphasis regarding planning and coordination activities. Thus it was recommend to disestablish the BRCOG and to create a downsized organization whose primary goal would be to provide technical support and who would act at the same time as a forum for political executives to discuss regional issues. Furthermore, the report recommend that the state should withdraw from the governing structure of the new agency which should be henceforth exclusively represented by the local elected executives. Finally, the report suggested that the new legal status should be shifted from a state agency to a nonprofit organization allowing for a wider range of public and private resources.

On June 30, 1992 the former regional state agency which existed for 29 years—under different names and status—has been abolished by the Maryland General Assembly. It has been replaced by a new regional agency, the Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC), a nonprofit organization. The BMC is from now on directed exclusively by the six local elected executives of the region,

---

\(^{18}\) The report aims to answer the five following questions: (1) Does BRCOG have the institutional capacity to accomplish its stated mission? (2) Is the organization structured and managed in a manner that it can carry out its programs effectively? (3) Does the agency engage in sound financial management practices? (4) Does the agency perform high quality work at a reasonable cost for its member jurisdictions? (5) To what extent are local administrative personnel, as well as key civic community leaders, satisfied with the quality of BRCOG’s programs and services? To address these questions, the methodology was based on the historical evolution of regional agencies in Greater Baltimore as well as the policy evaluation of the BRCOG’s structure, organization and programs. Some of the data sources were based on personal interviews and surveys with present and former local elected officials, state administrators and civic leaders. Thus, the study has a bias regarding the priorities and perception of each of the persons consulted. Not surprisingly, BRCOG was perceived negatively by several actors who are not committed to regional cooperation.
the Mayor of Baltimore City, the Commissioners of Carroll County and the County Executives of Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Harford and Howard Counties.

The regional agency's mission has been also deeply modified. Officially, the new mission of the organization shall (1) serve as a forum for local officials and their representatives to identify and address problems in the Baltimore Metropolitan Region; (2) Provide a central source of information and coordination for fashioning responses to needs in the Baltimore Metropolitan Region; (3) Assist generally local jurisdictions in developing regional policies, prioritizing regional infrastructure needs, and developing regional strategies in the Baltimore Region (Maryland General Assembly, 1992, ch. 201). In practice, the organization no longer produces a comprehensive regional plan. Instead, it now focuses on more specific issues. The major focus of the new council is on transportation planning since the BMC still officially serves as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for federal transportation certification and funding. BMC is moreover a regional research center, which produces and provides demographic, economic and markets data as well as services in geographical information system (metromapping). BMC also operates as a regional information center in managing a regional and urban planning library. And BMC is finally involved in some environmental issues like the clean air program or the reservoir watershed protection programs and other special projects.

4.4 Earlier Stage of Regionalism in Greater Baltimore: An Appraisal

Previously in this report we defined the concept of metropolitan governance as the capability to adapt the governance structures of a specific city region to the new urban form. Most specially, the American metropolitan governance is a type of regional mechanism that depends on the aptitude of creating consensus, collaboration and ultimately, the capacity for tangible action at the regional scale. Considering this definition of metropolitan governance, we can assert that political actors from the state or from within Greater Baltimore have failed to create an adequate framework for metropolitan governance.

---

19 Each urban center is required to have a metropolitan planning organization under federal law. Since the largest portion of the BMC was coming from the Federal Department of Transportation, a successor had to be created to fulfill the federal requirement. Otherwise, in the context at the time, it could have seriously jeopardize the creation of the BMC.
Although the regional planning agency originally received the mission to address regional problems and was established as the mechanism for intergovernmental cooperation, its history has been a continuity of successes and failures. It seems that the regional planning agency has been competent in pulling in its fair share of federal funding for transportation project construction and facilitate the creation of the Metropolitan Transit Authority. These funds have allowed the improvement of the transit system with the creation of the Baltimore Metro and the Light Rail System. However, the agency never implemented a growth boundary and or sprawl control policies. As a consequence, the improvements in the highway system has also contributed to the intensive expansion of the highway system which has stimulated the urban sprawl in the region.

Despite efforts from the council to develop a regional approach for low and moderate housing\textsuperscript{20}, the segregation patterns in the region are still manifest today. The regional coordination of land use has been particularly original in developing policies to deal with open spaces\textsuperscript{21}. Again, it has failed to control urban growth and sprawl within the region. Environmental planning has from its beginning been one of the main attention of the council with air quality and water preservation initiatives. But today, Baltimore still ranks very low in air quality within the USA and environmental groups are still watchful regarding the state of the Chesapeake Bay and its protection. Economic research has been consistent and has assisted the development of economic initiatives. On the other hand, except for the tourist redevelopment support, economic development strategies have failed to preserve the vigor of the central city and the impoverishment of part of its population.

We can probably assert that the earlier stage of regionalism in Greater Baltimore never achieved effective metropolitan governance or carried out an accurate form of regional cooperation. This result is mainly due to a lack of political determination. Baltimore City and its surrounding counties have by and large continued their own land use planning practices without real overall regional vision. In fact, the initial statutory choice preferred in 1963 is important for the current

\textsuperscript{20} In the early 1980s, the regional council has implemented a regional housing policy allowing low and moderate income participants to use certificates and vouchers anywhere in the region to give them a wider choice in housing and often the option to live near available employment.

\textsuperscript{21} Since 1969, the duty of the Program Open Space is to acquire and develop open spaces for parks and recreation.
outcome. The Governor in 1961 was considering a Metropolitan Government with regional elected representatives. It would probably have generated problems and conflicts among local elected officials but, on the other hand, it would have created political legitimacy to enforce the regional plans and actions. Instead, the statutory form of the Council did not include such powers as authority to tax, to pass ordinance or to execute its own regional planning proposition independently from the approval of local jurisdictions. If, on a strictly planning level, the regional planning agency was a serious and comprehensive regional coordination body, it was not a serious metropolitan governance or planning agency since the advisory status never allowed to the agency a formal and independent authority to govern.

The question remains, is the new regional agency, the Baltimore Metropolitan Council, able to provide the conditions favoring a strong leadership to address regional issues along with a comprehensive approach? In our opinion, and with a strictly normative regional planning point of view, the most recent transformation of the Greater Baltimore regional planning agency may be qualified as a step back instead of a step further regarding metropolitan governance.

At least, under the initial legislation, the regional planning agency used to be an independent state agency. Moreover, the regional agency used to combine a broad range of actors coming from the local level, some state representative and citizens. This made sense since regional coordination is in nature complex and multidisciplinary and requires involvement from a broad range of actors working together in cooperation. Indeed, regional planning requires cooperation, leadership, and a comprehensive approach. For instance, land use is related to transportation; transportation is related to environmental protection; environmental issues definitely cross local boundaries; economic development is related to regional infrastructures, workforce development and education; poverty and social problems are related to the regional segregation patterns; etc. And, all of these issues also require cross-jurisdictional partnership policies to succeed including the local, the state and the federal levels as well as business, civic and citizenship participation.

The latest and current version of the regional agency is now govern exclusively by local elected officials who typically tend to represent local interests instead of regional interests. And, as we already asserted, the context of political fragmentation and local competition is not likely to favor
an easy regional cooperation in Greater Baltimore. The logic is simple, the Mayor of Baltimore City, the Commissioner of Carroll County and the County Executives of Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Harford and Howard Counties are elected at the local level and their primary commitment and priorities will naturally be oriented toward the interests of their local electors rather than the "regional citizen" who has no well define democratic structure of representation in Greater Baltimore.
5. Regional Impulses for Metropolitan Governance in Greater Baltimore

Despite a context of political fragmentation and local competition, we argue in this study that there is a new form of interaction between central cities and suburbs motivated by the urban restructuring process but carried out by a modernistic form of public action. Thus, what are the initial factors that influence metropolitan governance in Greater Baltimore? To answer this question, this chapter looks at the regional impulses or the preconditions and other determinants which can favor regionwide initiatives.

For Foster (1997:376), regional impulses “are factors that motivate local governments and other interest groups to achieve regional outcomes”. Regional outcomes could be the creation of new regional structures or partnership such as regional planning organizations, regionwide multi or single purpose service entities, or any other intergovernmental or intersectorial agreements. It can also result in a process by which governments, other organizations and citizens think about and ultimately take over various form of regional initiatives. It is said that “the presence of or strong regional impulses should pave the way for regional outcomes, while the absence of or weak impulses should thwart them” (376).

Foster recognise ten broad categories of regional impulses: natural resource (geographic reality), macroeconomics (regional economic structure), centrality (central city influence), growth (center-periphery growth experiences), social (cross-jurisdiction socio-economic status), fiscal (cross-jurisdiction fiscal capacity), equity (predisposition to regional redistribution), political (regional political consensus), legal state and federal role over regionalism) and historical (history of interjurisdictional relationship). Each of those categories can either have a proregional impact or an antiregional impact. For instance, high central city influence should lead to a high center-periphery interdependence when a low central city influence should lead to a low center-periphery interdependence.

Foster is doubtless right in two ways. Regional impulses are essentials to understand the start-up of any metropolitan initiatives. And taken individually, all of those regional impulse’s categories
are likely to play a role of influence over regionalism. However, Foster remain equivocal regarding the way she constitutes the model as a whole. She uses sparse allusions to the theoretical literature over regionalism in order to identify and define each category of the list. In our opinion, affirming that the interplay of these ten regional impulses are the predictive structure of regional outcomes remains too discretionary and in some respect precarious. For instance, Foster found out that in the Buffalo metropolitan area, civic regionalism is an important factor to be added to the regional impulses framework. This suggest that the list should be evolutive and that every metropolitan area has its special circumstances and should be undertake with a flexible regional impulse framework.

We thus agree with Foster that regional impulses are initially consequential for regionalism. But regional impulses are not exactly some kind of objective factors that are out there influencing regional outcomes. Following the classical David Harvey’s methodological approach (1973), we rather think that how people identify, interpret and use regional issues to support regional outcomes matters more within the metropolitan governance process than the passive categories of factor themselves. For Harvey, the “distinction between the geographical and the sociological imaginations is artificial when we seek to relate to the problems of the city” (p. 24). We thus think that regional impulses should be found via the analytical process of fashioning an intellectual framework in support to regionalism. In this case study of Greater Baltimore, we use an inductive approach to understand how some influential ideas related to major regional issues have been specifically developed in order to propound a renewed form of metropolitan governance.

5.1 The Part of Urban Restructuring

To create a movement favoring a new form of governance, there must logically exist some dissatisfaction in the governance structure of a region. Initially, the need for new metropolitan solutions is presumably justified by the changing conditions of metropolitan areas and concurrently by the lack of adaptation in governance configuration. Urban restructuring is thus the empirical seed for new regionalism theories. In chapter one, we presented the main problems which affected old industrial cities during the last fifty years, and we have postulated in chapter
two that urban restructuring is creating a need for metropolitan solutions.

Every metropolitan area faces the same dilemmas sooner or later. Economic restructuring that is characterized by the shift from an economy driven by manufacturing to an economy dominated by the service sector parallel to an intense period of relocation of economic activities toward other regions or suburbs. This has produced major social problems induced by the loss of well-paid jobs as well as physical deterioration engendered by companies’ desertion. This situation has also generated the decline of central cities along with a profound mismatch between the location and qualifications required for new jobs versus the availability and adeptness of lay off workforce. The new rules of competitiveness in the global economy are also at the core of metropolitan problems. Every city region has been affected by the expansion of competition along with the displacement of firms driven by economic integration to the world economy and the international division of labor. The world system theory maintains that city regions are shaping the network of globalization. Therefore, the internal competitiveness and economic efficiency of each city region count more than ever for carrying through economic development, growth and wealth.

What is even more significant for new regionalism is the new spatial distribution of populations and jobs inside metropolitan areas. As we have seen, a low-density, decentralized and multinodal metropolitan region nowadays characterizes the widespread American urban form. This internal mutation involves an impoverishment of the central cities’ populations as well as a concentration of poverty within the oldest part of the regions. These trends also lead metropolitan areas toward a form of spatial demographic specialization where most parts of underprivileged classes get very isolated and constrained inside very limited parts of the central city or the oldest parts of the suburbs. Finally, this process of urban isolation is worsening by an ethnic or racial residential segregation. The new regionalism perspective maintains that without a more equitable share of the regional economic growth or at least a better social integration to suburban areas, central cities’ decline is not likely to be reversed.

Those are the broad problems encountered by old industrial city regions. However, every city region has specific metropolitan concerns. What are the specific problems facing the Greater
Baltimore region? In chapter four, we have seen that the county is the primary unit of local
government in Maryland. Consequently, the local jurisdiction’s structure of Greater Baltimore is
relatively simple and not as fragmented. It is definitively a characteristic of Greater Baltimore in
comparison to several other old industrial city regions. Thus, Greater Baltimore has a history of
functioning with few but very strong local governments. If we numerate all kinds of local
government units (county, city, incorporated municipality, township, special purpose district,
etc.), Greater Baltimore has only 2.8 units per 100,000 residents as opposed to 19.7 for
Minneapolis-St. Paul (GBC and GBA, 1998). As we have seen in chapter five, struggles for
metropolitan planning in Greater Baltimore indicate that a small number of governments in a
metropolitan area is not inevitably a positive factor for regional collaboration. The Minneapolis-
St. Paul region with a much more complex structure of local governments has nevertheless been
able—helped by the state government of Minnesota—to create effective metropolitan
governance, which tends to corroborate that a structure of powerful local governments can either
be an advantage or a handicap to regional collaboration.

Another Greater Baltimore character is the level of regional disparity between some counties and
Baltimore City. There are two especially striking aspects. The spatial discrimination between
poor and rich, and the fiscal disparity between jurisdictions. Indeed, Greater Baltimore embodies
some of the wealthiest areas in the United States like Howard and Anne Arundel counties while
some sections of Baltimore City are among the poorest of the country. For example, this is the
case in East and West Baltimore which can be compared to a third world city in a first world
(Levine, 1999). The problem is aggravated when the concentration of poverty goes side by side
with a ghettoization of poverty by race as it is the case in Greater Baltimore. This high
concentration of poverty is among the principal causes of several related social problems in
Greater Baltimore like for instance, a very high regional crime rate and serious public school
disorder. Such radical disparity is very difficult to interrupt and threatens to spread to the
surrounding counties. This situation jeopardizes the image and the competitiveness of the region
as well as the quality of life of the entire metropolitan area.

The regional disparity is also observable with regards to the assessable base. The assessable base
per capita in Baltimore City hardly represents half of the property value of the lowest suburb
counties. As a consequence, the structure of revenues between Baltimore City and the suburbs is completely dissimilar, not to mention that Baltimore City is not capturing its fair share of the new revenues generated by property and incomes taxes. Fiscal disparity is a fundamental problem of inequity for Greater Baltimore.

There are as many urban problems as there are motives to support metropolitan solutions in Greater Baltimore. However, these problems also represent as many walls obstructing regional cooperation. On one hand it emphasizes what makes metropolitan governance necessary. On the other hand, it stresses the reasons why most local jurisdictions want to escape from it. Urban restructuring itself is not sufficient to generate a metropolitan governance process. It unconditionally requires key leadership to stake over urban restructuring and take on issues that often require unpopular solutions. Leadership with regards to regional cooperation is initially the elaboration of a new vision for metropolitan development and governance. However, before this process can be engaged, there is a preliminary phase: problem definition and awareness.

5.2 The Initial Reports on Metropolitan Issues

Baltimore is renowned around the world for the renaissance of its downtown corporate center and its highly publicized Inner Harbor development project. Despite almost 50 years of economic development strategies in Baltimore, the city achievement is rather counterbalanced by the lack of distributive impact of previous economic development strategies, thus favoring private business interests and little spill over from the downtown redevelopment to the deteriorating neighborhoods (Levine, 1987; Hula, 1990; Harvey, 1991).

Researchers who are exclusively looking at downtown and Inner Harbor economic development programs surely forget the extensive strategy and the tremendous efforts made by Baltimore City along with civic organizations since the 1950s regarding urban renewal and public housing projects (Kelly, 1982; Davis, 1982; Froelicher, 1982). And since the 1970s in attracting or retaining industries throughout the city, in revitalizing commercial and neighborhood areas

---

22 Via the Housing Authority of Baltimore first established in 1937.
23 Civic organizations like the Citizens Planning and Housing Association which played an especially important role in the physical rehabilitation of Baltimore and in public housing.
and in trying to improve education and training via the Baltimore Economic Development Corporation²⁴ (Berkowitz, 1987; Hula, 1990). Despite all these efforts, the postindustrial urban restructuring process has had such a negative impact on the economic and social conditions of Baltimore City. Of course, the urban distress situation could have been worst without urban renewal and economic development policies, but the situation remains critical.

Nevertheless, at the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, Baltimore’s economic development strategy was acclaimed and pictured as a model of redevelopment for other declining cities (Reinhold, 1978). In 1977, the Washington Post described Baltimore as the “urban find of the year” when shortly after the National Municipal League designated Baltimore the winner of its “All-American City Award”. In 1981, Time Magazine dedicated one of its front pages to “Master Planner” James Rouse, the father and the main developer of Charles Center and Inner Harbor. Mayor William Donald Schaefer, the political leader of the Baltimore economic development strategy, was designated “best mayor in America” by Esquire in 1984. All things considered, Baltimore was gaining national and international recognition for its urban revitalization efforts at the time. But as David Harvey (1991:237) argues: “if people could live on images alone, Baltimore’s populace would have been rich indeed”.

With hindsight, it became evident that the successes of the downtown strategy were not sufficient to solve the inner-city problems. The process may have been slowed down, but it did not reverse the urban decline as the statistics indicate. Thus, starting in the mid-1980, a series of reports, often sponsored by foundations and civic or business organizations, have been published addressing the need for regional solutions in Greater Baltimore. In this report, we maintain that these studies have largely contributed to frame the principles and influence the creation of a new generation of urban strategies and regional programs.

²⁴ The BEDCO has been renamed as the Baltimore Development Corporation (BDC) following the merger of the BEDCO and the Center City-Inner Harbor Development Corporation (CCIH). It is still the economic development agent for the city of Baltimore.
5.2.1 Baltimore 2000

Among the initial reports that aimed to take stock of the Baltimore economic development strategy with a critical and regional perspective was *Baltimore 2000, A Choice of Futures*. This report was published by the Goldseeker Foundation in 1986 for its tenth anniversary but was written independently by Peter L. Szanton, whose aim was to address a limited number of issues and recommend a civic agenda until the year 2000 in order to solve the social and economic problems of Baltimore. It was in some respects the post-mortem of the Mayor Schaefer’s time, elected governor the same year, following 15 years of power at the city hall. After describing the major changes from 1960 to 1985, the report takes up the projections of Baltimore’s future. And finally, in a more practical way, the author suggests some actions and policies which he believes essential to achieve a healthier economy and a better society. One interesting aspect of the report is that it was to consider the whole Baltimore region, not only the city.

Szanton gave prominence to the racial segregation within the region and the problems engendered by these circumstances: a declining revenue base, a climbing concentration of poverty, a weakened school system, etc. Szanton’s analysis also talks about the weak tradition of civic action within Greater Baltimore. He emphasizes the fact that only one Fortune 500 companies was based in Baltimore in 1986 concluding that “for the last century, Baltimore has been a branch office, not a headquarters, town” (p. 11) like Pittsburgh, Cleveland or Minneapolis. But the problem is not only the lack of large companies or headquarters since “there are major businesses in Baltimore, and families of great wealth in the city and its suburbs. Yet few have exhibited strong traditions of corporate citizenship or of civic philanthropy” (p. 11). Finally, Szanton points out that Baltimore’s black community is not influential enough,

---

25 The Morris Goldseker Company is directly connected to the creation of the Morris Goldseker Foundation in 1975. Shortly before passing away, the man who became the symbol of the speculators strategy of neighborhood turnover, donated his fortune “to help people help themselves” (Olson, 1997). The Goldseker firm has in fact played a major role in the “blockbusting process” of the 1950s and 1960s. This real estate strategy consisted in strengthening the xenophobia of the white middle class population toward black people to push them out of the central city where they were already attracted by the new suburban life style (Orser, 1991). It is paradoxical to see a foundation supported by a firm that contributed to create an urban segregation problem, looking for solutions to solve economic and demographic problems for Baltimore.

26 Peter L. Szanton was the Founding President of the New York City Rand Institute and President at the time of its own consulting firm, Szanton Associate, a policy and management consulting firm based in Washington D.C.
referring to an article drawn from Black Enterprise which concluded that “... in this town there are two overwhelming realities: politics and money are the unabashed sources of power, and Baltimore’s blacks have been unable to get a firm grip on either” (p. 12).

After looking at some projections which trends had gone rather like our own previous analysis in this chapter—city declining and suburban growth—Szanton propose a list of actions and policies for a preferable future. Those initiatives should be based on three goals: 1) better economy to enter the economy of the future and create employment for the jobless; 2) better schools to prepare people for a productive life and to retain and rebuild a middle class; 3) greater financial support for Baltimore City from its region and state to help the heavier burden of economic and social problems supported by the central city. After the “first act”, the downtown redevelopment strategy, Szanton suggests that the “second act” in Baltimore’s development strategy is not likely to be accomplish without a broad regional consensus. The consensus-building process should be “undertaken by a relatively small group of business and professional people-persons familiar with the needs and resources of the city, and with the political processes of the region and state” (p. 28). Although, Szanton definitely reposes his consensus-building strategy on the civic actors, not the politicians, the Mayor of Baltimore City would have nevertheless an important leadership role in adopting it and building support for it. Afterward, a plan should be offered for collective debate throughout a public hearing process.

If the three goals mentioned by Szanton are surely among the most essential issues for improving the regional conditions, the solutions proposed by Szanton are rather conventional. Making Baltimore a more friendly business place when improving the productivity of the labor force by rising the quality of public education; making the port of Baltimore more competitive; attracting talent as well as high-technology business and information-based services; encouraging entrepreneurship; etc. Unlike previous solutions, his preventive approach related to pre-school youth development to improve school performance is a rather ambitious proposal. But perhaps it is at the regional level that his proposals are the most interesting. At first, he proposes—as some

Morris Goldseker Foundation wanted a fresh look at the Baltimore’s economic and demographic situation and favored to assigned someone with no personal Baltimore history to the task.
other before him—\(27\)—a tighter link to Washington since Baltimore benefits in many respects from its proximity to the Capital. Szanton also suggests a series of solutions to create a greater fiscal balance or to eliminate regional disparities. Among his suggestions from the most radical to the less radical: blurring of the boundaries (theoretical); commuter tax on income redistributed to Baltimore City; restructuring of local tax system in a more redistributive way; state could take full responsibility for funding (and administering) public education; etc.

According to the number of publications and critics that referred to \textit{Baltimore 2000} and all the talks engendered by this report, it is pretty clear, as Arnold (1990:36) mentioned, that “the report caused a sensation in official circles and concern among the general public because it concluded that the entire Baltimore Renaissance up to 1986, while very promising and helpful, was not going to solve the city’s deeper problems of job losses, unemployment, and middle-class flight or elevate the low level of education and skills possesses by nearly half its residents”. However, \textit{Baltimore 2000} did not have an immediate policy impact in concrete terms.

\subsection*{5.2.2 Baltimore and Beyond - Breaking the Boundaries}

Five years later, Neil Peirce, Curtis Johnson and Lenneal Henderson published, as a special section of The (Baltimore) Sun on May 6, 1991, a quite controversial report (The Sun, 09/08/1991) entitled \textit{Baltimore and Beyond}\. In 1993, they reprinted the same report under the title “Breaking the Boundaries” in a meaningful book for the new regionalism paradigm, \textit{Citistates: How America Can Prosper in a Competitive World}. Citistates was looking at six different city regions, Phoenix, Seattle, Baltimore, Owensboro, Dallas and Saint Paul. For each one, the authors were detected the most notable regional problems before “identify a realistic next generation of potential solutions that seemed to make sense in the particular region’s distinctive civic and political culture” (p. ix).

\footnote{As far as we could go back, this concept of a Washington-Baltimore common market was already a proposition in the mid-1970. A plan of action has been elaborated by the Regional Economic Task Force to create a nonprofit regional marketing corporation for what was labelled \textit{The Chesapeake Bay Country}. This plan has been discussed in the Regional Planning Council meeting of October 17, 1975.}

\footnote{The report notably received the financial support from the Abell Foundation.}
Simply, they argue that in a context of market liberalization, regional economies are becoming the centers of national productivity and the main generator of wealth throughout the world. They consequently require particular and customized strategies since the real competitors are the other citistates (or city regions). In this context, the citistates—including central cities, inner and outer suburbs and rural hinterland—should imperatively emerge as a fundamental entity for sustainable social and economic organization as well as regional governance. They thus maintain that “existing forms of organizations and governance are less and less successful in meeting the real needs of times” (p. 11). Several reasons justify what they call the interdependence imperative for Greater Baltimore (pp. 131-132).

1. City image—regions are known by their central cities and skilled workers may or may not want to move there according to the image of each region;

2. Work force—inner cities are the likeliest labor pool for qualified and professional staff;

3. Pay me now or pay me later—if you fail to address inner-city problems (like public education, poverty, crime, etc.) the problems will come back in higher taxes in one way or another;

4. Physical safety—pockets of high crime increase the danger in the whole region;

5. Growth and the environment—more the population is dispersed, more the mass transit becomes impractical and the air pollution increases;

6. Suburban customers—the suburban population represents an important mass of customers for the central city which helps to create or maintain jobs;

7. Suburban workers—hundreds of thousands of people from the surrounding counties work in the central city;

8. Suburban jobs—the counties are where most jobs are created today and many city people need those jobs;

9. etc.

Looking at Greater Baltimore’s regional problems, the authors asked the following question: How Greater Baltimore’s governance could be reorganized? After interviewing several business, civic, and political actors, they concluded that Baltimore suffers from a profound internal leadership capacity to address regional issues. Here some of their observations (p. 128):
Baltimore City and its neighbors are failing to function cooperatively. They often exhibit sheer indifference toward each other—and on occasion, outright hostility. A political hacksaw hovers over the neck of any county officials who suggest meaningful assistance to the troubled inner city. A Baltimore politician will be pilloried for giving up an ounce of the city’s autonomy now that blacks are finally in full control.

To create a more cohesive region, to channel more revenues to Baltimore City, to improve the school system, to rebuild the human conditions of deprived neighborhoods, to lower criminality, to protect the environment and to control urban growth, etc, Greater Baltimore needs to strike a new deal. This deal should be based on more cooperation among the regional community claim the authors. But, in a context where local politicians are not likely to undertake regional reform, “people power is needed to force action” (p. 134).

To renew metropolitan governance in Greater Baltimore, Peirce and al. proposed the creation of a “Commonwealth” plan based on the alliance of civic forces in the region and supported by the leadership of business organizations and the foundations. In concrete terms, they suggest a one-time Civic Congress including people from Baltimore City as well as the five counties to create a consensus on common regional interests and to give birth to a Baltimore Region civic League advocating for metropolitan solutions. The idea behind this initiative would be initially to set up a regional vision supported by civic organizations and citizens to offset the commonly local vision of urban development. Secondly, citizen leadership is seen as the only way to incite politicians to redesign politics and policies and make them adopt a regional approach to urban development since they would have an indubitable support to take that direction.

On their own admission, the Baltimore and Beyond report, when published for the first time in The Sun in 1991, received a rather mitigated review (Peirce and al., 1991). Mayor Kurt Schmoke from Baltimore City did not appreciate the negative description of some critical problems of his city when suburban county executive saluted the report. Aside a general support from The Sun, the deputy editorial page editor of the newspaper dismissed the report as “one of a confusing kaleidoscope of visions” (The Sun, 09/08/1991). Business and civic organizations generally welcomed the report as a confirmation of their own view. But almost a decade after the publication of the Peirce Report, we are still waiting for the creation of a Baltimore Region Civic
League and its release did not have the anticipated impact. In fact, the greatest merit of the report was probably to have given rise to a media coverage, a strong reaction from the community and a regional debate on regional issues.

5.2.3 Baltimore Unbound

The real initial stimulus for a renewed regional thinking in Baltimore was notably the research and publication by David Rusk of *Baltimore Unbound. A Strategy for Regional Renewal* in 1996. Rusk owns a long experience in urban affairs. He started his career as a civil rights, anti-poverty worker and administrator for the U.S. Department of Labor preceding a political career as New Mexico State Legislator (1975-77) and Mayor of Albuquerque (1977-81). Prior to *Baltimore Unbound*, he wrote *Cities Without Suburbs* while he was Guest Scholar on Urban Affairs for the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Printed in 1993, *Cities Without Suburbs* received extensive attention throughout the United States and can also be considered as a substantial contribution and an influential analysis for new regionalism.

In *Cities Without Suburbs*, Rusk’s message is clear. The isolation of central cities from their suburban areas must cease in order to realistically deal with urban problems. His thesis is supported by an elaborate statistical analysis on 522 central cities in 320 metropolitan areas of the United States. This assemblage of statistics has given a lot of credit to his conclusions even if not everybody agreed with his data interpretation (see Blair and al, 1996). Making use of this analysis, Rusk presents two types of central city dynamic: the elastic and inelastic cities. Elastic cities capture suburban growth in expanding their city limits by annexation, county consolidation or by other type of regional cooperation like metropolitan government, intermunicipal agreement, tax-base sharing, regional affordable housing redistribution, etc. On the other hand, inelastic cities are characterized by the inability to expand their city limits or to capture a share of suburban growth and wealth. Comparing the two types of city regions, he demonstrates that elasticity favors growth metropolitan wide; that inelastic cities are more segregated by race and income class and consequently that poverty is more concentrated in inelastic cities than in elastic cities; that elastic cities are more equitable since the income gap between central cities and suburbs is smaller than within inelastic cities; etc. But what is the most striking in his book is
doubtless his concept of *point of no return* (p. 74):

"Past the point of no return, city-suburb economic disparities become so severe that, in a broad sense, the city is no longer a place in which to invest or to create jobs (with the exception of downtown business districts). (...) Cities past the point of no return are not hopeless. However, they cannot escape the grip of ghetto poverty solely by their own efforts. Despite the redevelopment projects, enterprise zones, and neighborhood empowerment programs, no city past the point of no return has ever closed the economic gap with its suburbs by as much as a single point. Isolated within their metro areas, decade by decade cities past the point of no return demonstrate the fourth law of urban dynamics: ghettos only become bigger ghettos."

This is one of the details that attracted the attention of the President of The Abell Foundation\textsuperscript{29}, Robert C. Embry, before taking on David Rusk for an investigation regarding the dilemmas and the challenges surrounding specifically Baltimore. *Baltimore Unbound* was thus born from the initiative of a foundation and offered as a "contribution to what needs to be an ongoing debate about the issues" as we can read in the foreword of the publication.

In the *Baltimore Unbound* report, Rusk first exposes the evidence that Baltimore is a typical example of an inelastic city and is consequently programmed to a constant decline within its metropolitan environment. What is happening to Baltimore City today is the result of its incapacity to adapt to the foregoing suburban-style development that has prevailed in America during the last decades. As a consequence, Baltimore did not obtain its fare share of spin-offs from the last period of urban growth within the metropolitan area. For this reason, Baltimore went past the point of no return since its population has declined more than 20% from its peak level, more than 30% of its population is member of a minority, and the city/suburban per capita income ratio is less than 70%. According to these three threshold indicators developed by Rusk, Baltimore slides way down the point of no return along with half the selected industrial cities in this report (table 5.1).

\textsuperscript{29} The Abell Foundation's mission is to effect positive change on societal problems in the Baltimore area, with a strong focus on programs promoting educational reform, job creation and tourism; strengthening families; reducing drug addiction; and alleviating hunger and homelessness. The Foundation makes grants exclusively to organizations located in the state of Maryland (The Abell Foundation website, 1999).
It is clear that the recent trends in urban development have evolved in a new urban form where the suburban areas have become increasingly autonomous and more isolated from the central cities’ problems. So why should suburbs care? For Rusk, suburbs pay and will continue to pay for declining central cities in many ways (p. 22):

- Suburbs pay through higher state and federal taxes to support increased social services and urban aid. Imposes a heavy burden on a region's competitive position;
- Suburbs pay for costly duplication of major regional facilities when suburbanites no longer feel comfortable and secure in using city-based facilities;
- Suburbanites sacrifice their enjoyment of a region's history and tradition.

Rusk also points out the fact that the best economic regions generally have healthy central cities at their core. Thus central cities and suburbs are interdependent and the economic future of the whole region is jeopardized by the decline of Baltimore City as a place to live, to work, to shop and to visit Rusk insist. Therefore, the Baltimore region has to be reprogramed in order to achieve a more equitable urban development. In his perspective, it means essentially to reverse the central city’s isolation to achieve ultimately a more even distribution of poor minorities throughout the region.

To achieve this goal, the Rusk’ strategy is rather ambitious. He picks up well-known metropolitan arrangements in United States and Canada and proposes to apply these to
Baltimore. First of all, he suggests the creation of a Municipality of Metropolitan Baltimore (label as Metro) covering Baltimore City, the five counties traditionally included within the political definition of Greater Baltimore and Queen Anne’s County located to the other side of the Bay. Metro would function as the upper tier of a two-tier system of local government modeled onto the former Metro Toronto. It would be governed by an elected Metropolitan Council of seven members along with one elected Metro Executive.

The Metro general function would have to guide and manage the comprehensive metropolitan planning, zoning and housing programs. But its first priority over the other would be to dissolve the concentration of poverty in Baltimore City’s neighborhoods in opening up new housing opportunities for the underprivileged throughout the region. This is what Rusk calls the Fair Share Housing Program based on the same type as the one that has been elaborated by the Montgomery County’s housing program. In practical terms it means that “for every housing development of 50 or more units, the developer would have to sell or rent 10 percent of the units to moderate-income households and sell another 5 percent of the units to Metro’s Housing Opportunities Commission” (p. xviii). In addition to this, Rusk proposes the creation of a regional tax-base sharing program modeled on the one existing in Minneapolis-St.Paul since mid 1970s. For the Baltimore region, it would thus required that “all local jurisdictions in the metro area allocate 40% of the incremental growth in commercial and industrial property valuation to a regional tax pool. In addition, the Maryland law would require allocating to the common pool 40% of the incremental growth in residential property tax for residences valued above 150% of the regional median housing value ”. (p. 123-124)

On the whole, Rusk proposes to create a strong growth management policy including a democratic political power along with tools to promote social equity with in its core a regional

30 On January first, 1998 Metro Toronto has been replaced by the MegaCity of Toronto when the provincial government of Ontario decided to merge the six constituents in one municipality. In the Canadian constitution, provinces have full authority over municipal affairs and they have an history to intervene more than the U.S. states legislatures.
31 Montgomery County, Maryland, is an interesting example of social and economic integration via and unified local government. They first have a countywide school system which is not common within the United States. The county also has the exclusive planning and zoning control throughout the county which allows for an efficient growth management system. They notably developed in the 1970s a program called the Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU). The program requires builders of fifty or more residential units to set aside 15% of the units for low and moderate income tenants or buyers. (Rusk, 1993)
approach for public housing. In order to achieve this, he believes that the action of the state government is essential. As he says: “Metro cannot come into existence without decisive but controversial action by the Maryland General Assembly and the Governor” (p. 101). Maryland, along with several other states, has a tradition of respecting the principles of home rule and to give a lot of deference to local governments in the administration of local or regional affairs. These habits are rather difficult to change and the local elected officials are generally more than reluctant to give up any power they already own. But since “(...) many of American cities’ problems are structural (...) state legislatures hold the keys to reorganizing urban governance effectively”, (p. 73)

After the publication of *Baltimore Unbound*, the regionalism issue suddenly became more significant for several actors within the Greater Baltimore region. Previous studies like those from Szanton and Peirce and al. were dug up and used to reinforced the Rusk analysis since these studies were reaching pretty much the same conclusions: (1) urban problems originate and impact on the whole region; (2) the central city will not be able to solve its problem by itself; (3) you must therefore think in terms of regional solutions.

Why the previous studies did not have the same impact? One reason is certainly the timing. There has been a real resurgence nationally for the regionalism idea since the beginning of the 1990s that took some time before bearing fruit. Another explanation could be the insufficiency of data in earlier studies that could have had the effect to dissolve or invalidate more easily the arguments (Embry, 1996). With his complex of data analysis, Rusk shows the powerful trends that are going on and they look irreversible. Actually, it seems that his concept of *point of no return* captured the imagination of some people and scored a direct hit. And despite people having more or less agreed or disagreed with the data, part of his persuasiveness came from having some original and plausible data. Moreover, as a former politician, he is also a pretty eloquent orator and he gave many speeches in Baltimore. He also proposes some detailed and integral remedies to face the situation. Not accommodating or popular remedies but a strong analysis to support these uneasy recommendations. (interview 4) On the whole, he was able to show and illustrate two paths for Baltimore’s future. He also revealed that without a regionwide
strategy, the inelastic city drift is not likely to stop.

According to manifold interviews, it seems that *Baltimore Unbound* really triggered something in the region. In fact, a lot of different people in several organizations seem to have had a real reaction to Rusk’s work. In the years following the publication of *Baltimore Unbound*, the Greater Baltimore Committee, the Citizens Planning and Housing Association and more recently the Archdiocese of Baltimore have all developed some programs which focus explicitly on regional issues. Those three organizations have been at least in part stimulated by David Rusk’s work.

5.2.4 Baltimore Metropolitics

While David Rusk’s statistical analysis contributed to the new regionalism debate in Greater Baltimore, Myron Orfield contributed in a different fashion by offering a comprehensive metromapping analysis on existing conditions and trends in Greater Baltimore. Like Rusk, Orfield is also an influential author for the new regionalism paradigm. In 1996, Orfield wrote *Metropolitics: A Regional Agenda for Community and Stability*, a highly praised book.

In this publication, Orfield emphasizes the fact that no American metropolis is immune from social and economic polarization. Urban sprawl, middle-class flight, concentration of poverty are more costly and pernicious than any other social problems. Orfield warns that the same patterns of regional polarization that were devastating for older industrial cities clearly emerge in younger metropolitan areas too. Even city regions with a progressive background like Minneapolis-St.Paul or Portland are not sheltered from expansion and concentration of poverty and racial segregation with all the problems engendered—destructive social consequences; degeneration of school systems; intensification of crime; human and financial resources disappearance; etc. He points out the restrictive and low-density land use practices, the policies favoring new developmental infrastructures (freeways, sewer systems, etc.) along with political balkanization as the sources of metropolitan affliction.

The value of his work relies especially on a sophisticated graphical representation of the destructive pattern of regional polarization. He applied the latest technology in Geographical
Information System (GIS) to create detailed, elegant and comprehensive maps illustrating multitudinous regional trends. Among the significant findings allowed by this methodological approach is the explicitness that suburbs are not a monolith, socially, racially, economically, politically, etc. In fact, there would be three types of suburbs:

- First, there would be the older inner suburbs that are often declining side by side with the central cities and sometimes even faster.

- The second type is the low tax-base developing suburb that is growing without a sustainable tax-base to support the needs of its population in a long terms perspective.

- The third type is the high tax-base developing suburb, which comprise region’s highest incomes and most of the regional new economic resources. Commonly using their land-planning (or zoning) powers and local autonomy to restrain the accession of moderate and low income residents, this last type of affluent suburbs is able to escape from social, economic, and environmental costs assumed by aging part of the metropolitan area.

Orfield’s main argument is that the older declining suburbs and low tax-base suburbs are sooner or later getting clobbered by the same practices and policies that converged on the central cities to create disinvestment and polarization. Accordingly, the rings of distress neighborhoods are just going to keep appearing as upper and middle classes will continue to move out. Another main focus for Orfield is related to fiscal disparity. While the developing suburban communities expand their tax-base without sharing the social, economic and environmental regional needs, older parts of the region have to support these costs with only a narrow access to fresh resources generated by the new growth. This impasse is an important structural factor of regional fiscal inequity and contributes significantly to jeopardize metropolitan stability. All things considered, Orfield has unquestionably contributed to go beyond the central city centric view of regionalism.

With *Baltimore Metropolitics: A Regional Agenda for Community and stability*, Orfield applied the same ideas but specifically for Greater Baltimore. The study was publish in 1996 by the Citizens Planning and Housing Association (CPHA)—an important Baltimore City’s neighborhood organization—which took on Myron Orfield to supply the nonprofit organization
with a clear look at the regional dynamics and disparities for the Baltimore region (Interview 3). CPHA was at the time in the process of developing a Campaign for Regional Solutions. Again, this report was supported by a financial contribution from The Abell Foundation.

Orfield said in his report that the disparities within Greater Baltimore were some of the most dramatic that he describes as a “dangerous social and economic polarization” (p. 1). What is the latitude to redesign urban practices when a clear majority of Greater Baltimore’s inhabitants lives in the suburb and represent a critical political power? According to Orfield’s analysis, the Baltimore suburban communities are diverse in several respects. They range from the very rich to the very poor. Using the 1990 census definition of Baltimore Metropolitan Statistical Area\(^\text{32}\), Orfield distinguished three distinct types of suburban communities in Greater Baltimore in addition to the central city: (1) high social need inner places (inner places); (2) high social need outer places (outlying communities); and (3) low social need places (white-collar places). Table 5.2 displays some statistics for each subregion.

As we observed, more than 70% of the region’s population are living in areas with high social need when only 28.4% of the regional population are living in low social need places. Of course, the central city shows significant differences as opposed to its suburb counterparts. The median Household Income ($24,045) and children poverty (34%) rank way under or over the regional average. Nevertheless, the disparities between high social need suburbs and low social need suburbs remain considerable. When high social need places have a median household income around $35,000, low social need places stand around $50,000. The same thing applies for children’s poverty with 9% and 16% for high social need suburb as opposed to 3% for low social need suburbs.

Orfield’s maps show that each county incorporates at least some parts that are designed as high social need places and some sections that are low social need places. The central city is obviously not the only place that experiences problems in the region. This suburban diversity lead Orfield to the conclusion that metropolitan coalitions can be developed in the Baltimore

\(^{32}\) Instead of using the political definition of Greater Baltimore, Orfield uses the statistical definition which includes Baltimore City along with six other counties: Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Harford, Howard and Queen
region among the communities that are experiencing social and economic problems. An important segment of the region shares the same necessity for a metropolitan approach to urban development in order to stabilizing the central city along with older inner suburbs and outlying communities.

Table 5.2
SELECTED STATISTICS FOR EACH GREATER BALTIMORE'S SUBREGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Central City</th>
<th>High Social Need Inner Places</th>
<th>High Social Need Outer Places</th>
<th>Low Social Need Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population, 1990</td>
<td>2,054,215</td>
<td>736,014</td>
<td>582,724</td>
<td>139,658</td>
<td>595,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region's total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, 1990</td>
<td>$35,745</td>
<td>$24,045</td>
<td>$35,868</td>
<td>$33,536</td>
<td>$50,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income, 1989</td>
<td>17,1%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For Orfield, this coalition should be crystallized first around the tax-base inequity problem and if successful can be stretch to other regional issues. The metropolitan fragmentation of the tax base is among the most pernicious problems since it nourishes an unfair local competition and encourages urban sprawl as well as wasteful low-density development patterns. Tax-base sharing is thus the entry point of regionalism concluded Orfield. The second priority regarding regional solutions would be reinvestment and fair housing throughout the region. These reforms are essential to decentralized poverty, insure social equity and sustain physical improvement to encourage middle class to stay or to come back to the central city, the inner suburbs and the outlying communities’ areas. The second range of metropolitan solutions would be related to a comprehensive coordinated growth management strategy including a transportation/transit reform as well as a welfare reform. Those policies are rather dedicated to reinforce regional equity and favor an efficient and sustainable regional development.

Anne's. However, for methodological reasons, the total population listed in table 5.2 of 2,054,215 does not correspond to the seven counties in their entirety, which had a combined population of 2,382,172 in 1990.
5.3 The Regional Planning Agency as a Metropolitan Incubator

Notwithstanding its governance dilemmas, the regional planning agency has constantly contributed to frame metropolitan issues within Greater Baltimore and especially to support regional planning with acute information and studies. Since its creation in 1963 the territorial definition of Greater Baltimore includes most of the jurisdictions where urban growth has occurred within the metropolitan area. As a consequence, the numerous studies produced by the regional planning agency are still fairly relevant since they look at the same initial territorial definition, providing a longitudinal expertise for Greater Baltimore. Besides, information is the key element for planning and one of the major strength of the regional planning agency is undoubtedly its research function and its capacity to generate metropolitan diagnostics.

This aptitude to understand how the region evolves has been an important asset to direct the elaboration of regional politics and to suggest solutions in a wide range of domains. At first, this expertise has been put to good use over the elaboration of five quinquennial regional plans adopted from 1967 to 1986. Besides assuring the comprehensive planning process, the regional planning council has also initiated or been involved with several metropolitan initiatives during this period.

Nowadays, the Baltimore Metropolitan Council is still directly involved in transportation planning via the Transportation Steering Committee, which serves as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO). BMC also plays a coordination role for some special projects like the Clean Air Public Outreach program or the Watershed Protection Programs. Occasionally, it plays an advocating role for metropolitan solutions. For instance, it sponsored coinjointly with the Greater Baltimore Committee a regional forum on economic development and public safety in 1997. BMC also contributed to the development of a regional vision when they publish studies, strategic assessments or data in regard to the region. Especially when they proposed or instigated metropolitan solutions. Occasionally, BMC also helped created of new metropolitan organizations. For instance, the Greater Baltimore Alliance—the current regional economic development organization—was initially incubated by the BMC (see chapter 7).

33 Especially before the 1990 census which indicated a new megapolis for the Baltimore-Washington metropolitan area.
But nowadays, except for transportation planning, the BMC and its staff are, as a general rule, not directly involved in the operation of metropolitan function. They usually work with organizations as consultants, technical advisors and information providers, which leaves the region with a lack of leadership to address directly metropolitan problems with an overall perspective. Likewise, it is probably in part the main reason why in the 1990s an increasing number of organizations became concerned with metropolitan issues in Greater Baltimore.
6. Development of a Regional Vision in Greater Baltimore

In this chapter, we examine the development of a renewed regional vision in Greater Baltimore. The general question which this section deals with is: how do regional actors change the way they think about urban development and what are the means and strategies applied to foster the development of a relative consensus about the future of the city region? To answer this question, we first look at the programs and comportment of some nonprofit organization within the region that have modified their mission in a way that correspond to the new regionalism principles. Secondly, we look at other commitments towards regionalism which encompasses the support from the media, the Maryland Smart Growth initiative as well as the most recent strategic planning processes in Baltimore City and Howard County.

6.1 Nonprofit Organizations’ Regional Programs

Following the publications of Szanton, Peirce et al., Rusk and Orfield on regionalism, several nonprofit organizations in the Greater Baltimore area started considering metropolitan issues in their mission. In a way, these previous studies and reports represent the stimulus for regional thinking and have been useful in suggesting miscellaneous approaches to build regional solutions. It appears that actors like business, civic or religious organizations are the true incubators of a renewed metropolitan vision to set out a regional agenda for action in Greater Baltimore. At least three nonprofit organizations elaborated a process for developing explicit regional programs: the Greater Baltimore Committee, the Citizens Planning and Housing Association and the Baltimore Archdiocese. Despite different fundamental missions and goals, these three organizations reveal a comparable understanding of Greater Baltimore’ situation and share a join interest for metropolitan outcomes.
6.1.1 Greater Baltimore Committee (GBC)

The GBC consists of 600 member businesses from the entire region, including Baltimore City and the five counties covering the political definition of Greater Baltimore. Officially, its mission is "to improve the business climate of the Greater Baltimore region by organizing its corporate and civic leadership to develop solutions to the problems that affect the region's competitiveness and viability." (GBC, 1998:1). For decades, GBC has played an especially influential role in the redevelopment of downtown Baltimore and in many other issues within the region. It is just recently that the GBC made regionalism one of its top priorities in setting up a regional public policy agenda to increase the competitiveness of the entire region.

6.1.1.1 GBC's initial focus

Into the second half of the century, as Baltimore City was increasingly affected by urban problems, a small group of business leaders\(^4\) decided to create a public policy entity to bring back wealth to the city. In 1955, Greater Baltimore Committee (GBC) was thus created as an action arm for local economic development. From the beginning, the downtown redevelopment was the main object of intervention of the GBC. GBC's initial vision was to raze and rebuild a 33 acres section in the heart of the central business district. A relatively ambitious strategy for downtown revitalization called Charles Center Development Plan was formalized in 1958 by the GBC and the Committee for Downtown—made up of industrial, financial and commercial leaders. The $150,000,000 Charles Center project covered 16 sites and by 1975, most of the project was completed. It included different types of service and equipment like office buildings, retail, commercial and residential facilities, a vast underground commercial and public parking along with hotel facilities (Pritchett, 1982).

Charles Center was in some respect a "showcase project by which the business community first tested the feasibility of downtown redevelopment" (Lieberman, 1982:38). In 1970, the

\(^4\) Mainly bankers and retailers among whose was included the renowned developer James Rouse.
MetroCenter Plan consolidated a projected plan for downtown Baltimore. Thus, before the completion of the Charles Center project, another even more notorious project was under way: the restoration of Baltimore’s Inner Harbor. No longer used as a port facility and deserted in a shocking state of degradation, the Inner Harbor project was more than just a physical improvement and new facilities’ addition to the city. It was the Baltimore’s business and government leaders new view of the future (Lieberman, 1982). Their vision anticipated downtown Baltimore becoming a major tourist and entertainment destination with convention center facilities along with the rebirth of its retail, office and financial activities which could become attractive enough to bring in new residents.

Since the 1970s, Inner Harbor continuously welcomed new and massive investments to put into effect the metamorphosis of this area. Several office buildings like the World Trade Center have been built. The Maryland Science Center along with other recreational facilities like the National Aquarium have been located in this area. The Convention Center materialized along with a large complex of eating, drinking and shopping activities has been developed succeeding the erection of Harborplace envisioned by the James Rouse’s company. Inner Harbor also became a multi-use sports complex after the completion of two new professional baseball and football stadiums. All these constructions are only among the most noticeable examples of the non-stop openings that have occurred so far and still continue to take place in the Inner Harbor area and beyond.

The Charles Center and Inner Harbor realizations were not the only vision raised by GBC. The other vision was the redevelopment model to achieve those projects supported by a strong partnership between business and governments. In order to increase the confidence of the business sector to reinvest in the central city, it was assumed that an important contribution of governments was required. And this strategy apparently works. Indeed, once the federal, state and local governments have decreased significantly the economic risk for private developers in building the physical infrastructure, in investing in public institutions in the downtown area, in initiating some of the fundamental components of the plan, in offering a broad administrative and financial assistance, and in involving the citizens into the process35, the business sector inevitably joined the strategy to redevelop downtown Baltimore. Within that process, the governments

35 Through such means as conducting electoral campaigns for development loans.
played a crucial supportive role to unfold the plan, but it was clearly the business sector under the GBC’s leadership that was initial motivating force behind the redevelopment plan. (Lieberman, 1982; Hula, 1990)

Previously in this report, we made an allusion to the contentions raised by the Baltimore’s redevelopment model supported by a tight public-private partnership (Levine, 1987; Hula, 1990; Harvey, 1991). Charles Center and Inner Harbor might be qualified as a financial, commercial, real estate and symbolic success by its stakeholders, the city and the visitors. However, critics assert that this redevelopment strategy has produced uneven economic impacts and that the benefits have not been spread adequately to the impoverish black population and to the displaced workers victims of the manufacturing decline in the region. It is generally said that the physical and estate development orientation and the business domination of the downtown redevelopment strategy profited to corporate and finance sectors above all. Likewise, the economic development approach build on corporate services and tourism is not likely to provide well-paying jobs to low-skilled central city residents. Levine (1991:118) also talks about the inadequate linkages between downtown redevelopment and neighborhood economies:

“The justification for corporate center development, (...), rests on an urban variant of trickle down economics. Investment leveraged in the city core, it is argue, will eventually spill over to distresses neighborhoods, stimulating economic activity and creating jobs. The evidence in Baltimore, however, suggests there has been little spillover from a booming downtown market based on real estate, services, commercial ventures, and tourism to neighborhood economic development. Moreover, in view of the cuts in the municipal budget during the Schafer years, there is no sign that the revenues generated from downtown growth have been used to underwrite neighborhood improvements. In the absence of explicit linkage policies aimed at promoting balanced growth between downtown and the neighborhoods, downtown Baltimore has been redeveloped as an economic island, unconnected in any organic way to the deteriorating neighborhoods around.”

All these arguments are relevant but remain a central city centric view of economic development. Szanton, Peirce et al., Rusk and Orfield offered a stimulating contribution to the public debate on the question, emphasizing the metropolitan context of city decline. According to them, the inadequate linkages—brought up by Levine—would not only be between downtown and the deprived neighborhoods, but also between all jurisdictional components of the region. Their
perspective goes beyond the traditional debates between the neoliberal and the marxist perspectives of economic development. Consequently, their theoretical and progressive viewpoint and solutions are considered seriously by business organizations like the GBC as an effective answer to the need for a more comprehensive explanation of urban problems, and a valuable approach for community-wide social and economic improvement.

6.1.1.2 GBC’s regional agenda

Even though GBC is a metropolitan organization by nature of its membership and mission, from its creation in mid 1950s, the downtown redevelopment was the primary object of its intervention. Thus, its scope of influence has historically been confined to the central city and so is the categorization of this organization since its creation. The 1990s mark a turning point for the GBC. After focusing so many years on downtown and the central city, GBC started to recognize that to carrying through a viable economic development strategy and to guarantee competitiveness for Greater Baltimore it would require an effective regional commitment.

The initial stimulus for GBC to start thinking regionally was the publication by David Rusk of *Baltimore Unbound* in 1996. Shortly after the book was released, some people within the organization had a tangible reaction and became interested in Rusk’s work. This period also corresponded to the appointment of Frank Bramble as the new Chairman of the GBC who was inclined to refocus the mission of this organization. Refering to Rusk’s study, Bramble declared that “regionalism is key to our ability to leverage our marketplace” (The Sun, 05/20/1996). Part of the attractiveness came from the fact that the book included an elaborate statistical analysis along with the fact that Rusk was suggesting specific remedies. But at first, the GBC’s staff was more intrigued than completely convinced by Rusk. Nevertheless, it appears that *Baltimore Unbound* was the triggering factor for GBC to start digging out the question of regionalism. (Interview 4).

Then in 1996, GBC went through an internal process, created a committee on regionalism, commanded its own studies, looked at other regions’ experiences, and consulted specialists regarding metropolitan issues (Interview 4). In July 1997, the GBC’s board endorsed a regional program document entitled *One Vision One Future. A Report on Regionalism*. In this report,
GBC state that “an exclusive focus on individual jurisdictions is no longer in the best interests of either the region or its individual jurisdictions” (p. 2). The report points out the increasing interdependence between the city and the counties along with several metropolitan issues that are not restrained by political boundaries like crime, environmental quality, school system and the quality and availability of the workforce throughout the region. The report acknowledges that race relations, high concentration of poverty, and the fiscal disparity among jurisdictions are some of the most fundamental issues to be addressed regionally. Just like Orfield, the continuous spreading of social and economic problems in the older inner ring suburbs also concerns GBC. It also concedes that despite all the accomplishments realized within downtown Baltimore, the city will not be able to reverse its problems by itself. Accordingly, GBC is apprehensive about the future of the region since there is growing evidence that regions with declining central cities are less competitive than regions with healthy ones. In short, the report underlines that all these considerations are threatening the overall quality of life and the economic competitiveness of the overall region.

But the report does not conceive regionalism exclusively as a problem solving operation. In One Region One Future, regionalism is also considered more positively as an opportunity to take part to the global economy. Adopting the same point of view as Peirce and al., the report acknowledges that “regions are becoming the primary economic competitors in the new global economy” (p. 4). Therefore, initiatives that focus exclusively on the central city—like the Empowerment Zone—are not likely to reverse realistically the profound trends which afflict the disconnected deprived parts of the region. For the GBC the choice is clear, “we need to start thinking and acting like a region if we are to be successful in the future”(p. 2) on the national and the global scale.

This is what leads GBC to advocate for “policies and mechanisms and partnerships that bring the resources and capabilities of the entire region to bear on a set of problems that ultimately affect every single person living and working in the entire area” (p. 5). Among the solutions suggested by the report, GBC endorses the three following initiatives (p. 8-10):
1. Regional growth management policies that lead to redevelopment and reinvestment in older neighborhoods and reduce the infrastructure costs to the governments and taxpayers of the region.

2. Policies that result in a system of tax base sharing in the region. Any system should focus on the growth in tax base and could draw upon a number of different models that have adopted across the country.

3. A policy for developing affordable housing throughout the metropolitan area. A key goal of this policy should be to avoid creating concentrations of people living in poverty.

The GBC ultimately recognized that regionalism is not an easy or a quick process. The One Region, One Future report marks a long-term commitment to regionalism for the business organization. For the next decade and beyond mention the report. Besides advocating for specific regional policies, the GBC addresses the question with pedagogic dispositions in order to get people thinking positively about regionalism and to build an increasing consensus for metropolitan solutions with other groups and individuals.

Another realization, targeting an educational and marketing campaign to persuade more people of the value of regional cooperation and to help starting an agenda for action, was the State of the Region Report published in July 1998. The report was produced jointly by the Greater Baltimore Committee and the Greater Baltimore Alliance. It is a comparison of the Baltimore metropolitan area with nineteen other American regions. At first, the mission of the report was at first to present regionwide data instead of the more customary city, county or state data. Secondly, the report aims to look at the Baltimore region in a comparative perspective. How does the Baltimore region compares, not only against old industrial regions in transition, but also against high-growth economic regions in development? (Interview 4)

The sample is in fact representative of the regional diversity within the U.S. It encompasses Baltimore’s regional competitors like Philadelphia, Richmond, and Washington; fast growing
employment hubs like Atlanta, Dallas, and Charlotte; high-tech regions like Austin, Boston, Raleigh-Durham, and Seattle; areas known for having progressive policies to promote regionalism like Indianapolis, Minneapolis-St.Paul, and Portland; older regions in transition like Cleveland and St. Louis; Western metropolitan areas like Denver and San Diego; and Southern metropolitan areas known for positive business climates and strength in a particular targeted business sector like Tampa (finance) and Greenville-Spartanburg (manufacturing). Broadly speaking, the report confirmed a number of strengths and weaknesses about Baltimore Metropolitan Area. The strengths include the relative affluence of the buying income and market growth; a reasonable cost of living; top quality health care, transportation\textsuperscript{37}, and cultural assets; and quality higher education. Among the weaknesses are a low employment growth; high rate of unemployment; a lack of diversity in its economic structure; and a serious problem regarding public safety and high crime.

After the publication of the report, members of the GBC started giving presentations, using the State of the Region as a tool to promote regionalism throughout the region. For instance, the GBC held a symposium short after the publication to discuss ways of linking jurisdictions to deal with business and non-business issues like, for instance, drug abuse in the region. 150 civic and business leaders have participated to this symposium (The Sun, October 2, 1998:3c). In December 1998, the GBC organized a regional delegation including civic, business and media participants along with politicians to Minneapolis-St.Paul. The primary goal of this visit known as Gaining Perspective was to develop a better understanding of how Minnesota’s fiscal disparities act contributes to the region’s economic prosperity. The second goal was to find out more about the Metropolitan Council and the contribution that it makes to the region. This trip to Minneapolis-St.Paul is in the same nature, as that of the report, that is, to learn from other regions’ experiences. Meanwhile, during the one-year period between the publication of One Region, One Future and the publication of the State of the Region Report the GBC and the Baltimore Metropolitan Council co-sponsored—in cooperation with the University of
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\textsuperscript{36} With counsel and input from the Johns Hopkins Institute for Policy Studies (IPS).

\textsuperscript{37} The good ranking in transportation is especially due to an efficient connectivity to other metropolitan areas via air and train services along with the relative Baltimore’s nearness to other urban centers like Washington and New York.
Baltimore—a half-day regional forum on economic development and public safety. The forum was called *There are no Boundaries*.

For the GBC, part of the regional issue is equally a region-state legislature challenge. The GBC directly sponsored or at least supported several bills dealing with regional issues to the General Assembly of Maryland. One of them is the *Maryland Regional Economic Competitiveness Act* (House Bill 802, February 12, 1999). For the second consecutive year, this bill was proposed at the General Assembly. The purpose of this policy is to establish a state fund to encourage and reward regional partnership via inter-jurisdiction joint activities. Joint activity is defined as an economic development project or a revenue sharing agreement, which would be carried out, performed on behalf, or contracted by two or more local jurisdictions (counties or Baltimore City). The fund, administered by the state, would thus provide incentive to local jurisdictions to exercise cooperative economic activities and that way, reduce regional fragmentation in the state. The Bill 802 was rejected for the second time in two years, which proves the GBC right when they anticipate that the politics of regionalism is a long-term process.

### 6.1.2 Citizens Planning and Housing Association (CPHA)

CPHA is a pioneer as a Baltimore City based organization in the field of social, physical and economic rehabilitation. According to its founder, the late Frances Morton Froelicher (1982:26), the origin of this organization goes back to 1936 after a local newspaper published an article dealing with city slums’ problems which “tried to document the relationship between bad housing, disease, crime, and other social ills”. CPHA was formally created in 1941 and can be defined as a “nonprofit membership organization committed to the use of citizen action to develop the best possible quality of life for all the people of Baltimore. Taking directions and leadership from its membership, CPHA works to achieve decent housing, thriving neighborhoods, accountable quality schools, responsible and responsive community planning and fully informed citizen participation.” (CPHA, 1998a:1). In practice, CPHA has a history of working with neighborhood groups, which is the initial operational scope of this organization.
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38 The Schaefer Center for Public Policy from the University of Baltimore was primarily the facilitator for the conference.
After decades of activities restrained to Baltimore City and County, CPHA started considering in mid 1990s, the question of whether it was appropriate for the organization to look at the larger regional picture.

6.1.2.1 CPHA’s initial focus

Throughout its long existence, CPHA has played a leadership role in discussions, decisions and coalitions on issues and politics surrounding housing, planning, zoning, parks and open spaces, transportation, air pollution, public education and related fields. CPHA has been in the forefront of numerous reforms in Baltimore, working closely with housing and planning departments of the city to improve the physical and social urban environment. Among its first accomplishments is the publication of the *Baltimore Plan of Housing Law Enforcement*, preceding the adoption of the first Housing Code for Baltimore City. Besides, in a context influenced by a Southern culture (Arnold, 1990), CPHA was dedicated to be a biracial organization and “was the first city wide civic organization to have dinner meetings with blacks and whites in attendance” (Morton Froelicher, 1982:28). CPHA also supported the creation of the Regional Planning Council and helped set up the GBC, which—as it is recapitulated in the previous section—became the leader of the downtown and Inner Harbor redevelopment.

During the 1970s, CPHA has assisted the Inner Harbor revitalization project in doing researches, surveys and recommendations and in defending the plan throughout debates and democratic processes. The organization also promoted such projects as the construction of the Convention Center facilities and The National Aquarium in Baltimore. Therefore, CPHA has been an active partner toward Baltimore’s renaissance. The principal objective of this support was to create a livelier Baltimore and resurrecting pride within the population (Rehbein Marqua and Watts, 1982). Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, CPHA worked through community activism in order to strengthen community organizations and rebuild neighborhoods. Improving public school systems, advocating for liquor and tobacco regulation and campaigning against crime and drugs are among the late concerns of the organization during the last two decades.
6.1.2.2 CPHA’s regional agenda

After David Rusk’s *Baltimore Unbound* was published, the CPHA started considering the larger policy issues that have been driving the city’s plight. Despite some disagreements within the organization regarding whether or not a regional focus would have been compatible with the traditional commitment to grassroots and neighborhood organizations, CPHA came to the conclusion that “if they want to save the city, they cannot do it just from within the city” (interview 3). They realized that there are too many planning decisions which impact on the city that are made elsewhere, at the federal and state level, specially in transportation expenditures, or simply in the suburbs via their land use planning powers.

Subsequently, with financial support from the Abell and Goldskeer foundations and additional funding from the Blaustein Foundation, United Way of Central Maryland, and the First National Bank of Maryland, CPHA has instigated a project that is explicitly regional. CPHA decided to set up a standing board committee called the *Committee on the Region* and charged that committee with developing and conducting a *Campaign for Regional Solutions*. The Campaign aims to “craft an agenda of specific regional strategies that hold promise for ensuring the long-term vitality of the Baltimore region and to build a region-wide constituency of support for that agenda’s implementation” (CPHA, 1997:1).

One of the first actions of the members of the committee was to contract Myron Orfield to supply them with a clear picture of what the transition conditions were for the Baltimore region. An important lesson from the *Baltimore Metropolitics* report is that the same public policies, which have contributed to Baltimore City distress, are doing it to older suburbs as well. These problems might spread to the next rings of suburbs, as people will continue to move out. In other words, inner communities and older suburbs are in the next line of decline. Orfield’s message is that Greater Baltimore cannot keep continuing the pattern of building new suburban settlements for every generation while neglecting the declining parts (Orfield, 1996). The Committee has promoted this message via the publication of a document entitled *Understanding Our Larger Neighborhood. A Closer Look at Baltimore’s Regional Realities* (1997). This document first introduces the initial vision of the CPHA regarding regionalism and secondly combines a short
After reviewing the Orfield's study along with prospecting for manifold other regional initiatives around the country, the Committee on the Region determined to take up two issues to primarily lead with. The first was the revenue sharing issue, and the second was the transportation plan issue. These two regional topics seem to embrace everything else CPHA is dealing with (Interview 3). Particularly the land use planning and a better redistribution of the regional benefits.

**Revenue sharing issue**

The revenue sharing issue is directly influenced by the Orfield’s report, which favor tax-base sharing as a point of entry for regional initiatives. Various forms of regional tax sharing exist and they generally intend to promote cooperation instead of competition for new property tax. For the Baltimore version, sharing regional tax-revenue growth means that each jurisdiction—the 5 counties and Baltimore City—would contribute an amount equal to 10% of its growth in real property tax base starting in 199939 and cumulatively for every year following. The Baltimore Metropolitan Council would administer this regional cooperation fund. It is believed that entrusting the BMC with this sharing mechanism duty would strengthen its role as a regional body (interview 3). The BMC should use these revenues exclusively to address, on a regional basis, problems of public safety, economic and workforce development, and conservation of older neighborhoods. Or to support the goals outlined in the Maryland Regional Competitiveness Act if adopted during the 1999 General Assembly of Maryland’ session.

To explore the potential and implication of such a policy for the Baltimore Region, CPHA and its collaborators on this issue contracted William Ratchford, former director of the Maryland General Assembly’s Department of Fiscal Services, to execute the analysis. Ratchford concluded that the revenue generated by growth sharing would be rather modest, especially at the beginning. This is why it was proposed to add to the regional fund a jump-start tax-base sharing
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39 Taxed at the average regional rate.
provision\textsuperscript{40} for the first five years of the program. Without the jump-start tax, the Ratchford’s estimations for the three opening years of the program varies between $3,6 to $11,1 millions. With the jump-start tax, the amount of the regional fund would vary from $18,1 to $19,8 millions. Even with the addition of a jump-start tax, the fund would remain relatively modest for several years after its creation.\textsuperscript{41}

Despite this fact, the coalition formed by CPHA, GBC, and several other civic and environmental groups resolute to go further with the project, assuming that it would be the first step toward a more effective regional problem solving system (Investing in Community Work Group meeting, February 24, 1999). Thus the group helped to elaborate and afterwards support the House Bill 970 introduced on February 12, 1999 to the General Assembly of Maryland. The bill entitled\emph{Baltimore Metropolitan Regional Investment District} failed however during the seasonal session of the Maryland General Assembly. A scenario highly expected by the supportive coalition which first intention was to increase public awareness over this issue, not its immediate adoption (Investing in Community Work Group meeting, February 24, 1999).

\textbf{Regional transportation issue}

Concurrently with the revenue sharing project, one of the main CPHA’s interests is transportation planning. There is an unequivocal opportunism in picking up the transportation issue (interview 3). First of all, this is a rather easy topic to get funded in the context of transportation planning process occurring in the Baltimore region. Above all, since transportation is related to regional land use and environmental issues, several other organizations are also interested in that topic. This has led to a coalition—named the Baltimore Regional Partnership—which includes CPHA via its Committee on the Region, the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, the Environmental Defense

\begin{center}
\textsuperscript{40} In the first year, each jurisdiction would also contribute an amount equal to what would be generated if 1% of its real property tax base were taxed at the average regional rate. In the second year each jurisdiction contributes 80\% of this amount, in the third year 60\%, in the fourth year 40\%, in the fifth year 20\%, and nothing in subsequent years.\textsuperscript{41} The Minneapolis-St.Paul regional tax base sharing system established since 1971 redistribute regionally more than $500 millions yearly.
\end{center}
Fund, the Baltimore Urban League, and 1000 Friends of Maryland\footnote{Formed in 1996, 1000 Friends of Maryland is a coalition of business and development companies, architectural and historical preservation organizations, community and environmental groups. Its mission is to preserve what is best for Maryland and to encourage sensible growth.} to advocate for new alternatives for regional transportation planning (CPHA, 1998b).

Among the earliest intervention of the Baltimore Regional Partnership was in 1998 when it stepped in the debate over the comprehensive review of the metropolitan transportation plan, called *Outlook 2020*. The blueprint of the plan estimated a 13% population increases in the region over the next 20 years, but a 42% growth in total miles traveled. Following these predictions, the plan was to endorse a $4 billion expenditure on new highway and transit capacity and another $12 billion to maintain and run the existing road, rail and bus network (The Sun, 11/17/1998). Besides, the Transportation Steering Committee (TSC) of the Baltimore Metropolitan Council—the regional planning organization which elaborated the plan—was composed essentially of professional planners representing each of the Greater Baltimore’s jurisdictions when it should have included local elected officials to conform to the requirements of the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration.

The coalition radically objected to the adoption of the plan as it was. According to them, the first version of *Outlook 2000* was engaging a wrong direction since it would reinforce existing problems and was asked to be redrawn by the coalition. It was foreseen to increase sprawl, double traffic congestion, erode transit use as sprawl grows and worsen air and water pollution (The Sun, 11/24/1998). In a joint statement submitted to the TSC, the coalition proposed an opposite direction for transportation planning in Greater Baltimore:

"The region must do a better job of managing congestion, it must reduce projected demand for automobile use and it must curb sprawl by encouraging compact development patterns and reinvestment in established communities (...) The plan replicates past mistakes by relying almost exclusively on expanding capacity both to serve new development and to alleviate congestion, while failing to propose more creative and cost-effective strategies to manage demand and mitigate congestion" (Matheny, Replogle and Epstein, 1998:2).

Several alternatives relying on those principles were proposed. Like for instance, maintaining and improving the existing transportation infrastructure—including infrastructure for train
services; creating transit hubs that make moving from buses to other public transportation an efficient process; improving sidewalks and pedestrian conditions near transit stops; promoting bicycle use by building bikeways and, bike parking and enhancing transit stops linked; establishing car-pool lanes, where commuters would pay toll to travel in a fast lane during rush hour; etc.

Moreover, the Baltimore Regional Partnership was upset by the structure of the TSC, which was composed essentially by appointed professional planners who work for elected officials and who are subordinated to the Baltimore Metropolitan Council led by the County Executives and the Mayor of Baltimore. This situation restricts public access to decision-makers or decisions. Along with the TSC membership structure problem, the coalition is concerned with the lack of regional vision related to the growth management aspect of transportation outcome, asserting that "each local jurisdiction designates its growth areas with little or no attention to impacts on neighboring jurisdictions or on regional patterns of development" (Matheny, Replogle and Epstein, 1998:12). They were also complaining about the absence of a public forum to address regional issues, and were contending for a better public participation within the planning process. Perhaps the public is invited to participate to the TSC’s review process, but the real elaboration and decision-making process is not open to the public, affirm the coalition (Matheny, Replogle and Epstein, 1998:21).

Hence, this coalition kept an energetic presence in the transportation planning process in the recent years, which was not enough however to discard the adoption of the plan in November 1998 without significant modification following the numerous recommendations of the Baltimore Regional Partnership. In December of the same year, the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration—known as the Federal Review Team (1998)—retained several arguments of the coalition in their Report on Certification Review for the Baltimore-Annapolis’ transportation planning process. They notably encouraged TSC to listen and consider public comments and to frequently, clearly and openly communicate to its partners and public how regional priorities are set for and what are the long term regional policy priorities (p. 16).
More importantly, the Federal Review Team decided to withhold full certification of the Baltimore transportation planning process until the TSC conforms to several required quality improvements in the regional process. The Federal Review Team also found that the composition of the TSC was inconsistent with the requirements of the federal metropolitan planning regulation and required that TSC include local elected officials on its voting membership (p. 18). The team also found that the role of the public on the TSC process was inconsistent with the federal regulations (p. 20) and required TSC to provide the citizens of the region an opportunity to bring regional transportation planning concerns to local officials (p. 21). The final certification decision has been reported to 1999.

Choosing community and the legislative equation

But the Committee of the Region’s agenda is not only restraining to revenue sharing and transportation issues. The Committee is also involved in a long-term campaign to educate the population, the civic, community and business leaders as well as the politicians in regards to regional identity and metropolitan interdependence. The assumption of the program is that elected leaders are waiting to be led and are not going to support regionalism unless they have the support from their constituents (interview 3).

One recent highlight for this campaign is the organization of a conference entitles Choosing community; Purpose and possibilities for the Baltimore Region, held on April 29, 1998. About 300 people participated to the conference which aimed to explore three dimensions related to regionalism: (1) the regional planning dimension (transportation, land use, and environment); (2) the revenue sharing dimension; and (3) the quality of life in the region. This was in a way, the beginning of a work in progress for the Committee to promote regionalism within the region and to build a collective support over these three issues.

Following the 1999 session of the Maryland General Assembly, the CPHA’s Committee on the Region was wondering about the perfect formula for successful regionalism in Greater Baltimore. They thus piloted a public forum entitled The Legislative Equation: Regional Problem-Solving, Metropolitics, and the Maryland General Assembly held on May 12, 1999. Several delegates of the Maryland General Assembly attended to this forum which aimed to
answer meaningful questions for the Committee on the Region at this stage of its existence and for its next steps: How have regional initiatives fared in the General Assembly? What are the political obstacles and how shall we overcome them? What needs to happen between now and next year’s session to position regional initiatives for success?

6.1.3 Baltimore Archdiocese

A very interesting fact about the Baltimore Archdiocese is surely its historical legacy to the Catholic Church in America. In 1789, Baltimore became the seat of the first diocese in the United States. John Carroll of Upper Marlboro, Maryland, was thus the first consecrated Catholic bishop in the United States. It is only in 1808 that Baltimore has been raised to the rank of archdiocese. Until 1846, the Baltimore Archdiocese covered the entire country with representatives in different locations. The Archdiocese of Baltimore underwent succeeding subdivision during the following years and nowadays, the Baltimore Archdiocese’s domain corresponds roughly to the State of Maryland divided in three vicariate (Baltimore Archbishop, 1999). None of these three vicariates correspond precisely to the political definition of Greater Baltimore. But the Archbishop along with several other religious institutions are by nature regional organizations.

Recently, besides its spiritual mission, the Baltimore Archdiocese decided to consider the perspective of a regional approach to improve the well being of its fellow citizens. However, the Baltimore Archdiocese is not the only Catholic organization to have adopted the values of regionalism to their conventional scope of action. For instance, the Cleveland’s Archbishop is also very committed to regionalism in his region. And the Metropolitan Alliance of Congregatio in Chicago, especially through the funding director of this organization Mary Gonzales, is also very entrusted over regional issues. Mary Gonzales was a speaker during the CPHA’s annual meeting in 1998. It seems that her short presence in Baltimore made a good impression and her message to the effect that it is insufficient to work exclusively with people in the neighborhood, created a momentum for the Committee on the Region to carry through its campaign (interview 3). Considering these occurrences, it appears that regionalism is becoming
a moral or even a spiritual issue.

6.1.3.1 Baltimore Archdiocese’s regional agenda

In 1998, the Baltimore Archdiocese launched a program called Beyond the Boundaries: New Challenges of Faith in Metropolitan Baltimore (Baltimore Archdiocese, 1998). This program is described as a “spiritual formation and reflection program that aims to help Catholics in the greater Baltimore metropolitan region to learn more about their faith and about the region in which they live” (p. 1). Their label might sound a little like some publications from Peirce and al., but their direct inspiration is closer to Rusk’s ideas on regionalism.

It was in 1996, the publication year of Rusk’s Baltimore Unbound, that the Archdiocese became interested in urban issues. This very same year, the Bishop John H. Ricard, formed the Inter-Vicariate Task Force on Regional Issues in order to overlook the conclusions and recommendations proposed in Rusk’s book. The Task Force essentially tried to develop a regional perspective to help pastoral and institutional leaders of the Archdiocese with social, economic and political issues affecting the region as a whole.

After studying Rusk’s viewpoint on regional problem, the Archdiocese’s Task Force does not seek to promote particular political strategy to deal with regional issues. This is to some extent within the roots of religious values and in order to share the common good with both their local and regional Baltimore’s communities that the Beyond the Boundaries program was conceived. The movement was also inspired by the fundamental principle of the Second Vatican Council, which declared that the “religious mission can be source of commitment, direction, and vigor to establish and consolidate the human community according to the law of god. In fact, the church is able, indeed it is obliged, if times and circumstances require it, to initiate action for the benefit of everyone, especially of those in need (...)” (p. 2). The other fundamental principle is found in the Eucharistic communion with Jesus and commitment with one another. It is said within the program: “truly authentic eucharistic workship instills in us a care and concern for every human person” (p. 4). In a way this is a sense of connectedness that the Archdiocese want to develop among all the Catholics and other citizens of the Baltimore Region.
The program has been developed as a new resource for people actively involved in the church’s life. It is also meant for being taught throughout tutoring sessions of small group participants. Finally, the mission of this regional program has three basic goals: formational, spiritual, and motivational (p. 1):

1. The formational goal seeks to inform participants about some aspects of Catholic Church social teaching, about some aspects of the Baltimore metropolitan region, and about the concepts of “jurisdictionalism” and “regionalism.” They also want to explore regionalism as a potential effectiveness for improving the general well being of all the population of the region.

2. The spiritual goal aims to strengthen the faith of participants, in order that they may understand and embrace the vital connection of Catholic faith in both the church as well as within the civic community.

3. The motivational goal seeks to empower and encourage participants toward continuing engagement with these matters, in order that they may become aware of these issues as they encounter them in the news, and in order that they may be able and willing to take part in public discussion of these issues, and work toward resolving them with respect for the dignity, rights and responsibilities of all people.

6.2 Other Commitments towards Regionalism

Greater Baltimore Committee, the Citizens Planning and Housing Association and the Baltimore Archdiocese have elaborated explicit regional programs specifically for Greater Baltimore. There are other commitments toward regionalism that are not necessarily tangible regional programs or not especially elaborated for Greater Baltimore. For instance, some regional newspapers have been seriously involved over the issue of regionalism. Supporters of new regionalism would see some glimmer of hope with the implementation of the Maryland Smart Growth project, the Governor’s plan to revitalized older residential areas and to control sprawl when respecting local government autonomy. And we can also see the footprint of new regionalism within the most recent strategic planning process of Baltimore City as well as in
suburb. In some respects, these recent commitments towards new regionalism indicate that these ideas are going a step further in the development of a renewed vision of urban development in Greater Baltimore.

6.2.1 The media’s implication in the debate over regionalism

The media and especially the newspapers are rarely indifferent to the debates over regionalism. They can stand in favor or they can stand against, their opinion can also change over the time but generally they have an editorial position on the subject. There is no doubt that newspapers’ coverage increases awareness of regional issues throughout the population. In the case of Baltimore, at least two daily papers have a considerable importance regionally: The Washington Post and The (Baltimore) Sun.

The Washington Post contains a daily metropolitan section that covers Baltimore’s current affairs. More importantly, this newspaper number among one’s ranks, a distinguish specialist of metropolitan questions, the columnist Neil Peirce. The latter writes regularly about regional issues in this newspaper. Sometimes, Peirce refers to Baltimore as a case study for the purpose of his comments. Of course, Peirce adopts a position favoring the new regionalism principles, and he also uses other medias to achieve his pro-regionalist campaign since he notably runs a web site call Citistate.

The (Baltimore) Sun generally stand in favor of regionalism also. This position was confirmed when the newspaper published, in January 1998, an editorial series on how Baltimore City and surrounding counties could better work together. Between January 4 and 10, eight articles were published reviewing the most crucial aspects of regionalism for Greater Baltimore. These eight articles summarized the newspaper’s editorial standing.

In Walking City to Expanding Suburbs for example, the article took a look back at the events which have lead Baltimore from a walking city to a larger metropolitan area. After reviewing the regionalism idea, this introductory editorial give prominence to the practical signs of interdependence between Baltimore City and the suburban counties, presenting the Baltimore as one economy, one society. The editorial concluded that regionalism is an “inescapable reality to
encourage”.

The next editorial, *Shared Funding for Culture*, asserted that “all jurisdictions benefit from area’s museums and art institutions, but not all pay to ensure their success”. For instance, the largest art museum of the region, the Baltimore Museum of Art, receive nearly $3 millions from Baltimore City when Baltimore County’s contribution is less than $200 000, and much lower from other counties: Howard ($18 000), Harford ($15 000), Anne Arundel ($12 000) and Carroll ($375). The situation is the same for other cultural institutions that are massively used by suburban residents. After looking at other cities’ regional cultural funding model, the editorial consider the duplication of one kind or another regional shared funding for culture in the Baltimore region. Such a system “would be a major step toward ensuring the funding stability of institutions that contribute to the quality of the region’s life” concludes the article.

The transportation issue is approached in *Put the Mass in Mass Transit*. Looking at the enormous amount of money spent on the Greater Baltimore’s highway system (more than 6 billion in the last decade) and at the several new highways recently opened, the article underlines the fact that “congestion is worse, the rush-hour is longer and road rage is a buzzword for the late 1990s”. Between 1988 and 1997, 70% of Maryland’s transportation budget went to highways when mass transit received only 22%. Now that the interstate highway network is almost completed, it is time to transfer resources and attention to the regional bus and rail system affirm the editorial. This is the only way to get rid of congestion and to connect people from the inner city to suburban jobs.

The controversial question of race is tackled in *Hold the Race Card*, which asserts that “race has nothing to do with the Baltimore area’s reticence to forge regional solutions—and everything to do with it”. It is easy to associate the lack of regional cooperation in Greater Baltimore to race in such a social segregated context, and both sides play the race card. From black people who think that housing dispersion of Baltimore’s poor population in suburban counties is a menace to their local communities and popular power, from white people who are abandoning the central city to its problems that they often associate with race, and too often, elected officials from the city and suburbs play on the apprehension of people from both side to be re-elected instead of
facing one of the most important issue of Baltimore. The editorial concluded that race should not
be an obstruction to regional cooperation and that it is time for a strong political leadership to
overcome racial prejudices within the region.

The Need for Affordable Housing article underlined the disproportionate concentration of
affordable housing in some areas and the scarcity of affordable housing in some others areas.
This is creating an incoherent situation. In Carol and Howard counties where the median price of
a house is above $150 000 and where apartments are sparse, young middle-class families, low-
wage employees and even mid-level employees cannot manage to buy a house or to live there. In
these counties where commuting by mass transit is also rather difficult, low-wage employees are
hard to find for retail and catering businesses. Looking at an acclaimed model for affordable
housing just next door in Montgomery County, the editorial supports similar policies for ensuring
a better distribution of affordable housing through the region.

In Tax Sharing Make Sense, the editorial sees the regional revenue pool as one of the best way to
encourage metropolitan cooperation. It is also viewed as an environmental solution for land use
planning since every local government will benefit from the new businesses whenever they
locate in the region. Under the current system, every jurisdiction tries to pull in residential,
commercial and industrial growth at all costs in order to increase their tax base and to keep the
property tax rate low. In some respects, the tax-base sharing solution could also restrain
terjurisdictional competition. For all these purposes, the editorial is fully supportive of the
Citizens Planning and Housing Association and the Greater Baltimore Committee in their effort
to implement a tax-base sharing system for Greater Baltimore.

The following editorial begins by asking the following question: what separates Baltimore with
many other metropolitan areas that are considering or that have already achieved regional
approaches? In How we Compare with Elsewhere, the article claimed that “other areas appear
fixated on quality of life for themselves, their children and future generations. We don’t.”. Places
with severe social problems nearby are not as attractive as places where it is safe and
pleasant to live. Baltimore is a metropolitan area with a very high level of regional disparity and
with serious social problems to be solved in order to improves its image along with its
competitiveness. But the article pointed out that Maryland and Greater Baltimore have an history of caring about the Cheasapeake Bay and the quality of life beneath the water more than caring about the environmental and social quality of life on land.

The concluding article, 2020 vision for Baltimore, explores the continuous impact of suburban sprawl in a long-term perspective. It expresses that “running away offers, at best, short-term comfort. Over time, it spells disaster for Maryland”. What will happen if the situation worsen instead of improving in crime, traffic congestion, defective school system, air and water quality, land destruction, and what if these problems spread across boundaries? Suburbanization has created outcomes that exceed local boundaries. Therefore, the main conclusion of the editorial series is that the entire region would benefit of a more regional approach to urban problems.

The (Baltimore) Sun was also directly involved in dialogues regarding shared interests between the Baltimore and Washington regions. For example, on November 17, 1998, the newspaper sponsored a community forum entitled Baltimore-Washington Regional Cooperation: Opportunities and Obstacles which was notably focusing on the Region’s bid for the 2012 Olympic Games along with other economic development possibilities (The Sun, 10/31/1998). The Olympics were then presented as an activity that could make the concepts of regionalism more concrete and as a new opportunity to focus on common interests of the Baltimore-Washington region (The Sun, 04/12/1998).

Of course, the newspapers’ implication in the debate over regionalism turns out to be an essential resource to educate citizens, civic organizations, business leaders and elected officials about the metropolitan interdependence, the regional issues and potential regional solutions. Undoubtedly, this kind of involvement contributes to expand metropolitan consciousness through the population and perhaps eventually to develop a democratic support for a political philosophy shift through elected officials.

6.2.2 The Maryland Smart Growth Initiative

As we have seen, the Bill 802 regarding the Maryland Regional Economic Competitiveness Act and the Bill 970 regarding the Baltimore Metropolitan Regional Investment District, have both
failed to be adopted during the 1999 session of the General Assembly of Maryland. Despite these defeats, the projects proposed have definitely increased the political awareness over these issues. As a consequence, following the legislative session, both projects have been submitted for a summer study commission. Besides, it does not imply that the State of Maryland is not at all attentive to the aims of new regionalism. In fact, there is an increasing concern regarding the consequences of suburban sprawl at the political and administrative state level via the initiative of Governor Parris N. Glendening who played a triggering role into the implementation of the *Smart Growth and Neighborhood Conservation* project.

Smart Growth is not strictly a spontaneous idea considering that the early stages of the project can be traced to more than a quarter of century ago. It might be stated that the basic principles of smart growth started during the 1960s when numerous initiatives from the State of Maryland have been elaborated to protect the environment and most especially the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. The *Maryland Environmental Trust* and the *Scenic Wild Rivers* programs were adopted at the end of the 1960s as a measure of conservation, protection and management of Maryland environment. The *Program Open Space* adopted in 1969 was the first of several other programs established in order to acquire recreation, agricultural and open space for natural protection, park, preservation of productive agricultural land and woodland, and general public use. The Chesapeake Bay was the main target for a series of ambitious programs like the *Shore Erosion Control Program* in the 1970s and the 1983 multi-state Chesapeake Bay Agreement for restoring this natural basin. During the 1990s, other environmental protection programs were adopted like the *Economic Resource Protection, and Planning Act* and the *Forest Conservation Act Bay*. (Maryland Office of Planning, 1998) Environmental problems are in some respect, the foundation of the current philosophy developed inside Smart Growth.

In the mid 1990s, Governor Glendening was increasingly concerns with the patterns of urban growth. The 1990 census showed that the population was moving out of older suburbs even faster than out of the central city. People were also moving farther and farther, which was creating a situation of uncontrolled sprawl and engendering several problems related to agriculture, wasted land and infrastructures, traffic jam, social segregation, environmental protection, etc. The Governor thus asked to its planning staff to find solutions related to sprawl
which could at the same time reinforce the older neighborhoods. The Governor specified a certain number of parameters to respect. The solution should (Interview 10):

- Cost no money;
- Not involved a new bureaucracy (no super agency);
- Change the structure of thinking of the state government;
- Be a bottom up program (should be implemented by the local governments or agencies);
- Not create political battles (land use will should stay under the control of local jurisdictions);
- Be based on incentives instead of constraints;
- Come from (or involve) the population;
- Use the public money smarter.

In 1996, Governor Glendening and his key staff began a consultation process. After several meetings and forums with every county of Maryland and Baltimore City, the new program was elaborated and submitted to the General Assembly. The state chamber was reluctant to support the integral program originally. But since the Governor has a strong power over the budget, three days before the vote on the Bill, the Governor put as a condition to redistribute the discretionary annual 100 million budget, the acceptance for the Smart Growth project (Interview 10). In the beginning of 1997, the General Assembly approved the program, about one year before the re-election of Governor Glendening for his second mandate.

The *Smart Growth and Neighborhood Conservation* initiatives is essentially the implementation of a set of five complementary Bills:

1. **Smart Growth Areas Act**: A law limiting most state infrastructure funding related to development to existing communities or to those places designated by State or local governments for growth.
2. **Rural Legacy**: A grant program to create greenbelts to protect geographically large rural areas from sprawl through purchase of easements and development rights.

3. **Brownfields and Voluntary Cleanup and Revitalization Incentive Program**: Three programs to facilitate clean-up of contaminated areas and commercial/industrial development on those sites.

4. **Job Creation Tax Credit**: Income tax credits to businesses which create jobs within designated areas to promote redevelopment.

5. **Live Near Your Work Demonstration Program**: State employer and local government matching cash grants to homebuyers who purchase homes near their workplace.

Strictly speaking, this program is not a regional approach to urban problems. However, the vision comprehended by these initiatives encompasses several values of new regionalism. The premise of the program postulate “that taxpayers’ dollars should not be spent on programs that either promote sprawl or damage the environment. It encourages development and economic expansion, but only in locations where it makes the most sense and the infrastructure is in place (or planned) to support it” (Smart Growth Website, 1999). The three primary goals of the program are:

- To save the most valuable remaining natural resources before they are lost forever;
- To support existing communities and neighborhoods by targeting state resources to support development in areas where the infrastructure is already in place;
- To save taxpayers millions of dollars in the unnecessary cost of building the infrastructure required to support sprawl.

To keep the program simple and acceptable, it deliberately avoids creating an additional administrative level and also avoids substantial new expenses for the state. Essentially, the implementation of the program uses the power of planning and the prevalent State capital funding to re-orient policies and spending according to Smart Growth principles. Consequently,
this situation tends to respect the local governments’ autonomy and confers to those, a lot of power within the planning process. This is the case for the *Priority Funding Areas*, the places where state funding would apply. Of course, the *Smart Growth Areas Act* automatically designates some places as *Priority Funding Areas* including Baltimore City and the areas inside the Baltimore and Washington Beltways along with other areas. The legislation also enables each county to designate and revise periodically their Priority Funding Areas, which must encounter a minimum of criteria. The State will direct funding to these Priority Funding Areas but the planning process remains established on a county by county framework. A question thus remains: how effective Smart Growth will be to control suburban growth?

Essentially, Smart Growth attempts to use state funding as a growth management policy, which means using investing state infrastructure money as an incentive to fight sprawl in supporting more compact growth and to redevelop older places in directing part of the new growth in those areas. As opposed to some more explicit land use policies—such as in Oregon where state-level growth management laws are definite and powerful\(^{43}\)—the Smart Growth project does not address a direct control over land use and do not implement boundaries for growth within its metropolitan areas. The project does not either challenge the established authority of counties. This allows a considerable interpretation of the state vision and law for planning practices by State agencies and local governments, especially in designating Priority Funding Areas in each county. This latitude is reinforced by the lack of specific legislative direction from the state since the law does not provide clear guidance for measuring the desirable effects of the policy in the future, not to mention that the law allows several exceptions to the rule in order to approve subsidy outside Priority Funding Areas (Porter, 1999). Which is likely to weaken the magnitude of the law.

Furthermore, some real estate developers think the project is not likely to work since the suburban sprawl patterns reflect a public desire for suburban life style. Environmentalists are concerned that counties are not taking the legislation very seriously. During the initial phase of the project, some of them have submitted plans corresponding to all the land previously

\(^{43}\) Oregon is widely regarded as the leader, having adopted rules more than two decades ago that force cities to erect barriers against growth, drawing circles on the map beyond which development may not push.
anticipated for development and designated it as their Priority Funding Areas. And finally, the success of the project relies very much on the governor engagement for the program. If a new governor is elected and does not embrace it, it could in theory signify the end of smart growth. (The Sun, 10/06/1998)

6.2.3 Strategic planning process in Baltimore City and Howard County

Seeing the future as one’s—people, agency or organization—wants it to be is probably the best short definition of strategic planning. Strategic planning is thus a prime example, which reveals the development of a vision. The elaboration of PlanBaltimore and Howard County’s Strategic Plan are both the expression of local governments and their respective population regarding their representation of the future. Throughout these two processes, there is a growing consciousness for regionalism.

6.2.3.1 PlanBaltimore

In the case of PlanBaltimore, it is the first effort in developing a comprehensive plan for Baltimore City in more than 20 years. The process started in 1997 and has been lead by the Baltimore City Planning Department. A few foundations like Fannie Mae and Annie E. Casey Foundations supported it. The public has also been implicated throughout several public meetings and special subcommittees focusing on housing, transportation, community economic development, urban design, environment and public facilities. A preliminary draft of the plan has been published in April 1999 and submitted for public forums on its content. The final version of PlanBaltimore was published during the summer of 1999.

The strategic plan is based over three guiding principles: (1) Creating a first class global city; (2) Working together as a region to address common challenges and attract future growth; (3) Supporting neighborhood revitalization in partnership with residents and businesses. Therefore, the plan talks about a new spirit of metropolitan partnership to strengthen the entire region. The Plan approach regionalism in stating that Baltimore City is the heart of a growing metropolitan region and recommend to manage growth in a way which preserve inner-city communities and which restraint sprawl. Those two objectives match each other perfectly since the development
patterns of the past decades—characterized by low-density and sprawl—impose several social and environmental costs. Changing the current growth patterns might therefore suggest reinvesting in older parts of the region like the central city. In order to carry through these objectives, the plan sanctions entirely the principles of the Smart Growth program from the State of Maryland.

It is a question of good timing if the Smart Growth project is to coincide with the introduction of regionalism as a key piece of PlanBaltimore. The plan thus leans on the State legislature, which requires that all jurisdictions update their master plan to accommodate growth management, and at the same time to reinvigorating established communities. Not to mention that the Smart Growth legislation automatically designates the entire Baltimore City’s territory as a Priority Funding Area. But the question remains: will smart Growth really generate smart growth?

The plan also underlines the specificity of the central city as a crucial factor of competitiveness for the whole metropolitan area. PlanBaltimore aspires for Baltimore City to become a world class cultural, educational and entertainment center in order to create an attractive image to bring in new investments within the entire region. These sort of amenities would reinforce Downtown Baltimore as the business, government, educational and cultural center of the region and are seen as a positive thing to position the City in order to attract its fair share of future growth.

In order to promote a regional approach, PlanBaltimore suggests that Baltimore City work in collaboration with neighboring local jurisdictions and support other regional partners in their efforts over regional solutions. Like for instance:

- Support the Greater Baltimore Committee (GBC’s) efforts to spread the benefits of regional economic growth across jurisdictions through tax base sharing.

- Support the Greater Baltimore Alliance (GBA’s) efforts to market the region and develop a coordinated region-wide system for workforce development.

- Encourage the Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC) to coordinate the development of a regional vision based on the goals of the Smart Growth Initiative. The BMC should use the
vision as the basis for future transportation planning and spending in the region.

- Provide a better balance of housing opportunities throughout the region by building more middle-income housing in the City and increasing the supply of affordable housing in the counties.

- Promote regional participation and responsibility in addressing issues of air and water quality, solid waste disposal and future landfill development.

- Support the efforts of the Baltimore Area Convention and Visitors Association (BACVA) to market the region as a tourist mecca, generating positive economic impacts for the entire State.

- Support the Washington-Baltimore bid to jointly host the 2012 Olympics as a way to increase our global presence, generate jobs and public improvements, and strengthen ties to Washington D.C.

- Continue inter-jurisdictional efforts to fight crime and increase public safety.

- Develop a regional funding strategy for sustaining City-based cultural institutions that benefit all jurisdictions, and a collaborative marketing plan to promote arts and cultural tourist destinations throughout the region.

This agenda is rather ambitious for Baltimore City and by all means consistent with the new regionalism spirit. This agenda also indirectly acknowledges the Baltimore City’s constraint over regional issues. Indeed, most of the strategies proposed are rather a supportive than an active leadership from Baltimore City. The City leans on other organizations like GBC, GBA, BMC or BACVA to carry through new regional approaches. The City is also willing to promote and encourage some fundamental principles related to environment, land use planning, or the funding of cultural institutions. The City is more directly involved in the Washington-Baltimore bid to jointly host the 2012 Olympics, by building more middle-income housing in the City or in inter-jurisdictional efforts to fight crime and increase public safety.
6.2.3.2 Howard County Strategic Planning

Regional issues might have a better chance of being addressed if there is a coincidence of interests between the central city and the suburbs regarding metropolitan vision. Some indications reveal that there is an enlarging consideration for regional questions in the suburbs as well. For instance, the most recent Strategic Economic Development Plan for Howard County (1998) includes one section out of eight focus areas regarding exclusively regionalism. In 1997, the Howard County Economic Development Authority (the Authority) created a task force of business and community leaders in order to elaborate a new Strategic Economic Development Plan and to shape the county vision for a ten-year period. The task force included representatives from business, government, real estate and education.

Along with business retention, expansion and attraction; enabling activities (friendly business approach and infrastructure); workforce readiness; workforce availability; financial mechanisms; land use; marketing and communication; the report tackles directly regionalism. “By the year 2007, Howard County is an energetic promoter of regional partnerships in the Baltimore/Washington metropolitan area” (p. 17) state the report. Three objectives intend to fulfil the vision: (1) ensure that current local information like real estate, zoning, infrastructure and workforce is included in the statewide database and use for effective economic development; (2) support cross-boundary planning and County’s effort to ensure infrastructure systems and land uses at jurisdictional boundaries are compatible; (3) active participation in regional economic forums or entrepreneurial programs.

Another indication that Howard County is awakening to a new way of thinking is preservation and renewal of older neighborhoods instead of fast-growth development issues (The Sun, 03/14/1999). Despite the fact that this county has been the Baltimore region’s fastest-growing area as well as the wealthiest suburb for decades (see tables 3.1 and 3.2), some parts of Howard began to experience an increase in crime, poorly managed rental homes, schools with low test scores along with the appearing of old decaying business sectors. Planners—along with other people affected—are concerned that Howard County will be “built out” in about 10 years from now. At the current rate of development and prevalent zoning practices, convenient land blocks for building new homes will be missing in less than a decade and new development should then
be inclined to settle outside Howard County’s boundary. Table 6.1 indicates that of the Howard County’s 160,640 residential acres, 112,277 (about 70%) are already developed or committed to land that cannot be developed such as preserved land, parkland, open space, etc., which leaves the county with limited undeveloped land for future development (37,437 acres). This is not so much considering that in 1999 only 4,721 acres were being used for residential development. In this context, preserving aging neighborhoods and renewing historic areas becomes a key issue for the future of this community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Developed or committed</th>
<th>Recorded Unbuilt</th>
<th>In Process</th>
<th>Undeveloped</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Density</td>
<td>62,655</td>
<td>4,993</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>25,354</td>
<td>94,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>22,980</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>3,774</td>
<td>28,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density</td>
<td>5,273</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>6,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,303</td>
<td>2,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Town</td>
<td>12,060</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>14,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Zones</td>
<td>7,251</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>3,268</td>
<td>12,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>112,277</td>
<td>6,205</td>
<td>4,721</td>
<td>37,437</td>
<td>160,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>69.89%</td>
<td>3.86%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>23.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department of Planning and Zoning (1999). *Growth and Development Trends*, Howard County, MD.

These concerns are particularly manifest within the elaboration process of the 10-years county General Plan to be adopted in 2000 by the Howard County Council. The strategic planning process in Howard County is still under progress. In accordance with requirements of the Howard County Code, the initial step in revising the General Plan is the preparation of a General Plan Guidelines by the Planning Board. In order to develop these guidelines, the Planning Board received recommendations from a Task force regarding the issues which should be included. To accomplish its charge, the Task Force held weekly meetings from May to July 1999 hearing from numerous County agencies and private organizations regarding the most critical issues the County will be facing over the next two decades. Additional issues have been drawn from a series of iIssue Papers prepared by the Department of Planning and Zoning. Following the
adoption of the Guidelines, the Department of Planning and Zoning has to draft the General Plan amendments for consideration by the public, the Planning Board and ultimately the County Council for final approval. Looking at this process, allows for the anticipation of the new strategic plan.

Among the most critical issues identified so far, the task force—along with the guidelines—recognizes the importance of Responsible Regionalism and Sustainable Growth. The 1990 General Plan was the first to pay direct attention to regionalism. For the updated version of the General Plan, the task force first acknowledged that “decisions made and policies enacted in Howard County, by individuals, organizations, and government agencies, affect other jurisdictions, just as the actions taken in other jurisdictions affect Howard County.” Issues related to economic development, transportation, housing, education, zoning, development policies, water and wastewater treatment as well as environmental protections expend beyond local boundaries and should be apprehended in a regional perspective, say the Task Force. Therefore, the General Plan should take in consideration the changes affecting jurisdictions that are regional in scope. It should also take the lead for suggesting some policies based on Howard County’s strategic location within the Baltimore-Washington corridor. It thus recognized its economic and social ties with the urban region centered on these two urban cores. The Task force has also identified four priority issues regarding regionalism:

1. Have existing regional organizations, such as the Baltimore Metropolitan Council and the Washington Council of Governments, been successful in finding region-wide solutions to issues affecting economic development and redevelopment, changes in population distribution, residential development and redevelopment, regional transportation networks, and environmental protection?

2. Should Howard County strengthen its ties with other jurisdictions in the Washington-Baltimore metropolitan region, beyond existing memoranda of understanding and participation in existing metropolitan planning organizations and other regional organizations,

---

44 The five organizing principles of that plan are Responsible Regionalism; Preservation of the Rural West; Sustainable Growth; Working with Nature; and Community Enhancement.
to achieve more complete coordination of economic, residential, transportation network development, and environmental protection?

3. Should Howard County ensure that its policies and programs affecting the environment are coordinated with and complement programs and policies enacted by other jurisdictions?

4. Should Howard County take a leading role in establishing a regional body to develop, implement, and enforce policies and regulations pertaining to zoning, housing, transportation, economic development, and environmental protection throughout the Baltimore-Washington region?

The General Plan Task Force also tackles the delicate question of Sustainable Growth. The plan addresses several of the topics related to “the County’s need to manage its growth; to use its remaining undeveloped land in a way that will benefit all of the County’s communities, old and new; to balance residential and employment uses; to ensure that public facilities and infrastructure are available and well-planned; and to ensure the County’s continued fiscal health.”. Of course, this aspect of the General Plan is directly related to the State’s Smart Growth project in order to ensure consistency with State guidelines and objectives regarding land use practices. The Task Force identifies eight Sustainable Growth priority issues:

1. Preparation by the Director of Planning and Zoning of an annual report assessing progress towards the General Plan goals and established performance measures over land use and environment.

2. Evaluation of the residential and non-residential land inventory in terms of location, size, access, zoning and environmental constraints to better assess suitability of man-made and natural resources for development or non-development.
3. The means of promoting economic redevelopment and community revitalization. Redevelopment and revitalization of older communities offers the greatest opportunity to preserve land values and tax revenues while addressing unmet needs. Neighborhood preservation starts with excellent schools, safe streets, refurbishing and recycling housing stock, road maintenance, accommodating diversity and land use policies that reinforce the integrity of communities.

4. The impact of alternative rates of growth in new housing and employment on operating budget expenditures given existing levels of service. Determine an effective fiscal balance between anticipated capital maintenance needs and capital improvement demands. This General Plan will be the first in which construction of new or expanded public facilities will meet significant competition while maintaining the aging infrastructure for capital funding.

5. The causes and implications of the slower residential growth rate than that expected by the 1990 General Plan. Assess the appropriate residential growth rates for the Planned Service Area and the portion of the County outside the Planned Service Area.

6. Reassess 1990 General Plan targets for unit mix in light of the aging of the population, land availability, the housing market, the balance of jobs and housing, and the economic development need for a diverse labor pool.

7. Assess the impact of the changing age characteristics of the population on County service demands and changes in the housing market. What is the impact of an aging population on household income and the County’s tax base? Is sufficient and suitable housing for seniors available in Howard County?

8. Measure the effectiveness with which the County integrates economic development, zoning, transportation, and accessibility in its planning process.
In conclusion, we can say that the strategic planning process in Howard County formally takes in consideration regionalism and growth management nowadays. We can observe that Howard County’s definition of the metropolitan region includes explicitly the entire Washington-Baltimore urban area, not only Greater Baltimore. We can also observe a shift from a fast growth approach to urban development to a new sustainable growth period, which is gradually taking over.
7. Design and Implementation of Metropolitan Governance: Regional Economic Development Strategies in Greater Baltimore

Along with Greater Baltimore, many American regions are experiencing the emergence of a new regional vision for urban development. In the last decade, we saw an increase of thought committees, task forces, and civic initiatives or reform projects that aim to study or develop metropolitan solutions. Nevertheless, previous chapters of this report show that the implementation of metropolitan governance remains a step that is politically very difficult to achieve in the Greater Baltimore region. In Greater Baltimore however, it seems that the emergence of an economic development strategies at the metropolitan level has reached a consensus as an initial stage toward new regionalism.

The main purpose of this chapter is to study how Greater Baltimore public, private and civic actors are replying in concrete terms to the "economic" interdependence issue. More especially, we would like to describe what economic development strategies have been developed recently to adjust simultaneously to the impact of the global economy on cities, the economic restructuring, and the transformation of the regional spatial context. The design and implementation of metropolitan governance refers here to the mechanisms developed to create, either new regional policies or strategies, either new metropolitan institutions in order to address regional issues.

7.1 The Economic Interdependence within Metropolitan Areas

When we think about immense countries like the United States or Canada for example, there is by no means a single, homogeneous national economy for each of these nations. In the United States, the Eastern and Midwestern parts have a different economic history than the South. And the South has a different development evolution than the West Coast. In Canada, the Maritimes (East Coast) have a completely different economic base than Central Canada including Ontario and Quebec which have more economic closeness with areas located at the U.S. border than with
the Canadian West Coast. As Barnes and Ledebur (1998:1) maintain in *The New Regional Economy*, "local economies—primarily metropolitan-centered and strongly linked—are the real economies (...) Therefore, the conventional view of the nation as an economic unit without important internal differentiation must be put aside". A refined theoretical framework is thus essential for the comprehension of national economies.

Taking one's inspiration from Barnes and Ledebur, we envision the political economy with three essential elements: (1) the metropolitan political economy; (2) the national political economy and (3) the global political economy. Each part in this model is linked to the other and is interdependent. But each part has its own internal logic and cohesion as well. Thus, when the global political economy is an aggregation of national political economies, the national level is in fact a collection of metropolitan political economies. In other words, metropolitan political economies are the foundation and economic units of national and global political economies.

Of course, the national political economy still matters. For instance, there is an "overall" technological level, a standard of life or an economic policy tradition in the United States that is different compared to Mexico, its adjacent neighbor. Nation states play and will continue to play a fundamental role in the regulation of world affairs, as well as an internal constitutional role to maintain civil and political rights for citizens living in democracies. But basically, nation states are historically fortuitous political and military entities. Economic regions and metropolitan areas are the effective economic engines evolving under the context and the rules of the nation. Every metropolitan political economy has in fact its own structure and dynamic. In a borderless world, these distinctive features are presumably exacerbated according to Barnes and Ledebur’s perspective.

Economic growth and urbanization are intimately interrelated. As a result, metropolitan areas have experimented a simultaneous growth since the beginning of industrialization and these trends tend to persevere during the post-industrial era. As a consequence, metropolis might still be seen as a functional organization for economic growth since (Barnes and Ledebur, 1998:30):

\[45\]

Barnes and Ledebur tend to use the term “local economies” to designate in fact “regional or metropolitan economies”.
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1. Proximity, size, and resource concentrations provide economies of scale and competitive costs.

2. The metropolis is a seedbed and incubator for entrepreneurship and innovation.

3. The metropolis is a center of decision making, information, and communications.

According to the neoclassical theory, *agglomeration economy* is the intrinsic principle of the productive metropolis. Proximity, complimentary, interaction and availability regarding factors of production are among the driving forces of economic productivity and growth within metropolitan areas. Likewise, sectorial clustering is also an essential factor of growth. The size of an industrial sector (producers of similar or related products) in a particular region is significant to explain economic growth. The quality of factors of production also matters. Labor, capital, infrastructure, interaction and mobility quality, etc. are also essential elements of metropolitan growth. Therefore, negative externalities such as the lack of skilled workers, a high level of criminality, or congestion, may affect the productivity growth of the entire region.

The new regionalism paradigm recognized that regional internal coherence is a key element to achieve economic efficiency. Thus, agglomeration economies exist beyond local jurisdictions in all metropolitan areas. In fact, most of the states or local jurisdiction boundaries have been fashioned by political, civic or military determinants rather than by logic of economic patterns. Moreover, economic and social urban realities are by nature continuously in transformation. For example, if economic activities tend to centralize within metropolitan areas they tend to be more and more dispersed within spatially enlarging urbanized areas. As a result, there is a repeated mismatch between the effective metropolitan governance and the functional regional economic organization in America.

For all those reasons the new regionalism’s logic would command an adaptable—or stretchable—governance for metropolitan areas. It seems indubitable now that regional governance is not only an acute necessity but also a raising concern for almost every metropolitan area. Economic competitiveness is in fact a recurrent consideration for new regional initiatives. It even seems that metropolitan economic structures are easier to implement
than arrangement in other domain. Perhaps it is because economic interdependence is more discernible than other domains of interdependence since the business organization naturally crosses boundaries. Perhaps economic development is seen as an investment that you can expect a return from rather than a charge involving new expenditure for local jurisdictions. Perhaps the institutional form and mission of economic development organizations is generally circumscribed and not very restricting for local jurisdictions. But in the daily life of metropolitan areas, is there a social or political impetus toward economic interdependence? In *Regional Excellence*, a book that provides many case studies of regional initiatives across the United States, William Dodge (1996) answers by the affirmative.

Indeed, in many metropolitan areas we can see the creation of regional economic development organizations (EDOs). These organizations are created in order to increase economic partnership between central cities and suburbs. In a survey conducted by Bennet and Nathanson (1997) on 14 EDOs throughout United States, we can learn that the typical example of EDO has a territory that covers the regional economy but may differ depending on the issue. The organizational form or status is typically a private non-profit or public-private non-profit. Many private non-profits received support from the public sector. Quite often, EDOs are involving or are collaborating with chambers of commerce. Marketing their regions to attract new economic activities is a prevalent mission for EDOs. According to Bennet and Nathanson’s findings (1997:35) “the advantages of this (...) are that EDO members present a unified region to relocation consultants and prospects and that the regional EDO allows each locality to capitalize on collective strengths.”

Greater Baltimore Alliance (GBA), a regional EDO created just a few years ago, stands directly on this tradition of economic development marketing. But prior to GBA, there have been other efforts that have changed how local jurisdictions are approaching economic development. Greater Baltimore truly has a relatively long history of debate and endeavor over regional economic collaboration. Starting with the economic development planning efforts from the initial mission of the Regional Planning Council, through some reports or task force regarding Baltimore Region’s development during the 1970s, until the creation of the Greater Baltimore

---

46 Generally corresponding to the Metropolitan Statistical Area definition of each region.
Technology Council about a decade ago. It seems that all these efforts are now more inclined to bear fruit.

7.2 Foregoing Regional Economic Development Initiatives

7.2.1 The Regional Planning Council and the General Development Plans

In 1967, with the adoption of the first Baltimore Region General Development Plan, economic development officially became a metropolitan duty. As we have seen in chapter 4, the major function of Baltimore Regional Planning Council (RPC) created in 1963 was the preparation and adoption of a comprehensive plan addressing economic development among others. Thus, from 1967 to the last plan adopted in 1986, Greater Baltimore's regional economy was not only studied meticulously but a joint strategy involving every RPC's partner was elaborated in order to fulfil the Council's mission.

Generally speaking, regional economic planning in Greater Baltimore was tackled in relationship with other planning issues like transportation, education and training, poverty, housing, segregation patterns, etc. It was most especially looking at positive and negative conditions underlying Baltimore's economic possibilities. Afterwards, these plans were trying to identify the most important economic issues for the region. For example, the 1972 plan was focussing on concentration of poverty in the urban core and in some rural areas; social and geographic segregation regarding race or discrimination about gender; quality and accessibility of jobs in the region; transportation and availability of housing in the suburbs; manpower training and retraining or work experience for young persons; etc. The 1982 plan was instead emphasizing land and infrastructure for economic growth; institutional settings for economic development; and the interrelationship between Baltimore and Washington metropolitan areas since 1977; etc. 47

Along with the identification of issues, various recommendations were formulated in order to improve or insure Baltimore region’s economic health. The basic development goal of these recommendations was to promote and achieve a more centralized development pattern in order to

47 1972 and 1982 General Development Plans have been most especially studied for the purpose of this report.
maintain and revitalize existing communities. Following this perspective, Baltimore City was presumably inclined to receive a greater share of the region’s growth and to improve its economic position within the metropolitan complex. For example, the 1972 plan was suggesting that the Baltimore’s central business should be reinforced as the financial-administrative-business service center of the region; that public and private agencies should join to remove barriers to employment on the basis of race, age or sex in order to insure equal employment opportunity for all citizens of the region; that employers and local jurisdictions should insure the availability of housing for workers and their families at appropriate prices and rents; that State and Federal levels should take action to reduce inequities regarding the unequal share in fiscal burdens between the city and counties; etc. The 1982 plan suggested to increase efforts to attract high tech industries by emphasizing the existing research institutions in the region; to increase activities of the Port of Baltimore along with additional gains associated with the tourism and convention activities centered within the Inner Harbor; to assure that adequate funds are dedicated to the preservation of existing facilities (road, bridges and public buildings); to develop a Coordinating Council to study requirements for current and future occupational supply and demand; to create a statewide development strategy; etc.

Plans like this are often the case in many regional planning processes. The recommendations remained quite general in their scope and relatively imprecise. This was often due to the bargaining process and compromises that are often essential to reach a consensus. This also left the execution phase open to a substantial level of interpretation. All of the general development plans were suggesting a vision along with a strategic orientation for the overall region. But they never represented a formal obligation that every local jurisdiction must conform to. Since the RPC was not a level of government but rather an advisory council, it had no regulatory endowment to enforce its plan. The implementation phase was thus the result of a collaborative effort among local jurisdictions and other partners like the State of Maryland, which did not ensure the execution of every aspects of the plan. If we consider what these plans achieved, we can presume that many pieces of those plans ended up on the shelf. Besides, the last Baltimore Region General Development Plan was ratified in 1986 shortly before the RPC’ substitution in 1987.
7.2.2 Business Organizations for a Unified Economic Development Program

The RPC was not the only organization to be interested in regional economic development during the foregoing period. In mid-1970, business organizations like the Greater Baltimore Committee (GBC) and the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan Baltimore (CCMB) attempted to create a unified economic development program for the Baltimore Area. This process started in 1975 when the GBC promulgated *An Economic Development Proposal for the City of Baltimore*. This report noticed that the City of Baltimore’s economic development strategy fell way behind in comparison to rival cities. Among other things, the report urged that Baltimore adopt an energetic program for the promotion and the development of new economic activities. More precisely, the report was recommending a unified approach to economic development for the entire region. And according to the GBC, this unified approach should be managed by a new economic development agency based in the CCMB. The report was also suggesting that funding for economic development and promotion should be augmented. The GBC’s report thus recommended that the CCMB should play a leadership role to support an upgraded economic development strategy.

To this initiative, CCMB answered by creating a task force to evaluate the economic development situation in the Baltimore Region along with its own commitment to improve the economic performance of the region. In February 1975, Task Force 2000 was set up by the CCMB with two mandates:

1. To make recommendations of the consolidation and rationalization of existing economic development organizations.

2. To recommend a vehicle for the creation of an economic development marketing and promotion campaign for the Baltimore Region.

Task Force 2000 has thus published two reports. The first was entitled *Merger of the Economic Development Commission and the Baltimore Industrial Development Corporation.*

---

48 Chapter 4 describe the obstacles encountered by the RPC during its existence.
49 The Economic Developing Commission was created in 1963 principally to handle site location with prospective businesses. The Baltimore Industrial Development Corporation was created in 1972 to address the lack of land
argument of this report was unequivocal. It was suggesting to merge the two economic development city agencies into one and to increase funding along with a higher level of professionalism. This recommendation was followed by the city shortly after the release of the report when it merged these two agencies and created a new one called the Baltimore Economic Development Corporation (CCMB, 1977).

The second report released in 1976 is more relevant for the present study. Entitled An Economic Development and Promotion Campaign for the Baltimore Region, the logic of this report is supported by a comparative analysis of different regional economic development organizations in twelve selected cities throughout the United States. The Task Force 2000 pointed out that despite several decades of physical development, especially profitable for downtown Baltimore, "promotional programs (...) have had serious shortcomings; and that serious gaps exist in economic development programs in Baltimore, particularly with respect to the attraction of new industry and regional and national headquarters, and that this was undermining the financial growth and vitality of all civic institutions and governmental programs in the region" (p. 5). This was not the first time, however, that concern about the lack of promotional programs for Baltimore was raised. In 1973, Hill and Knowlton Inc., a public relations firm, released A Marketing Plan for Greater Baltimore. Following some of the recommendations of the plan, the Baltimore Promotion Council was created in order to assume advertising for public relations within the city, promotion of tourism and conventions. It was in fact a central city promotion—an Inner Harbor advertising strategy instead of regional marketing approach.

Task Force 2000 identified that what is missing in Greater Baltimore is economic development marketing and promotional programs for the entire Baltimore Region. The overview of twelve economic development organizations in Atlanta, Denver, Cleveland, St. Louis, Philadelphia, Dallas/Forth Worth, Kansas City, Cincinnati, New York City, Boston, Pittsburgh and Chicago led the task force toward three major conclusions:

1. A large sum of money becomes available for industrial sites. This organisation was initially established in order to administer a $3 million bond issue devoted to the creation of an industrial land bank.
1. A comprehensive, effective regional economic development program must include two components: (1) a strong site location and job retention effort at the city and county level; (2) a top-quality economic development marketing and promotion campaign for the region.

2. A regional economic development marketing and promotion program is most effective when it is primarily financed and directed by the local business community since: (1) a regional outreach campaign, in order to be effective, must prove convincing to businessmen considering alternative relocation or expansion locations; (2) therefore, a program designed to persuade out-of-town businessmen to relocate in Baltimore must enlist the talent, resources and total commitment of local business leadership.

3. There must be a process of formal relationship which ensures close cooperation between local site location/job retention operations and the regional economic development marketing and promotion program so that the latter feeds prospects smoothly and effectively to the former.

These three conclusions are the foundation for the recommendations that are for the CCMB:

1. To take the responsibility for becoming the vehicle for private sector participation in a new economic development marketing and promotion program for the Baltimore Region and for coordinating private sector cooperation with public sector agencies to ensure the success of such a program.

2. To establish and coordinate a fund-raising campaign adequate to finance a full-fledged economic development marketing and promotion program.

3. To evaluate the attraction and drawbacks of Baltimore as a potential site location.

4. To upgrade economic data services and to expand the publication capacity of the CCMB.

5. To formalize the relationships and cooperative arrangements among all of the organizations active in economic development in the Baltimore Region.

These five recommendations intend to fill a vacuum regarding regional marketing and promotion. They also intend to give to the business community a sense of responsibility for
financing and leadership over a regional economic development strategy. And finally, they intend to increase the regional cooperation among the various economic development organization existing in the city and the counties.

Meanwhile, in 1975, the Regional Planning Council (RPC) assembled a similar task force on economic development to examine regional objectives in order to create an economic model for Greater Baltimore; regional parity to consider redistribution mechanisms between jurisdictions; economic development marketing to create an economic development strategy; and economic development organization and structure to consider various alternatives for a new regional economic development agency (RPC, 1975). The Regional Economic Task Force was established for the same reasons as Task Force 2000 since this initiative from the RPC was also stimulated by the necessity for a more specific regional economic strategy. Among the different elements tackled by this process was an exploration over promotional possibilities for the larger Baltimore-Washington common market. This aspect of the task force was identifying and describing a larger region—sometimes called the Chesapeake Bay Country—with two centers insisting on complimentary functions, close economic interactions and interdependence between both metropolitan areas. An action plan for a joint marketing program addressing the entire Baltimore-Washington common market was proposed and discussions among interlocutors from both regions were in progress. For its part, the Committee on Structure and Mission was suggesting the creation of a permanent organization for regional economic development. Finally, at its September 29, 1975 meeting the task force endorsed a recommendation for the creation of a nonprofit corporation, under the theme The Chesapeake Bay Country, for regional marketing and promotion between the two regions, Baltimore and Washington metropolitan areas. Despite the official supporting recommendation of the RPC, the project never took off (RPC, 1975).

Following Task Force 2000’s numerous proposals, two private studies commissioned by the CCMB have been carried out. First of all, the CCMB retained James D. Launder & Associates—a New York real estate firm—in order to perform an analysis about the strength and weaknesses of Greater Baltimore as a site location for business as well as an examination regarding the organizational structure of economic development. The study concluded that the port and Baltimore’s civic vitality were two main assets that could be used to it’s advantage. The study
also pointed out that a regional economic development marketing and promotion campaign for Greater Baltimore is seriously lacking. Shortly thereafter, the CCMB retained the services of Lippincott and Margulies Inc.—an internationally known communication and marketing firm based in New York and London—in order to develop a marketing plan for Baltimore. This analysis focused on the Baltimore’s serious image problem, the low visibility outside the region and the lack of awareness among business leaders of Baltimore as a potential location. The plan was suggesting the consolidation of Greater Baltimore’s promotional efforts carried out by the CCMB, the GBC and the five local jurisdictions, into one unified private agency for marketing and public relations. It was also calling for new professional resources and expenditures relying significantly on corporate contributors. In February 1977, the plan was successfully presented to the CCMB which gave its unanimous approval (CCMB, 1977).

“Baltimore More Than You Know” was the suggested promotional theme from Lippincott & Margulies, which was presented the next month to the population and the media. A sophisticated advertising campaign was elaborated in order to reach businesses. The promotion of the new Convention Center located in the Inner Harbor and the Pride of Baltimore clipper ship also located in the harbor, were the main publicity vehicle. This plan rejected the idea to develop a common strategy with the Washington metropolitan area. Planners of the strategy believed that “that because of the low visibility and awareness of the Baltimore region, you must first initiate your own program to achieve a clearer image focus in order to become a successful partner in any future Washington-Baltimore effort” (The Evening Sun, 05/11/1977). This was the first time that a possible merger between the GBC—a political action group—and the CCMB—which was more directly charged with economic development marketing—was envisioned. In 1978, the CCMB finally merged with the GBC.

To summarize, the result of the business organizations for a unified economic development’s process did increase the awareness for a strong selling campaign and was explicitly recognizing that, for economic purposes, Greater Baltimore is one community and that economic

$800 000 was expected to be raised in the private sector as one-half of an annual promotional budget. The other half are to come at 25% from the surrounding counties, 15% from the city and 10% from other public sources (The Sun, 05/11, 1977).
development programs should be regionally coordinated. This discovery is important to comprehend the next regional initiatives.

7.3 Contemporary Regional Economic Development Strategies

In this section, we look at the most recent regional economic development strategies that have been implemented in Greater Baltimore. When we talk about regional economic development strategies, we are referring to initiatives which seek to support regional economic development like promotion and marketing, economic policies for business or job creation, improvement of the workforce quality, sectorial business coordination, economic infrastructure plan, etc. The scale of emphasis must be a regional perspective instead of a local perspective. Two organizations can precisely embody the criteria mentioned in regard to Greater Baltimore. First, the Greater Baltimore Technology Council and secondly, the Greater Baltimore Alliance. The regional economic competitiveness act from the State of Maryland which we talked about in chapter six could also correspond to our definition of a regional economic development strategy. But we can only presume that it will be implemented in the future since it has never been adopted by the Maryland Legislature.

The two experiences selected are thus used in order to illustrate our assumption that there is a new form of interaction between central cities and suburbs motivated by the urban restructuring process but carried out by a modernistic form of public action whereby nongovernmental actors are increasingly predominant. This analysis also show that social capital is essential in order to understand the configuration of innovative urban strategies along with the form of metropolitan governance structures arising in a new regionalism era.

7.3.1 Greater Baltimore Technology Council: An example of an industry group approach to regionalism

Officially, the GBTC’s mission is to build the region as the location of choice for new, emerging and established companies. It also supports and promotes the use and development of technology for the growth and profitability of the companies and institutions in the Greater Baltimore region (GBTC website, 1999). Essentially, GBTC is an industry group focussing on
technology companies in the entire region. A coalition of more than 350 corporate leaders, entrepreneurs, venture capitalists, scientists, university partners and governmental institutional partners that is meant to be a vehicle for economic exchange, development and growth.

The origin of the Greater Baltimore Technology Council (GBTC) is purely the result of a private initiative. More precisely, the Greater Baltimore Committee started the GBTC about ten years ago. It was a response to issues and concerns regarding the technology business community that was believed to be the fastest growing economic activity of the future. It was an opportunity to diversify the industrial economic base of Baltimore. At the time, information technology was not very developed, so environmental and biotechnology were the real initial focus of this initiative. Subsequently, information technology related to computers and the Internet has become a crucial economic sector for the GBTC (interview 5). Only in 1999 did the Council spin off the GBC and become an independent nonprofit organization. The organizational structure is relatively simple including an administrative board and a light staff including three persons, an Executive Director, an Assistant Director and a Marketing Assistant.

GBTC is generally concerned with how to make the Greater Baltimore Region more attractive for technology companies even though its mission does not directly involve regional marketing effort. To some extent, GBTC promotes the region via the technology sector. More directly, this organization has the assignment to engender and maintain livable networks among technology companies and to develop strategic alliances along with establishing a synergetic atmosphere with people that have similar profiles, similar education, similar interests, etc. (interview 5). GBTC is moreover very concerned about the development of skilled workforce within the region, which is an important issue regarding the development of technology today. They also act as a political arm in order to speak for members before the local and national legislatures to ensure that the technological industry’s interests are understood.

In order to identify issues, opportunities and concerns for its members, the GBTC now has six standing committees represented by volunteer members: Entrepreneurship Business Group; Environmental Technologies Business Development Group; Information Technologies Business Group; Legislative Group; Membership and Marketing Group; Technical Workforce
Development Business Group (GBTC website, 1999). Each of those committees have its own mission to represent and is advocating for issues, needs and questions they address. Afterwards, one of the GBTC’s missions is to support these efforts by bringing the resources to answer these needs or demands.

The GBTC also works closely with regional structures of technological locations with incubator profiles. Some of these locations include: the Emerging Technology Center a multi-tenant incubator—recently located in the former American Can Company complex in the Baltimore City’s Waterfront—offering space and support services for new companies in the information technology field; the Greater Baltimore Technology Development Center, an incubator located in a renovated industrial building in the Baltimore City’s harbor, providing strong ties with universities, training programs, technical assistance, business counseling, etc. in the field of information technology, biotechnology, environment and telecommunication industries; the Maryland Technology Development Center, which is one of the Technology Advancement Programs from the University of Maryland in College Park providing physical facilities along with business and technological technical support for light manufacturing, biotechnology, electronics and information technology; and the UMBC High-Tech Business, which is also a university-based business incubator in Baltimore county offering space and services to entrepreneurial high technology companies (GBTC and Mid-Atlantic Venture Association, 1999). However, the GBTC’s role is not to be an umbrella for those locations. GBTC uses this regional structure of technological locations in order to connect and to develop collaborative partnership. In promoting Greater Baltimore as the location of choice for technology companies, GBTC uses technology incubators to attract or stimulate new economic activities (interview 5).

Other activities of this organization include sponsoring major events, seminars and showcases. Each year throughout October, GBTC is coordinating a series of events spotlighting science, technology and engineering in Greater Baltimore. GBTC also hosts the Distinguished Speaker Series. The idea is to bring a speaker into the region and provide the business community with an opportunity to hear outside specialists. GBTC also contributed to studies of the impact of the technology industry on the Greater Baltimore Region and in Maryland. They also organized technology showcases in order to promote Greater Baltimore selected companies and to create
connections between technology companies and regional incubators.

In summary, the GBTC's institutional form is unequivocally private and industry group oriented. It is a matter of economic growth regarding the well-being and the interest of its members. GBTC is not officially mandated by local political jurisdiction. In fact, counties and the city are already operating their own technology councils that are financially and politically independent from the GBTC. The GBTC has thus no power or coordination endowment over local economic development organizations. The GBTC tried to work with all of them but its power of influence is more implicit rather than explicit.

Unlike GBTC's One Region, One Future plan, CPHA's Investing in Community project, or Archbishop's Beyond the Boundaries program, GBTC does not directly try to achieve a new regional pattern of development or to set up particular policies over regionalism in order to improve the entire regional community. GBTC's task is member driven and aims to promote a specific economic sector—technology—and to satisfy the needs of their members. The institutional logic of the GBTC is that if, on a regional basis, one company is strengthening, then is the entire industry is strengthening regionally (interview 5).

7.3.2 Greater Baltimore Alliance: The Achievement of a Regional Marketing Strategy

As stipulated by this organization in most of their publications, Greater Baltimore Alliance (GBA) is now the exclusive regional economic development corporation created to build a competitive and successful economy for Greater Baltimore residents and employers. More especially, GBA has been created in order to lead and direct regional image building, attraction and retention programs, and provide a single regional point of contact and superior seamless customer service to newly locating and expanding employers. Under its current form, the GBA has been in existence since 1997. But we have to go back to 1993 in order to retrace the origin of this organization. The GBA was initially formed as a public-sector initiative of the Baltimore Metropolitan Council. Later, the GBA was transferred from the public sector to the private

51 See chapter 4.
sector under the leadership of the Greater Baltimore Committee. And in 1997, the GBA became a nonprofit independent organization.

7.3.2.1 GBA under the Leadership of the Baltimore Metropolitan Council

About one year after its creation, the Baltimore Metropolitan Council’s board—composed of the mayor of Baltimore City, the county executives of Baltimore, Anne Arundel, Harford and Howard counties, and the president of the Carroll County Board of Commissioners—reached a consensus on the importance to market Greater Baltimore outside the region (The Sun, 09/25/1993). Supported by the Greater Baltimore Committee and some Foundations, the Baltimore Metropolitan Council officially created a new organization called the Greater Baltimore Development Alliance in order to implement a regional economic marketing strategy. This is a crucial part of the metropolitan process since the six Greater Baltimore’s local elected officials agreed at that time with the principle of economic interdependence. This principle recognized that working together as a region is better than the traditional competition against each other and that economic development must be addressed on a regional basis. It was also recognized that the region needed a strong economic development program (interview 6).

In September 1993, the Greater Baltimore Development Alliance was created under the authority of the Baltimore Metropolitan Council with an initial budget of $250,000 including $50,000 from the Council, $50,000 from the Greater Baltimore Committee and a substantial $125,000 contribution coming from two foundations, the Jacob and Annita France Foundation and the Robert G. and Anne M. Merrick Foundation. These foundations, traditionally committed to education, health, human services, civic and cultural activities along with conservation initiatives, were seeing this regional initiative as a way to support job creation (The Sun, 09/22/1993).

The $250,000 marketing campaign intended to attract companies to Greater Baltimore with a joint promotional effort focussing most especially on consultants in the business-location industry, real estate firms and business people. Originally, the Greater Baltimore Development Alliance was working with a very limited staff and has since hired consultants in order to work with companies who show an interest in locating in Baltimore. Between 1993 and 1995, the
Alliance framed a national media relations campaign to promote Greater Baltimore, produced a statistical portrait of the region, and participated to trade shows and other events on the behalf of regional business and civic community (The Sun, 05/16/1995). The other positive impact of the Greater Baltimore Development Alliance is the economic coordination process engendered by the initiative. Indeed, the joint project was going forward with monthly meetings from economic development directors of each local jurisdiction in order to harmonize the joint strategy (The Sun, 09/25/1993).

However, the amplitude of this campaign remains to some extent modest compared to other marketing strategies in competitor regions that very often work out to cost millions of dollars. Moreover, the modest amount of resources and money allocated by the local jurisdictions via the Baltimore Metropolitan Council—$50,000—implies in some respect that they were not entirely ready to entrust the Greater Baltimore Development Alliance with a major role over economic development. Nevertheless, this alliance was a significant step in the direction of regionalism.

Even though the Greater Baltimore Alliance was incubated through the public-sector leadership, it was supported by a strong partnership with foundations along with the Greater Baltimore Committee. In order to increase the involvement of the business community and to expand resources to this initiative, it was decided in 1995 that the appropriate home for the Alliance would be the private sector in the future (interview 6). Following a “cooperative effort” (The Sun, 05/15/1995) between the Baltimore Metropolitan Council and the Greater Baltimore Committee, it was decided to shift the Alliance under the auspices of the Greater Baltimore Committee to a significant organizational transformation.

In fact, under the public-sector leadership, the Greater Baltimore Development Alliance did not have its own board. At that time, the initiative could have been described as an economic development program rather than as an independent economic development organization (EDO). Under the leadership of the Greater Baltimore Committee, the Alliance will become an authentic regional EDO known as the Greater Baltimore Alliance (GBA), will increase its financial and staff resources, and will have its own board of directors.
7.3.2.2 **GBA under the Leadership of the Greater Baltimore Committee**

In May 1995, the creation process of a refined regional marketing strategy for Greater Baltimore began. The survey conducted by Bennet and Nathanson (1997)\(^{52}\) on 14 EDOs throughout the United States was instructive about how Greater Baltimore compared to its counterpart regions and what the level of resources involved in regional marketing is elsewhere. In this study commanded by the GBA, we could learn that other regions are much more aggressive in regional marketing, that the commitment of the private sector is, in general, more significant and that the level of resources attributed to this task is much more considerable than it was for the initial Greater Baltimore Development Alliance’s effort. We could also learn that Greater Baltimore was slow in creating a regional EDO along with an articulated regional economic development strategy.

The new-fashioned existence of the GBA first started with the constitution of a more diversified board of directors. This new board included Kurt L. Schmoke, former Mayor of Baltimore City; former Howard County Executive Charles I Ecker; former Harford County Executive Eilen M. Rehrmann; Frank P. Bramble Jr., Chief Executive Officer of First National Bank; Willard Hackerman, President of Whiting-Turner Contracting Co.; Mary Junk, at the time Publisher and Chief Executive Officer of The Baltimore Sun Co.; and Philip M. Stolz, Vice President and General Manager of WBAL-TV. Other seats were reserved for representative of the State Department of Business and Economic Development and some regional non-profit organizations (The Sun, 05/16/1995). Despite a new organizational structure, the GBA continues with its work and is still formerly supported by Baltimore City and the five counties as the regional EDO.

The second step was a major fund-raising campaign to give additional resources to the GBA in order to accomplish its mission. In 1995, the financial plan was a five-year, $5 million fund-raising supported by public and private sectors (The Sun, 05/16/1995). Since the GBA’s private shift, the business financial contribution to the organization is much more important. Baltimore City and the five counties have substantially increased their financial support to the GBA and the State of Maryland is henceforth a financial backer (The Sun, 02/20/1997). With this new

---

\(^{52}\) Conducted in 1995 but published in 1997.
organizational structure and a $1 million annual budgeting plan, GBA continued to carry through its marketing activities and undertook the elaboration of a more detailed strategy.

7.3.2.3 GBA as a nonprofit independent organization

In March 1997, GBA prepared to propel the organization to a better position when it hired a high profile new chief executive officer (CEO) established as one of the top leaders in the regional marketing field in America. Ioanna Morfessis, a Washington D.C. native, served as the CEO of the Greater Phoenix Economic Council since its creation in 1985. Morfessis is described by Phoenix officials and her colleagues as very strong headed, persistent and an excellent negotiator. She is credited for the successful creation of an effective approach to regional development in the Phoenix area. She also received a large part of the credit for her role in leading Phoenix out of a real estate market crisis engendered by a financial scandal in the mid-1980’s. During her term as CEO of the Greater Phoenix Economic Council, it is said that more than 135 companies have been attracted in that region, resulting in at least 64 000 jobs created. Before that, she was director of economic development in Montgomery County—located close to Washington D.C.—where she notably contributed to launch the Shady Grove Life Science Center, a biotechnology research park. Among the 15 candidates for the job, the search committee that screened the candidates acknowledged that Morphessis had the best track record of retaining and attracting new industry to a large metropolitan area (The Sun, 03/01/1997).

With the hiring of a reputable leader to head the GBA, this is the status of the organization that is changing. First of all, the five-year budget plan, which was originally $5 million, continued to increase up to $8 million guaranteed by governmental and private sources. From that amount, $2.62 million was plan to be spent immediately in 1998 (The Sun, 02/11/1998). Secondly, after three years as an internal segment of the Greater Baltimore Committee, the GBA acquired its A regional EDO

53 To refer to Bennet and Nathanson (1997), this $2.62 million annual budget remains relatively typical of what is granted in other metropolitan areas. Their evaluation in 14 other region suggest an average annual budget of $2.2 million in 1995. This is presumably why Morphessis would like to see the GBA’s budget increase as much as $4 or $5 million per year eventually (The Sun, 03/05/1997; 02/11/1998).

55 In 1998, the GBA was financially supported by 112 investors from different areas: local and state governments, universities and colleges, foundations, newspapers magazines and local television companies, professional sports teams, hotels, professional associations, banks, and other private companies.
independence and became an autonomous nonprofit organization in March 1997 (The Sun, 03/08/1997). In order to avoid any conflicts between both economic organizations, officially proclaimed a fund-raising pact, promising not to compete for financial resources. They also agreed to work together in collaboration (The Sun, 03/30/1997). Despite its organizational mutation, the GBA still brings together the city and the five counties within a diversified administrative structure including members from the public—state and local governments—the private and the nonprofit sectors. Within the independent structure, every local elected official has now a seat on the board of directors.

The year 1998 was actually a crucial period for the GBA as stated in their first Annual Report as an independent organization (GBA, 1998). It first left the Greater Baltimore Committee to locate into its own offices. During the same year, the GBA expanded its staff members from two to thirteen becoming a much bigger organization. In this very same year the GBA and the Greater Baltimore Committee jointly produced and released the *Greater Baltimore State of the Region Report* (1998). In 1998, the GBA assumed leadership regarding the Washington/Baltimore coalition for the 2012 summer Olympic games. This project is considered by this organization as the most tremendous marketing and economic development plan possible. This is why it is one of the top priorities of the GBA.

Among other things, the GBA regularly sponsors forums, meetings and other events in order to engage the private companies, the public, the governments and other community leaders in the regional economic development strategy. An essential part of their *modus operandi* is to develop a positive image of Greater Baltimore within the region. The internal image will be a determinant for the private sector participation in the regional marketing strategy and also to increase the confidence of companies so they will be more predisposed to stay or expand in the region. Consequently, the GBA produced two periodic publications designed to inform Greater Baltimore’s leaders about what is going on regionally. *Dateline Greater Baltimore* is a postcard highlighting the new economic development activities in the region and *Alliance Alert* is featuring substantial relevant economic information and events that impact regionalism. The

---

56 See chapter 6.
GBA has also initiated with media collaboration a regional promotional campaign to aim to reveal positive aspects to live and work in Greater Baltimore.

The GBA also tried to establish a relationship with its local governments' counterparts. For example, in 1998 a special Advisory Committee—including the directors of the city and county economic development agencies along with representatives of the Maryland Department of Business and Economic Development, the Baltimore Metropolitan Council and representatives of private companies—was created in order to coordinate the economic development support and services to companies. The GBA, from this time on, has the resources to pay direct attention to the workforce development in the region, which is considered a prerequisite to compete nationally and internationally and an acute factor in business location decision. The GBA produced studies regarding Greater Baltimore’s labor market and contributed to building a regional coalition in order to conceive a strategy to address workforce issues. The organization also assisted companies more directly with their problems of recruitment or specific needs related to workforce development.

By nature, the GBA has a specific interest in building a business-oriented identity for the region since part of its mission is to attract new private companies. On that score, the GBA tends to embrace an ideological and political position favoring tax cuts. Morfessis is particularly convinced that this strategy is effective since Arizona has been doing personal and income tax cuts since the late 1980s, which has concur to economic growth after a severe economic depression in the mid-1980s (The Sun, 03/05/1997).

At the regional marketing level, the GBA has continued to establish connections with external firms, national media and consultants in the business-location industry. But it increasingly counts on the participation from the region’s private and public leaders in order to improve and sell the business image outside the region (The Sun, 02/27/1998). The GBA has thus participated with the executives of companies that have operations in Greater Baltimore to several Sales Missions in 1998. New York, New Jersey, Atlanta, Los Angeles, San Diego Oakland, Silicon Valley and San Francisco were among some of the regions visited. These missions are used in order to raise the awareness of Greater Baltimore as a business location but also to establish new
relationships with outside companies.

This extensive strategy is not the fruit of the improvisation. It has been specifically developed within the first six months after Morfessis’s appointment as the GBA’s CEO (The Sun, 10/02/1997). The GBA first started to develop a guide called *Competitive Assessment* (GBA, 1997a) designed to provide a general outlook about the Greater Baltimore’s competitive position in order to know the forces and weaknesses of the region. The guide is based on a variety of sources:

- Interviews with over 35 business executives (major regional employers) throughout Greater Baltimore.

- Interviews with site-selection consultants representing the largest and most experienced firms to gain their insight into Greater Baltimore and their input on the best way to manage the marketing effort to meet prospective needs.

- Information and data that views Greater Baltimore as a region (the way the area is most often evaluated by site-seeking firms) and compares it to key competitor regions.

From this study, we learn that the site-selection consultants tend to quickly eliminate Greater Baltimore since it is not specifically viewed as a dynamic business location. Greater Baltimore’s external image is in fact perceived as an old, blue-collar eastern industrial city with a renaissance downtown, a highly regulated place with high taxes and crime. From inside, Greater Baltimore is perceived as a deteriorating regional economic base with a falling central city at risk, placing the entire region at risk as well. Nevertheless, the region is characterized as a great place to live with several quality of life advantages that are not known by outsiders. Access to the Bay; ease of commuting; cultural, entertainment, and recreational options; access to the beach, mountains, and to the New York and Washington corridor; access to good colleges and universities; moderate, four-season climate; relatively low housing cost; cultural diversity; etc., are among the quality of life strengths suggested by a regional business executive.

Despite the economic base and infrastructures, Greater Baltimore has a lot to offer. It has access to broader regional markets (northeast and mid-Atlantic), size and diversity as a metropolitan
market, position as an important medical center, access to interstate and highway network, its proximity to an international airport, and it's important port, etc., the economic development marketing and services are considered weak compared to other regions. According to the Competitive Assessment, Greater Baltimore has a:

- Lack of a highly professional, or even visible, regional effort;
- Lack of coordinated response and management from the state, regional, and local entities;
- Lack of commitment in terms of time and resources on behalf of the business community;
- Lack of visible commitment and involvement from all state and local government leaders including financial investment and time;
- Lack of ability to quickly and accurately follow through on requests for information;
- Etc.

This is noted with the observation that the GBA has undertaken the development of a new marketing strategy. The strategy is broken down into two stages. Stage one is a strategy for Greater Baltimore to attain a competitive status. The first step would be to build an effective regional EDO like hiring professional staff, building strategic alliances with private, public, state, and local economic development organizations. The second step would be to build a strong business image nationally with national advertising, executing economic missions, etc. Stage two would be to sustain the competitive status of Greater Baltimore in building a business brand identity; attracting new businesses or capturing jobs resulting from regional inventions and innovations; becoming more international in attracting more foreign-owned companies; improving the business climate in general by advocating for business friendly policies, etc.

The GBA also established a Performance Report Card Committee in order to develop a methodology to measure the performance of the organization. This committee evaluated the level of customer satisfaction along with the attributes that favor or disfavor Greater Baltimore in the location decision process. In 1998, the GBA reportedly serviced 67 prospects representing a
potential of $493 million in capital investment and $656 million in potential payroll. Out of these 67 prospects, the GBA helped to pull in three new firms to Greater Baltimore. These three firms are *County Seat*, a distribution center located in Baltimore County; *Aero Fulfillment Service*, a distribution center also located in Baltimore County; and *Trident QRV telecommunications*, an engineering consultancy located in Hartford County. These three firms directly generated $6.5 million in capital investment, $4.2 million in annual payroll and 222 initial jobs. During the same year, the GBA coupled its efforts with other organizations to retain Carr Lowrey—an old glass perfume bottle manufacturer—from moving to another location. The GBA is also collaborating with the Governor’s task force to keep General Motors active in the region.

In conclusion, it took a long time to create a detailed economic development strategy. GBA now has the resources to be more and more comprehensive in its action. Involving people from the public, the private and the nonprofit sectors, the GBA is nowadays one of the few regional meeting places where people can address metropolitan problems in a mutual manner.
Conclusion

When we do researches about regionalism with Greater Baltimore as a case study, some people tend to ask: what regionalism is going on here? Indeed, as we said into the introduction, we cannot affirm that Baltimore represents the *avant-garde* as far as regionalism is concerned. If we would have prefer looking at success stories or describe miscellaneous models of metropolitan governance or governments, we would have proceed elsewhere since metropolitan governance is a very laborious political issue in Greater Baltimore—as it is in many other regions. It is indeed difficult to find a stable structure of regionalism in Greater Baltimore. In fact, very few city regions in America can be considered as a success story for regionalism. And their models are often so contextual that they are not easily reproduced. This is why it is also crucial for urbanists to try to understand what are the economic, social, political and spatial forces that favor or disfavor metropolitan actions.

Looking at Greater Baltimore is in our opinion a great comprehensive urban laboratory for new regionalism. It reveals that despite extreme circumstances of political competition and social segregation—generally unfavorable to metropolitan cooperation—regionalism can nevertheless clear its own path in order to engender new approaches in urban planning. We can also infer that there are structural forces that are behind the regionalism movement, even thought they are difficult to empirically apprehend. Looking at the reports, regional nonprofit organization’s programs and other commitments towards regionalism, it comes into view that structural factors like the economic restructuring, the globalization process and the spatial transformation of city region are, in a way or another, strong sources of impulse for metropolitan governance.

Even though regionalism is a logical solution for several urban issues, it remains a very difficult political issue and this report shows the obstacles to implement regional policies. It is indeed laborious to engender regional cooperation within a fragmented and competitive structure of local governments. Nevertheless, the Greater Baltimore case study reveals that there is a fundamental need for regional solutions nowadays. The local political structures are increasingly challenged by nonprofit organizations like, for instance, the Greater Baltimore Committee...
(GBC), the Citizens Planning and Housing Association (CPHA) and the Baltimore Archdiocese who are developing a new approach to urban problems. Despite fundamental differences in their missions, those three organizations reached the same conclusion: a metropolitan action is required in order to face contemporary urban problems. These nonprofit actors are in fact developing a new vision for urban development and are creating a process to think regionally instead of locally. The Greater Baltimore experience shows that innovative urban strategies favoring metropolitan approach are born from these forces.
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