

Convening the Community: Creating the Political Will for Creative Change

“Will We be Judged for What We Refuse to Become?”¹

A project of the Kalamazoo Consortium of Higher Education, sponsored by Kalamazoo College and Western Michigan University

Co-investigators: Kiran Cunningham and Hannah McKinney, Kalamazoo College²

Project Summary: We propose to lead a participatory action research project to engage the Kalamazoo County community in a broad discussion of the implications of the regional initiatives currently being considered throughout the county.

Introduction

In the past two years, serious discussions have taken place in Kalamazoo County³ about smart growth and regional economic development policies, including changing governance structures, consolidating economic development strategies, and creating more cooperative business relations. Plans have been formulated, discussed, and, in some cases, financed. As a result, we stand at the threshold of real change. Yet, strong grassroots involvement in these discussions has been missing. And citizen support is uncertain.

We propose to develop a mechanism through which citizens can participate in the ongoing discussions of regional change. In doing so, we hope to create the political will to bring about substantive changes in the ways in which the county, its governments, institutions, and citizens interact with each other. We will create an environment that fosters informed and thoughtful public deliberation on metropolitan governance. This public discussion will stress factual information, understanding varying perspectives, and identification of the tradeoffs that implementation of the proposed initiatives would necessitate.⁴

Research on public decision-making has shown that grassroots discussion and debate is key in the formation of public judgement.⁵ Our project is meant to generate such discussion in the community, complementing and enhancing other community efforts to enhance public and economic ties within the county. Many of the initiatives under discussion will require public funding such as tax base sharing or new governmental structures, items that can only be instituted with taxpayer approval. True political will needed to bring such issues to the voters can only come from perceived public support.

Environment in which this project is proposed

As in many areas of the country, the impetus for Kalamazoo’s search for better ways to do things came from corporate downsizing and plant closures. The first regional plan was developed by a group of civic leaders who named themselves “Fresh Start”. They proposed

¹ Rev. Joel Brooks, Christian Life Center, quoted by David Rusk in *The Kalamazoo County Compact: A Report by David Rusk*, p. 22, Oct. 4, 1998.

² Hannah McKinney is an economist at Kalamazoo College whose research and teaching interests are urban economics, public finance, and statistics and econometrics. She is also vice mayor of the city of Kalamazoo and has been personally involved in the development of the Compact. Kiran Cunningham is an applied anthropologist at Kalamazoo College whose research and teaching interests are community development, agricultural development, qualitative methods, and action anthropology.

³ Located in southwest Michigan, the county’s population is about 223,000.

⁴ “Building a Hands-On Community: A Guide to Public Participation in Battle Creek,” Kezziah- Watkins, Oct. 1995.

⁵ “Meaningful Chaos: How People Form Relationships with Public Concerns,” Harwood Group, A report for the Kettering Foundation, 1993.

changes in governmental practice in general and economic development practice in particular.⁶ The group issued this challenge: “Kalamazoo County needs a fresh start! Faced with major setbacks at its four largest companies, the Kalamazoo County community needs much more than “business as usual” if its future is to be as prosperous as its past. Complacency must give way to economic, political, and social cooperation.”

Many protested the lack of public input into their planning. Fresh Start held several community forums to discuss their ideas. The group was unable to find a mechanism to both alleviate the sense of exclusion many others expressed while still being able to negotiate complex and sensitive cooperative public/private agreements on the scale they felt vital to the county’s resurgence. Fresh Start’s cooperative vision marks an important bell weather change for this county. Raising over \$20 million for an economic development fund, an allied group formed, in part as a response to a Fresh Start proposal, and created a non-profit called Southwest Michigan First which will be a major economic development power in the county.

Next came the efforts of the Consortium for Higher Education. The Consortium, believing it had a “vital civic responsibility to help shape our community’s economic future,”⁷ brought urban experts David Rusk and James Gollob to Kalamazoo. After a well-attended community forum, the experts went to work. Gollob helped to create Regional Edge, a collaborative process which ‘convenes the marketplace’ to make local industry more competitive. He described the Regional Edge movement as a collaborative continual market improvement process where suppliers and competitors meet in industrial clusters to discuss and solve bottlenecks, build alliances, and plan for the future. Early last November, Regional Edge issued its first progress report at a large public forum.⁸ Regional Edge, as a market-based, private process, is one of the most exciting initiatives underway.

The Regional Edge cluster groups, collectively, developed what they called flagship issues, issues that needed to be addressed by collaborative public/private action. These were improvements in air service to the area, the development of “one-stop” economic development services for existing and potential firms, and working with educational institutions to improve worker skills. These flagship objectives are more likely to occur and succeed in an environment of common visions, goals, objectives, and definitions.

David Rusk’s report came in early October at another public forum. He challenged the county to devise a Kalamazoo Compact based on a metropolitan level land use planning mechanism and real metropolitan level governance. He focused on the:

major policy issues that increasingly retard the region’s progress. These are uncoordinated (often competing) economic development programs, fragmented land use planning, duplicative public works investments, growing tax disparities and housing policies that increase economic segregation and its consequences for public schools. The greater Kalamazoo community has the talent and resources to overcome these problems.... The challenge is simple: To develop the political will to change.⁹

He asks local governments to form a Kalamazoo Compact where they would agree to act as one to address these issues. Rusk believes the Compact would strengthen our economic base through: collaborative land use planning and growth management, tax-base sharing, fair share affordable housing, strong public education, and economic development marketing. He

⁶ “An Economic Development Alliance Concept for Kalamazoo County,”

<http://telecity.org/freshstart/concept.htm>

⁷ The presidents of Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo College, Davenport College, and Kalamazoo Valley Community College make up the Consortium. The quote is by James F. Jones, Jr, President of the Consortium, from page 2 of the *Compact*.

⁸ Regional EDGE: A Collaborative Action Strategy for Improving the Competitiveness of the Southwest Michigan Economy,” November 8, 1998

⁹ Rusk, p. 10.

commented that Kalamazoo, if successful, could be “A model for Michigan: A model for the USA.”¹⁰

He outlined specific steps that the private sector, local governments, and state government should follow to implement this Compact. One of his recommended steps was an educational, citizen involvement process created through some sort of private sector initiative. Our proposed project is one such process since our goal is to enable citizens in the county to discuss, learn more about, and define the issues that they see as detrimental to the continued economic and social health of our region, and begin to envision solutions. At the same time, we will take the information we learn from this grassroots involvement back to the groups working to achieve countywide cooperation. Smart growth policies, especially concerning consolidated metropolitan action on economic development and related land use areas, are gaining popularity around the country. Many localities and states have successfully created such collaborative compacts and programs that Rusk endorses.¹¹ In addition, many urban policy analysts and academic researchers see schemes such as Rusk’s as virtually foolproof ways to increase metropolitan economic vitality and livability.¹² Even Vice President Gore has proposed a livability agenda and promised public funding to implement his programs.¹³ Increasingly, policymakers think the issue is not whether to create regional smart growth alliances but how soon to do it.

One analyst who does not support such programs is Howard Husock from the J. F. K School of Government at Harvard University. Instead, he praises smaller local governments and points out that suburban interests may not be the same as those of older cities. Portage City has just hired Husock to critique Rusk’s assessment of Kalamazoo County. By May, that report will be public.

Our Council of Governments, the county organization for the 25 local governments in the county, in light of the Rusk and other initiatives, is considering restructuring itself to increase its overall effectiveness.¹⁴ The reorganization of COG could lead to real change in governance within the county. However, support from the 25 governing bodies is uncertain. Many look to the county government for leadership in matters of regional coordination.

But the public’s voice is missing. And without a public mandate, transforming change will be difficult to achieve.

Are we moving toward a Kalamazoo Compact?

We lack common definitions of the problems that a Kalamazoo Compact would address. Indeed, one person’s urban sprawl is another’s ideal development pattern. We have no common and clearly defined goals for the county such as ideal population or job growth projections. And without these, we lack the means to create a common vision for our future.

Many advocate building a countywide land use map incorporating growth management strategies used elsewhere such as the creation of agricultural preservation zones for exclusive farming use and urban growth zones for population increases. Indeed, Rusk said the creation of such a map would be the first step to creating a compact for collaborative action. But a move toward countywide planning presupposes that county residents understand and support the need

¹⁰ “The Kalamazoo County Compact,” prepared for the Kalamazoo Consortium for Higher Education, Kalamazoo, MI, presented October 7, 1998, in Stetson Chapel.

¹¹ One that will be referenced later in this proposal is Dane County Wisconsin which has just completed a successful county land use plan such as Rusk proposed for Kalamazoo County. See <http://www.co.dane.wi.us/>

¹² For a summary of current thinking on this issue, see *The Brookings Review*, Fall, 1998, various authors, pp. 1-38.

¹³ Al Gore, “The Clinton/Gore Administration: Livable Communities for the 21st Century,” Jan. 11, 1999, http://www.smartgrowth.org/library/gore_speech11199.html.

¹⁴ “Recommendation for Restructuring COG,” presented at special COG meeting, Nov. 12th 1998; Regular COG meeting, Dec. 11th, 1998.

for such programs. Without compelling reasons to preserve farmland and open space, a proposal to channel most development into already developed urban areas is unrealistic.

Most of those who are currently involved in discussions about any of these initiatives do not understand each other's attitudes. Until they understand and respect the positional and attitudinal differences among themselves, any attempt to build consensus will be ineffective. So far in our county, discussions have been held among leadership groups. These groups are struggling to come to consensus and compromise. But, to the extent that local governments are involved, without clear political support of their electorates, any agreements will be without teeth. Land use, governance, and tax questions are ultimately decided by voters. Over 200 governments faced ballot questions on conservation and smart growth initiatives in the last election. Over 70% of these passed.¹⁵

We don't know if there is support for a similar referendum in Kalamazoo County. We don't know how our citizens stand on the social, economic, and political issues underlying the call for a Compact. Will they support metropolitan alliances with their tax dollars and will they support their political leaders who attempt to create the Compact? How can citizens, schools, governments, and businesses jointly address the issues of job training and skills enhancement? What kind of an industrial orientation--high tech, basic manufacturing, small business--do we want to pursue? We need answers.¹⁶

Kalamazoo County is truly at a crossroads. We could see new metropolitan governance structures enacted within the county, which could be models for best practices in the sustainable communities movement. Or, we could settle back into municipal bickering and fault-finding. This project could be pivotal in determining which direction is taken.

Existing governance structures provide little incentive for regional cooperation. For instance, COG's request for a county-wide land use plan was half-hearted, at best. Texas Township Trustee Ed Woodhams, a lifelong resident of the area, pointed out that his township had just spent two years and thousands of dollars updating their land use map. He said he was unwilling to hand planning power over to the county. "I don't think the people of my township elected me to give their rights away. I think you are going to run into some opposition."¹⁷ He was echoed by at least three trustees from other townships. Local jurisdictions have to endorse and follow a countywide plan; otherwise, it is just an expensive academic exercise doomed to sit on a shelf somewhere.

Elected officials within each local jurisdiction represent the interests of those within their jurisdictional boundaries. The outcome of their individual deliberations is not likely to be a Compact for joint action, particularly for a Compact as far-reaching as that proposed by Rusk unless the political will has been formed at the grassroots level giving officials a clear mandate to take collaborative action.

Take, for example, the issue of farmland protection and the associated issue of greenfield development. In Rusk's plan, Portage, the suburban growth engine, would agree to a tax-base sharing scheme in which it would be the primary net contributor (they would give 40% of taxes stemming from new growth). Most of the townships would be recipients. Portage's incentive would be the creation of a countywide land use system channeling most growth into the city. The townships would benefit from increased revenues without encouraging development within their boundaries.

At least two major stumbling blocks exist with this plan. The first is the skepticism in Portage that enough large-scale commercial and industrial growth will occur in the city to offset

¹⁵ Phyllis Myers, "Livability at the Ballot Box: State and Local Referenda on Parks, Conservation, and Smarter Growth, Election Day, 1998" A Discussion Paper Prepared for the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, Jan. 1999. She ended her paper with a comment that "the challenge ahead for states, localities, and the nation as a whole lies in translating the ballot box statements into actions and alliances for on-the-ground change in the older settled areas and edges of America's expanding metropolitan regions."

¹⁶ "Mayor Gary Brown now requesting a countywide vision," *Kalamazoo Gazette*, p. c1, Feb. 10, 1999.

¹⁷ His comments were reported in "Advisory Council pursues county land-use proposal," *The Kalamazoo Gazette*, p. B1, Oct. 23, 1998. I also heard them at the meeting.

the loss in the growth of their tax revenue from sharing. Perhaps, 100% of the current and future revenue with no strings is better than 60% of future growth.¹⁸

The township representatives do not believe that the infrastructure and other public costs of developing greenfields outweigh the benefits of such development. They recognize that new schools, fire engines, and roads cost public dollars but believe they will recover these costs in additional tax base from the new development.¹⁹ After all, suburban development has increased our national prosperity for decades. Inexpensive gasoline for an automobile oriented society, billions of public dollars poured into an extensive highway system, giving ready access to cheap land, coupled with affordable mortgage financing, and publicly provided infrastructure, all these things made low density suburban development inevitable.²⁰ And the public and private incentives have not changed. Today, few people perceive farming as a viable industry in modern day Michigan. Farmland is all too often viewed as vacant land ripe for development.²¹

At the same time, the core problem, for our county and elsewhere, is to develop institutions, supported publicly and privately, that address three goals: social equity between all citizens in the area, enhanced environmental conditions, and incentives for increased economic prosperity.²²

Project goals and objectives

Goal: To enable the continuation of a countywide consideration of institutional reform to address the key issues of land use, economic development coordination, tax base sharing, fair share housing, and improved public education.

Objectives:

1. To provide timely information about public attitudes, knowledge, or misperceptions to those engaged in ongoing initiatives.
2. To help explain these initiatives and likely impacts of them to a wider audience.
3. To define problems, needs, and solutions.
4. To help build a common vision for the community.

Goal: To identify and understand community attitudes and beliefs about livability issues such as sustainable growth, economic development needs, and farmland preservation.

Objectives:

1. Conduct a county-wide survey that assesses the range and strength of opinions county residents have on these issues.
2. Conduct focus groups with a wide range of community groups and population segments.
3. Conduct case studies of several local areas with diverging views on these issues to determine why these views are so divergent.

Goal: To educate the community about countywide governance possibilities and the differing attitudes and perceptions citizens in different areas of the county hold about these issues.

Objectives:

1. Develop common definitions of the problems and issues.

¹⁸ Conversation with Mayor Gary Brown of Portage, Oct. 7, 1998.

¹⁹ Meeting with township supervisors, David Rusk, and Farm Bureau representatives, August, 1998.

²⁰ Roger K. Lewis, "A Call to Stop Buying into Sprawl," *Washington Post*, Jan. 23, 1999, p. G3.

²¹ Letter to the Editor, David Hice, *Kalamazoo Gazette*, Nov. 16, 1998.

²² Jim Schwab, Edward Macie, Corbett Judy, "A Plan for Liveable Communities," *The American Forest*, Vol. 103, Autumn 1997, pp. 28-9.

2. Disseminate information about best practices elsewhere.
3. Discuss pros and cons of consolidated governance systems.
4. Build in feed-back mechanisms so that information goes from citizens to groups active in county-wide change processes and back again.

Goal: To use a grassroots, inclusive, participatory process that engages county residents in the process of defining and working toward common goals.

Objectives:

1. Build the project work group to ensure that it will effectively enable the search for countywide solutions to continue during and after the project duration.
2. Continually add people and groups to the discussion by involving them in the project process.
3. Use the local steering committees and focus groups that represent the diverse nature of our community.

Goal: To collect and disseminate research findings in a timely fashion to enhance the quality of community discussion on these issues.

Objectives:

1. Create and maintain explicit links with ongoing regional initiatives so that information from the project is used to further their work.
2. Through focus groups, work group meetings, and community forums, and other media, disseminate preliminary findings and collect feedback after each phase of the project.
3. Develop a communication plan for transmitting findings that minimizes the risk of misinformation.

Project elements

We firmly believe that, if this research is to move us toward a consensus vision of this community's future, the process is as important as the end product. Our plan, therefore, is to conduct the research in a way that not only produces reliable data, but also engages and energizes the "subjects," turning them into agents with a vested interest in the results and the political will to use the results to create action plans.

The project will be conducted in three phases. The first phase assesses citizen understanding and attitudes toward regional land use issues and suggested reforms through focus groups and surveys. Based on information gleaned in this phase, the second phase will include an in-depth analysis of five local areas. Here we are trying to understand why people feel the way they do about these issues. The last phase brings together all of the information gathered in the first two phases and allows the community to build action plans, set goals, and make recommendations for change.

Some of the important project elements are highlighted below. The project timeline is given in Appendix One.

Project Work group

This group of stakeholders will be the primary decision-making body on project design throughout the project period. The group will determine the types of questions to be asked of citizens in a large countywide survey, review all project outcomes, act as a speaker's bureau on project findings and the need for a countywide Compact, and decide future directions for public participation resulting from the project

The members of this group will be elected officials from varying governmental levels, representatives from the Farm Bureau, Chamber of Commerce, Board of Realtors, local churches, and school districts. This group of about 20 people will meet six times over the project period.

The work group's first meeting will be a fact-finding trip to Portland, Oregon. This trip has two purposes. First, the group will see first hand that regional solutions do exist and can transform an area. While we don't advocate a Portland-type solution for Kalamazoo, we do believe that the group must believe that the county governance and institutions can create positive alliances to address our problems. As Rusk said, we need "to study best comprehensive practices and publicize results to the Kalamazoo Community."²³ While in Portland, we will meet with researchers from Oregon State and government officials and educate ourselves about regional solutions.

The second purpose of the Portland trip is to solidify the identification of members of the work group with project goals and with each other, enabling them to work together better and to be more accepting of the attitudinal differences which are represented in the group and in the greater county community.

County-wide survey

The project's first information gathering exercise is a county-wide telephone survey to explore residents' attitudes and perceptions about the issues underlying the various proposals. The community has been bombarded with information about the need for consolidated action, the types of action needed, and expected results. Now we want to know where they stand on these issues. The survey results will give us a sense of the range and strength of opinion county residents have on the kinds of variables that might underlie a countywide vision.

Because we cannot presume to know the issues important to various interest groups in the county, we will ask work group members what they see as important issues to include in the survey. We will follow with focus groups in various localities to again ask what are the important issues that these kinds of initiatives should address. The first groups will help determine what kinds of questions to include on the survey in order to understand citizen views about land use in the county. These focus groups will do some preliminary visioning exercises concerning aspects of county life they like best and least and imaging what land use patterns within the county will look like in 5 or 10 years. We will then ask them to suggest topics for information gathering. We will invite focus group members to participate in the information gathering processes and to discuss the outcomes among themselves and with other participants in the process.

The work group will meet to compile the final survey instrument. We will then ask them to pre-test it with members of their 'constituencies' and to report back with suggested improvements.

To maximize the community impact of the survey, we will conduct it on two tracks. The Kercher Center will do a random telephone survey meant to produce statistically significant data.

The random survey results will serve as a benchmark of citizen attitudes for project participants and the wider community. Survey results will pinpoint areas where citizens agree cooperation is needed, areas where they disagree, and areas where more information needed. The survey will also provide objective information on these issues that can help lower the emotionalism as the community discussion continues.

The research design for the Kercher Center survey is as follows. Independent random surveys of approximately 384 persons will be taken from each the following local area clusters where the colors refer to map below.

²³ "Compact," p. 23.



- City of Kalamazoo (white)—the urban core city, est. pop.78,000 with the highest poverty population, declining industrial base, and the largest percentage of minorities.
- City of Portage (light blue)—largest suburb, the region’s retail core, just beginning to experience population outflow to out-county growth areas.
- Kalamazoo Township and the city of Parchment (light green)—immediately adjacent to Kalamazoo City, characterized by low population growth and declining economic base
- Oshtemo Township and Texas Township (dark green)—highest population growth areas
- Villages of Augusta, Climax, Schoolcraft, and Vicksburg; City of Galesburg (orange)—small rural population centers
- Townships of Richland, Ross, and Village of Richland blue)—rural and scenic, the residential choice for highest income county residents, with high projected population growth
- Townships of Prairie Ronde, Schoolcraft, Brady, and Pavilion (pink)—among the least urbanized townships, part of the “South County” alliance
- Townships of Alamo and Cooper (orange)—along highway 131 between Kalamazoo and Grand Rapids
- Townships of Comstock and Charleston, Climax Village (yellow)—along I-94 between Kalamazoo and Battle Creek

We will also conduct the same survey non-randomly. We will ask all project participants to take the survey and to give it to others. We would like to make the survey available through the *Kalamazoo Gazette* and the internet as well. By administering the survey in this fashion, we will heighten awareness of these issues in the community, build ownership of the issues by community members, and gain some information about how those more vested in these issues feel about them. The data from both collection techniques will be analyzed and disseminated.

Dane County Bus Trip for Work Group

Once the survey results are compiled and analyzed, the work group will take a trip to Dane County, Wisconsin. Dane County has a countywide land use plan, DesignDane!, which was created collaboratively by its 48 local governments and other groups. In April, a countywide referendum may be held to determine if county residents will provide funds to preserve open space within the county.²⁴ This trip has a three-fold purpose. First, it brings the work group together again and allows them to re-commit to the project. Second, it highlights a successful collaborative initiative by a midwestern college-oriented county. And third, it allows us enough time to thoroughly present survey findings, get updates from workgroup members on the status of ongoing initiatives, and talk with the work group about any issues that need to be explored in our local area studies in the next phase of the project.

Local Steering Committees in the Second Phase

²⁴ Press Release, Jan. 20th, 1999, <http://www.co.dane.wi.us/exec/referendum.htm>.

Once the jurisdictions have been chosen by the work group for in depth case study, local steering committees will be established in each of the case study areas, made up of representatives from the farmer, government official, and non-farming resident constituencies. The steering committees' input on selection of focus group participants, their knowledge of issues of critical importance to their constituencies and their abilities to keep their constituencies informed and involved in the project will be of utmost importance to the success of our project.

The case study areas will be those areas in the county whose residents have the most divergent views on farmland and open space preservation, the costs of development, the need for countywide solutions, or other issues of interest to the work group. The data for these case studies will be qualitative in nature, stemming primarily from focus groups. This will allow us to obtain a deeper understanding of the reasons behind these divergent opinions. Simply knowing *what* people think is insufficient; knowing *why* is crucial to any kind of consensus-building process

Focus groups

We will use focus groups as the primary data gathering tool during the case study phase of the project. These will be with different constituencies in each of our case study areas including farmers, representatives from the local governance structure, and non-farming residents.

With representatives from the local governance structure, we would explore issues such as differences in opinion between planning commissions and township boards over the costs and benefits of development.²⁵ We also want to know how strong local governmental support is for the Compact. Would more information help or will jurisdictional conflicts keep a voluntary Compact from occurring in the county.

Finally, we will meet with non-farming residents in each of the five areas. Many township residents commute to jobs in Kalamazoo, Battle Creek, or Portage, having recently moved from these more urban areas in the county. We are interested in the perspectives of these commuters since they are the ones who others in the region point to as exemplifying urban sprawl. We want to know why they moved into the township, what they like about it, and how they feel about land use issues.

Other participation opportunities

We plan to distribute newsletters, establish an 800 number, create a web page about our project, and issue an open invitation for participation in the discussion process. Anyone or any group could act as a "community connector" someone who agrees to host a small gathering to talk about the project. The project work group will function as a speaker's bureau within the first few months of the project and would be available to speak to these and other group meetings. One of our major goals is to provide useable information to enable the groups contemplating or undertaking regional initiatives to better succeed.

Communication with the Community

This project will be accomplished under the auspices of the Consortium of Higher Education. We hope that these and other organizations in the community will help us disseminate our findings, detail areas where information and discussion is needed, and then use our project findings to help bolster their efforts to improve our community.

²⁵ Private conversations with Dean Hollub, Senior Planner for Kalamazoo County and with Nuria Stockman, chair of the city's Planning Commission.

Given the data collected, and process followed in the project, and resulting county actions, we will write a monograph summarizing our findings. This will be an ethnography of township and city life in a time of change with a heavy emphasis on the economic and political ramifications of development patterns. Metropolitan collaboration has become the newest tool in revitalizing urban areas. We think an analysis of the building political will from the grassroots level will yield important insights into the process of consensus and coalition building.

In addition to the ethnography and, perhaps more importantly, we hope our efforts will help Kalamazoo County residents build some unified goals. It is our hope that the political will generated through the research process will provide the momentum for actually carrying out the plans and enhancing the regional efforts already underway in the county.

Modified on 10/20/99

APPENDIX ONE: TIMELINE FOR EACH PHASE

WORKPLAN

Pre-project and Phase I (Survey)

Phase I budget: \$49,400

Tasks	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	WHO
Compile educational materials for workgroup use	X	X	X	X						PT
Form main workgroup of individuals already working on various SG/ED initiatives in county		X	X	X						PT
Take workgroup to Portland for initial educational seminar, meetings; discuss survey design needs and focus group membership				X						PT,WG
Select and organize focus groups from various county constituencies for initial visioning and survey design				X						PT
Meet with focus groups				X	X					PT
Finalize survey instrument with workgroup						X				WG
Send survey for review to all project participants						X	X			PT
Kercher Center at WMU conducts survey							X	X		KC
Distribute survey across community nonrandomly and as widely as possible							X	X		PT
Analyze survey results							X	X	X	PT,KC
Take workgroup to Dane County, WI: discuss survey results, public presentation materials, select geographical areas for local case studies; update each other on SG/ED initiatives									X	PT,WG

Phase II (Local area case studies)

Phase II budget \$20,150

Tasks	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	Who
Public presentations in a variety of media forms	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	WG,PT
Select steering committees for each of the local study areas		X	X					WG,PT
Meet with focus groups in each local area			X	X				PT
Analyze qualitative data from focus group meetings				X	X	X		PT
Meet with work group and committees to review focus group information					X			WG,SC
Meet with work group and committees to discuss next steps						X		WG,SC
Meet with local steering committees to analyze information and discuss next steps						X	X	PT,SC

Phase III (Project wrap-up and write-up)

Phase III budget \$32,000

Tasks	MAY	JUN	JUL	Who
Public presentations	X	X	X	PT, WG
Meet with work group to determine action plans		X		WG
Meet with local steering committees to determine future local actions		X		PT, SC
Summarize research findings in monograph			X	PT

Note: PT=project team and students; WG=workgroup; KC=Kercher Center at WMU
SC=local steering committees