

Imagine Columbia's Future

CITY OF COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
FINAL REPORT

PREPARED BY
ACP-VISIONING & PLANNING, LTD.

MAY 31, 2006



Approximately 400 people attended the forum held at Stephens College.

Imagine Columbia's Future

This report summarizes the results from the Imagine Columbia's Future Forum that took place on May 8, 2006. The report is divided into five parts.

Part 1 – Forum Overview provides a description of the forum's activities.

Part 2 – Presentations highlights main points from the presentations of the visiting speakers from Chattanooga, Tennessee; Springfield, Missouri; and Champaign County, Illinois.

Part 3 – Table Dialogue Activity summarizes the main ideas and themes from the Table Dialogue activity.

Part 4 – Exit Survey reports the results from the Exit Survey.

Part 5 – Conclusions summarizes the results of the forum.

Four appendices are included at the end of this report:

Appendix A: Responses – Table Dialogue Activity

Appendix B: Worksheet and Reporting Form – Table Dialogue Activity

Appendix C: Exit Survey

Appendix D: Community Profiles

ACP-Visioning & Planning, Ltd. was retained to assist the City in the design of the forum and in compiling the report.

Part 1: Forum Overview

On May 8, 2006 the City of Columbia, Missouri held a public forum called Imagine Columbia's Future. The purpose of this forum was to initiate a citywide dialogue on what steps to take to plan for the future of the community. It provided an opportunity to assess the Columbia community's receptiveness to a "big-picture" planning and visioning process that would ask questions such as "What kind of a community do we want to be in the future?" and "What do we need to do to get there?" Approximately 400 residents participated in the forum held in the newly restored Kimball Ballroom at the Lela Raney Wood Hall at Stephens College.

The forum included three key activities: presentations by representatives from three communities comparable in size to Columbia that had conducted or are currently conducting a vision process; small group discussions referred to as the Table Dialogue activity; and the completion of an anonymous and voluntary exit survey.

The three communities invited to present their vision processes were Chattanooga, Tennessee, Springfield, Missouri, and Champaign County, Illinois. Presentations focused on why each community chose to conduct a vision and on the outcomes of their efforts. In the case of Champaign County, the presentation focused on how the process, now underway, was structured. Springfield's presentation focused on how the city was implementing its vision plan. Details about the presentations of each of these communities can be found in Part 2 below and in the Appendix.

The Table Dialogue activity was designed to generate discussion among Columbia's residents in response to the three presentations. Participants were asked to think about benefits and obstacles to conducting a vision in their community. The summaries suggest strong support for the idea of developing some type of visioning process in Columbia and a desire for a positive, creative, and proactive vision process that would help create a strong sense of ownership in its results, bridge differences between diverse constituencies, and bring about a stronger sense of community by encouraging the broad participation of residents. A full account of the

Table Dialogue activity results can be found in Part 3 of this report. A verbatim record of reporting sheet responses is included in Appendix A. Copies of the associated participant worksheet and summary reporting sheet can be found in Appendix B.

The exit survey aimed to quantify the outcome of the Table Dialogue activity. It also provided a demographic snapshot of the participants. The survey's results indicate almost unanimous support (94 percent of respondents) for some kind of broad, community-based plan to occur in Columbia. Only one participant disagreed, and sixteen were uncertain. A similarly high number of respondents (89 percent) believe that a visioning process would benefit the community. The strong support expressed for a vision process is rendered more significant by the fact that those surveyed also conveyed interest in getting involved in work related to specific topics, most notably Environment, Downtown, Transportation, Arts and Culture, and Social Issues. Further details about the exit survey can be found in Part 4 of this report. A copy of the exit survey can be found in Appendix C.

Part 2: Presentations

The forum began with an introduction by Mayor Darwin Hindman and a presentation by Gianni Longo, the panel moderator enlisted to provide a general overview about what a typical vision process entails. Next, representatives of the three visiting communities each made a brief presentation, focusing on a specific aspect of their vision process. The presentations were followed by a panel discussion and a brief question and answer period.



Panelists respond to questions from the public.

A. Chattanooga, Tennessee

Mayor Ron Littlefield summarized the experience of Chattanooga, Tennessee. Chattanooga is celebrated for developing and implementing one of the first and most successful visions in the country. Vision 2000 was started in 1984 by a handful of community leaders and completed within a year, resulting in a list of 40 goals for the city. Chattanooga Venture, the organization that led the vision, organized citizen task forces to implement the vision. Working with City and County, the task forces spurred the development of 223 specific initiatives to implement the community vision. By 1992 (less than ten years from the inception of the program), 37 of the 40 goals created by Vision 2000 had been either completed or partially completed. The goals set forth in the Vision 2000 process generated major investments ranging from downtown and riverfront development to low-income housing and social initiatives.

In his presentation, Mayor Littlefield stressed the importance of creating a process open to all that seeks diverse participation,

recognizes and preserves every idea presented, promotes trust, eliminates barriers to a “sincere and honest dialogue,” and focuses on concrete, workable solutions. The vision has literally created a new way of doing business in Chattanooga with sustained, extensive public involvement in a wide variety of initiatives.

B. Springfield, Missouri

Tom Finnie, who recently retired as Springfield’s City Manager, presented the experience of Springfield, Missouri. In Springfield, the vision was initiated by City Council as the first step in creating a new comprehensive plan for the community. VISION 20/20 began in 1994 with more than 350 individuals volunteering to work together to identify a community vision. They were organized into thirteen focus groups that met over a period of 18 to 24 months leading up to the adoption by the City of Springfield and Greene County of the *VISION 20/20 Concept Plan* in early 1997. The *VISION 20/20 Concept Plan* identified policies and actions aimed at achieving the community’s vision; its elements were eventually adopted by City Council as individual elements of the comprehensive plan. Adoption began in 1999 with the *Center City and Parks, Open Space, & Greenways* plans; it concluded with the adoption of the *Transportation* plan in 2001. The City dedicated its planning director full-time to coordinate the effort, and used consultants to complete specific elements of the comprehensive plan, as needed.

The vision has had a positive impact on the community. One measure of that impact has been the overwhelming approval by citizens of 14 referenda to fund specific components of the vision. Other achievements include the approval of a hotel-motel tax increase for Jordan Valley Park and four other Springfield attractions; the establishment of a Neighborhood Assessment Program; the development of the Partnership Industrial Center West; substantial reinvestment in the Center City – including new businesses and new public buildings, with loft development and other residential uses now occurring in the downtown area; and the dedication of a 350-acre Central Park in the city’s downtown.

C. Champaign County, Illinois

John Dimit, Chief Executive Officer of the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission, presented the experience of Champaign County, a community that is currently conducting a vision process. Called *big.small.all* to stress its openness to all kind of ideas, the Champaign County vision emerged not from any crisis or single over-riding issue, but from a sense that the community could do better and had to do better to remain competitive. *big.small.all* started in August 2005 and will end in September 2006. The purpose of the

vision is to define a future for Champaign County that is clear, compelling, and broadly shared, and to spur action to realize the vision in specific, concrete ways – not by force of law, but by shared commitment in the community.

The vision is being conducted by an unincorporated non-profit organization guided by a diverse steering committee. The steering committee has mobilized the large number of volunteers needed to make the project successful, and the content of the effort is solely in the hands of the participants. After an initial phase of community brainstorming meetings and workshops, a broad-based group of interested citizens, known as the “Community Assembly,” has been tasked with the refinement of the public’s vision into a county-wide action plan. The Community Assembly will also develop “key performance areas” that will help realize the vision, and establish indicators of progress for each of these areas.

Funding for the process has come from a variety of public and private sources to deliberately expand a sense of ownership in the vision. The University of Illinois and local jurisdictions are among the financial supporters of *big.small.all*.

Part 3: Table Dialogue Activity

A. Overview

During the Table Dialogue activity, participants worked in small groups and were asked to respond to two questions:

1. What are some of the potential benefits of undertaking a vision process in Columbia?; and
2. What are some of the potential obstacles to undertaking a vision process in Columbia?

After a brief period for silent generation of ideas and note taking, participants shared their responses to these questions with their table. At each table, one group member was selected to record the group’s input on a reporting sheet. Twenty-nine groups completed their reporting sheets. The consultants used these reporting sheets to identify the main themes and ideas that resulted from the Table Dialogue activity. A total of 218 individual participant worksheets were collected; these were also reviewed and demonstrated a high level of consistency with the group reporting sheets.

B. Summary of Results

Verbatim responses from each group can be found in Appendix A. The collective output from all of the groups is summarized below. For the purpose of clarification, a distinction has been made between participants’ ideas and impressions related to a potential vision *process*, and their ideas and impressions related to potential vision *outcomes*.



The Table Dialogue Activity provided an opportunity for small group discussion.

Potential Benefits: Vision Process

In discussing the benefits of conducting a vision, forum participants expressed broad support for the process associated with it. They liked the fact that a vision is creative, proactive rather than reactive, and positive in its focus (unlike other public forums which tend to have a more negative or contentious format). They also felt that a vision would create a strong sense of ownership among community members since it tends to be more community-driven rather than government-driven.

Participants appreciated that a visioning process can converge diverse groups and enhance a sense of community. They liked the fact that the process brings different groups together and is inclusive of all community members, providing an opportunity for people to listen, understand different viewpoints, and educate each other about a variety of issues. Participants felt that such an opportunity can reduce divisiveness and polarization in the community, help people discover their shared values, and bridge differences between diverse constituencies. They noted that visioning offers the opportunity to compromise, build consensus, and develop creative solutions to problems. As one group phrased it, “People tend to complain less and participate more in this kind of process. It’s nice to find out where we agree.” Various groups expressed hope that such efforts could help build community spirit and good will.

Potential Benefits: Vision Outcomes

In addition to citing benefits related to process, the comments provided also addressed benefits related to positive outcomes resulting from a vision. Participants liked the idea of having a long-term vision, a plan for the future that focuses on the “big picture”. Growth management was a key theme that surfaced during the forum. As one group noted, a vision “moves the community to thoughtful future growth and wise use of resources, infrastructure, and land use.” Several groups noted that a vision could help preserve Columbia’s defining characteristics and sense of identity, and help direct development so that new growth is in line with the community’s plans for the future.

Participants liked that a vision would help the community set priorities and work toward common goals. They noted that the broad support generated during the visioning process would facilitate implementation of the vision. Specifically, various groups pointed out that a vision could generate more public support for government initiatives and tax referendums. Other groups noted that a vision could open up new opportunities for economic development.

Leadership was another significant theme that surfaced. Participants felt that undertaking a vision could increase the public’s

trust in existing leadership and public processes. They also noted that visioning efforts could help to develop new leadership within the community. In particular, several groups pointed out that a vision might be a good way to involve the University and its students as full participants in the community.

Ideas from many of the groups suggested that a vision could support a new way of doing business in Columbia. Participants felt that a vision could encourage more intergovernmental collaboration at city, county, and regional levels. They also noted the potential for expanding public-private partnerships. Many groups saw a vision as a good way to renew the democratic process and encourage more public participation. They pointed out that a vision could lead to a more responsive and transparent government, one that promotes buy-in at the outset of projects and engages a broad spectrum of stakeholders. Participants noted that such reforms could reduce the influence of special interest groups, lead to greater predictability in city projects, and generate results that benefit all community members – including low-income and disadvantaged residents.

Potential Obstacles: Vision Process

In their discussion of obstacles to a vision process, forum participants expressed concern that the process would not achieve a necessary breadth of involvement. They pointed out that demographic diversity was essential, and that special provisions might be needed to attract youth, low-income people, and other traditionally under-represented groups. In particular, they noted that transportation and child care needs may limit people's ability to participate. Participants also explained that a vision process would require the sincere involvement of major entities and institutions – including the city, county, university, businesses, banks, developers, hospitals, etc. Some groups were also concerned about how a vision may play out on a regional level. As one group noted, "We'll probably have difficulty getting a county-wide planning process endorsed by all government entities, and a vision which doesn't include the entire county will be destined to fail."

The timeframe and cost of a vision were other key concerns. Participants noted that the length of the process might lead people to lose interest and become apathetic. Several groups mentioned that a vision could be a very costly undertaking, and that it may be difficult to obtain the financial backing needed to see it through.

The "polarization" of the community was another challenge identified by participants. Many groups expressed concern that conflict between competing interests could block constructive dialogue, or that special interest groups might be able to "highjack" the process for their own agenda. Participants noted that the media

tends to drive public opinion in Columbia, and that media buy-in would be essential for the success of a vision. The transient nature of the student population was also a concern – some groups suggested that students may have less of a stake in the community’s future as compared to other residents. Participants emphasized that it would be essential to keep the public involved throughout the process, and ensure that visioning activities remain open and transparent.

Potential Obstacles: Vision Outcomes

Regarding the outcome of a vision, forum participants expressed one primary concern – that the end result must be implemented and enforceable, and not just another document on the shelf. Certain comments suggested that distrust in the potential for implementation stems from a perceived lack of implementation of previous plans. Some groups noted that existing, entrenched power structures may block implementation of the vision. In light of the difficulties of achieving compromise and consensus, another concern was that the final vision might be too diluted or generic, and not effectively address the community’s needs. As one group phrased it, “Will we be as bold as we need to be?”

Part 4: Exit Survey

An anonymous and voluntary exit questionnaire was distributed at the forum to gauge participants’ interest in undertaking a vision type of planning process, and to collect information on participants’ demographics. A total of 280 participants completed the exit questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of twelve questions; for the majority of these questions, response rates were around 96 to 98 percent.

A. Forum Evaluation

Responses to the evaluation portion of the questionnaire demonstrate widespread support for developing a vision for Columbia’s future. Nearly 94 percent of respondents want some kind of broad, community based plan, and nearly 89 percent of respondents believe that a visioning process similar to the ones described during the forum would benefit the community. About 84 percent of respondents expressed interest in personally participating in a visioning process. For those who would like to participate, the top areas of interest are Environment, Downtown, Transportation, Arts and Culture, and Social Issues.

The following tables show a numerical breakdown of the questionnaire responses.

1. Do you believe Columbia should develop a broad, community-based plan for the future?

	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Yes	261	93.9%
Maybe	16	5.8%
No	1	0.4%
Total	278	100.0%

2. Do you believe a visioning process, as described tonight, would benefit our community?

	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Yes	245	88.8%
Maybe	29	10.5%
No	2	0.7%
Total	276	100.0%

3. If the decision is made to pursue a vision process, would you be interested in participating?

	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Yes	225	83.6%
Maybe	39	14.5%
No	5	1.9%
Total	269	100.0%

4. What is your specific area of interest? [Check all that apply.]

	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Environment	149	12.0%
Downtown	145	11.7%
Transportation	135	10.9%
Arts and Culture	122	9.8%
Social Issues	119	9.6%
Economic Development	114	9.2%
Education	109	8.8%
Neighborhoods	108	8.7%
Housing	87	7.0%
Recreation	83	6.7%
Government	70	5.6%
Total	1241	100.0%

5. Please provide any further comments you believe would be helpful. (Optional)

While write-in responses to this optional question varied widely, some key themes did emerge. In general, the ideas expressed under this question reflect the same issues that arose during the Table Dialogue activity discussions. Most notably, many respondents emphasized the need for widespread participation in the process – including youth, minority, and low-income people. Some respondents suggested that meetings should be held at variable times and locations in order to draw greater public involvement, and noted that public transportation schedules should also be taken into account.

The importance of City-County cooperation was also mentioned by several respondents, who indicated that a visioning process should extend beyond Columbia to encompass all or part of Boone County. Implementation was another key theme, with several respondents noting the importance of truly incorporating public input and ensuring tangible results in the community.

B. Demographic Information

Among the questionnaire respondents, over half (55 %) are male, and over 90 percent are white. A large majority of respondents (70 percent) are between ages 35 and 64, with about one-third falling between 55 and 64. About two-thirds of respondents have household incomes over \$50,000, and 31 percent have household incomes over \$100,000. Respondents are highly educated, as 88 percent have a college degree and nearly 50 percent have pursued some form of post-graduate study. Respondents tend to be long-term residents—nearly 73 percent have lived in Columbia for 10 years or more, with 44 percent claiming 20 or more years of residency.

The demographics of respondents closely tracked the City’s demographics with one exception: African Americans account for only 4.8 percent of the respondents, while they account for 10.9 percent of the City population. The information presented in the following tables can be compared with census data or other data sets to determine how participation at the forum compares with the overall demographics of the Columbia population.

6. What is your gender?

	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Male	148	54.4%
Female	124	45.6%
Total	272	100.0%

7. Please tell us which ethnic or racial group you most closely identify with.

	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
White/Caucasian	244	90.4%
Black/African American	13	4.8%
Asian	11	4.1%
Other	2	0.7%
Total	270	100.0%

8. Are you Hispanic or Latino?

	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Yes	4	1.6%
No	244	98.4%
Total	248	100.0%

9. What is your age?

	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Under 19	3	1.1%
20-24 years	4	1.5%
25-34 years	31	11.4%
35-44 years	45	16.5%
45-54 years	58	21.2%
55-64 years	89	32.6%
65-74 years	30	11.0%
75 or older	13	4.8%
Total	273	100.0%

10. Please tell us about your annual household income.

	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Less than \$15,000	15	5.8%
\$15,000 to \$34,999	39	15.1%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	32	12.4%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	48	18.5%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	45	17.4%
More than \$100,000	80	30.9%
Total	259	100.0%

11. Please tell us about your education attainment level.

	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Less than a high school diploma	4	1.5%
High school diploma	4	1.5%
Some college	24	8.8%
College graduate	79	28.8%
Post-graduate study	163	59.5%
Total	274	100.0%

12. How long have you lived in the Columbia area?

	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
0-4 years	33	12.1%
5-9 years	41	15.1%
10-19 years	54	19.9%
20+ years	119	43.8%
Life-long resident	25	9.2%
Total	272	100.0%



One table shares the results of its discussion with the larger group.

Part 5: Conclusions

The responses from forum participants indicate unequivocal support for the notion of developing a vision program in Columbia. They also begin to suggest how the vision process can best address Columbia’s unique circumstances. Four guiding principles with key recommendations emerged from the comments received from the Table Dialogue activity and can help structure the process. The principles are:

- 1) **Maximize public involvement** so that all community members, including minorities, low-income, youth, and traditionally underrepresented groups can get involved in a meaningful way. This principle suggests that the vision should aim to attract residents well beyond “professional participants,” stakeholders, and special interest groups. It suggests the need for developing an extensive outreach effort specifically targeted to involve a broad and representative cross section of the community. It suggests that public meetings must be strategically located and designed (see next principle) to facilitate access and participation.

- 2) **Develop a process that is positive in focus, safe, creative, and fun** so that differences and tensions that exist in the

community today can be bridged and shared common values can be discovered. This is accomplished through a rigorous design of both the overall vision process and individual meetings. The overall vision process needs to be laid out in a way that each meeting has a clear purpose and presented so that purpose is understood by the public. Individual meetings need to be designed and facilitated to ensure that all residents who participate have an equal opportunity to contribute their ideas. Meetings should favor dialogue over grandstanding and minimize opportunities for manipulation by special interest groups and individuals. Exercises should be interactive, engaging, designed to capitalize on residents' intuitive knowledge and understanding of issues, and focused on surfacing shared community values.

- 3) **Ensure that the vision is truly community-driven** so that the all key decisions about the future of Columbia are arrived at through constructive city-wide dialogue. This principle suggests a commitment to transparency and structuring the process to enable public deliberations at critical junctures. Transparency and community driven decision-making translates into ownership of the results and support during implementation.
- 4) **Involve key institutions** (such as the City and County, the three universities, the printed and electronic media, the business community, and individual property owners and developers) to encourage intergovernmental and public-private collaboration at city, county, and regional levels. This principle suggests that a specific targeted effort should be made at the onset of the process to gain institutional endorsements and in some cases financial support. Institutional involvement should be nourished while the process is underway through timely and periodic sharing of information, and should extend to the implementation phase. During implementation institutions and individuals can play very significant roles. Their involvement in implementation can be expedited by the understanding and knowledge they have of the process and its results.

Participants raised one important question: Should the vision be focused on the City of Columbia or should it expand to include surrounding communities and Boone County? The pros and cons of expanding the vision beyond Columbia should be carefully considered. On the positive side, expanding the process to the region

will more closely address the reality of how the city functions today with residential, businesses, and commercial areas freely crossing jurisdictional lines. On the negative side, regions have fewer institutional mechanisms to facilitate the implementation of the vision and require more deliberate implementation steps. Keeping the process within Columbia will provide the regulatory, funding, and planning tools for implementation of the vision. Limiting the vision to Columbia, however, will also limit how much shared values, sense of place, and character will affect the region as a whole.

This report will be discussed at the Council Retreat on June 22, 2006 and during a Council Work Session, yet to be determined. The public will be invited to attend the work session to talk publicly about the outcomes of the forum.

Imagine Columbia's Future

CITY OF COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
APPENDICES

PREPARED BY
ACP-VISIONING & PLANNING, LTD.

MAY 31, 2006

Appendices

- A. Responses – Table Dialogue Activity
- B. Worksheet and Reporting Form – Table Dialogue Activity
- C. Exit Survey
- D. Community Profiles

Appendix A: Responses – Table Dialogue Activity

Responses – Table Dialogue Activity

The output below shows each table’s responses to the following questions, as recorded on their Table Dialogue Reporting Forms.

Question 1: What are some of the potential benefits of undertaking a vision process in Columbia?; and

Question 2: What are some of the potential obstacles to undertaking a vision process in Columbia?

Table	Potential Benefits	Potential Obstacles
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustained, controlled growth Greater community cooperation and contributions – ownership Having an opportunity to focus on the big picture instead of just the day-to-day activities Greater horizontal involvement v. vertical 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too many individual visions – need to be better reconciled Assuring all the major entities in the community are involved (county, university, city, etc) Special interest groups pulling various directions
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discover we all don’t want the same things Fosters better listening – hearing what others are saying Help to foster a sense of “intention”, as communities have a tendency to drift. Identify the positive things we have and what else we think we need. Process is a community-building activity In future Columbia will be well-designed city w/ long term planning, long term vision Enhance our public facilities Increase community dialogue and deliberation May have an unanticipated benefit Potential to stimulation positive economic development Great opportunity to improve our community overall If we did a really good visioning, would transform the leadership in community as well as develop new leadership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Getting all segments of community involved (diverse stakeholder participations) Cost (adequate financial resources?) Missouri stoicism – Missourians tend to make do than seek grandiose (show me!) Columbia wonderful to come up w/ ideas – univ and “regular” people – getting them to listen to each other To decide identification of Columbia – education? Economic? How to develop in the future? Sustained participation over long-term Will to carry out the vision Developers vision not in the best interest of uncontrolled development “hardliners” – fear of the other side city gov’t – their need to control the process no design expert.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bring opposing groups together Bring objectives of the community – better support for tax increases Expansion of resources to benefit all, especially under-privileged More new leadership Government (city-county-regional) cooperation Unified effort to broadly discuss opportunities Broad participation Synergistic generation of new ideas All interests to share goal Growth of arts and culture Synergy created by consensus Optimistic Differences dealt with (some notes illegible) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of civic effort, apathy, non-voters Hard to get things done through coop Getting beyond apparent polarization of community Inclusiveness can be an obstacle Will we be as bold as we need to be? Avoid getting bogged down in ???? Will other entities be included in the process Ideas without self-education – could be only the repeat of the latest popular thing Usual suspects
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diversity of buy-in via a broad spectrum of stakeholders Create variety of solutions and opinions Build trust in the community Develop standards for housing, neighborhood, and business growth. Less acrimony among community groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of city, county, university, public schools cooperation (should not just be city-based) Cost Resistance to vision by elected officials and special interest groups Complete process in reasonable timeframe
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive guide for future – gets/ provides input Reviewed/updated on regular basis What is Columbia? – Identity – help capture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> huge population of skeptics – how do you get the general population involved, make people feel included?

Table	Potential Benefits	Potential Obstacles
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People w/ great sense of fairness – inclusive • Respect for ideas • Identify problems • Type of growth • ??? (several illegible notes) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't shoot ideas down • Need to understand that it is citizen-driven, not political.
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Become more competitive in economic development, spousal employment • Developing a greater understanding of those with whom we seldom interact • Increase economic potential and diversity in the community – wider range of demographic groups • Clearer direction for decision-makers for what the larger community would like to see done; building in accountability • Utilize our 3 universities, medical community, to increase economic leverage – what we have to bring more industries and get infrastructure on track w/ the pace of growth • Improve infrastructure before its critically needed – long-range planning (macro perspective). • Create more leaders – include more members of the community • Reduce the sprawl problem – structure for how growth should occur • Help Columbia determine what community we want to be • Take the future and work it backwards – recognize it will be different • Go with a process we've seen today • Encourage and enhance participatory democracy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of diversity of needs / ideas. Accountability and comprehensive communication • Having a true plan and vision • Special interest groups hijacking process; limiting constructive dialogue; using this forum • Polarized community; maintaining civility of discourse.
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration of all community groups • Opportunity for people of divergent viewpoints to hear and understand those different viewpoints • Maintaining charm, interest of community • Columbia needs to have an identity, not lose its flavor • Open communication lines, hear all groups • Strong regional plan / vision for marriage of university, city, region, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanding public transportation • See community grow in a manner that reflects the best of our past • Savings of time and cost if working toward a few common goals rather than many conflicting goals • Sense of purpose • Helping citizens have an investment • Potential for coming up with a way to keep unbridled growth from eating up green space and similar issues affecting quality of life. • People of different backgrounds come together and build common values and goals – can be implemented • Leadership training and more brains thinking about the same thing • Interested in the city looking good to people coming here and for potential growth • City and county cooperation • People tend to complain less and participate more in this kind of process. Nice to find out where we agree. • Understand the real sense of direction for the community

Table	Potential Benefits	Potential Obstacles
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sense of community wide spirit • Realize we're all not alike – find out needs and compromise in coming up with solutions • Better government – truly of the people 	
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People heard in various groups, committees, commissions input is organized • Better communications across the entire community spectrum • Decide on, and then maintain, the Columbia we desire • Inclusion of a broad population in the decision process • Organized, in better, overall development plan • Discussion on issues that people feel strongly about would be apt to be heard • Being ahead of the curve, rather than always playing catch up • Transparency and therefore trust • Long term benefit for future generations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic barriers • Class barriers – “glass ceiling” • Reliance on sales tax for funding sources – impacts low income population • Rigid city gov't structure • Planning overrides committees / volunteer input - Individual members therefore discouraged and see no benefit to their service • Involving fringe groups or individuals • Frustrations if people feel they aren't being heard.
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move forward more rapidly by engaging in this process • Create a more informed, committed and vigilant citizenry • Opportunity to find out what sort of city we would like to become and examine possibilities of attaining that city • Could help in achieving consensus re: direction and amount of growth • Improve our ability to preserve key defining characteristics of our community • Opportunity to cross-reference ideas • Identify what changes Columbia needs that will attract long-lasting airline services • Work on perception that people are more important (people first) • Bridging differences in community such as academic v commercial, hi / lo econ, city v suburb 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level of short-term inhabitants • People too busy • Financial limitation • Small visions get lost • Overcoming doubt in the process will make a difference • Entrenched power blocs (dev/bus/environmentalists) which lead to complacent citizenry.
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive planning – city/county/univ • Focus on future – what is important • Better communication between parties • Citizen-led, not gov/power-led • Inclusive of community – average people will have a voice • Better communication • Become more dynamic of a city • Economic enhancement that benefits everyone • Shared vision for the community to focus on • Sustainable and manageable growth to benefit our future • New ideas that may not have been brought up before • Columbia can always be improved • Everyone will have a voice • Large # of people will buy into the process • People won't be afraid of each other – will learn to talk • Policy makers will know what the people want/desire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost • Gov't factionalism • How does it affect me? • Convincing people to participate • Finding the time – can people give the commitment? • Political and spiritual differences between people • Willingness to fund goals? • Length of time involved • Do we start from scratch – do we disregard Metro 20/20? • Don't see any obstacle • Getting everyone together
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater sense of community good will. Greater consistency and predictability in city projects. Ideas fit with city desires. A benchmark to basis city decisions. It will narrow the debate on issues. • Education on community issues, on things outside your interest. More thought about the future instead of near term (next year) • Developers and neighborhoods do not trust the city. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust buy-in. That the end result will be implemented and enforceable. • That the city decision process can be affected. • That decisions will be made on a broad concept of community interest, not solely on monetary and zoning regulations • Balanced participation btwn “rational powers” (gov't developers, chamber members) and

Table	Potential Benefits	Potential Obstacles
	<p>Help to develop consensus on development issues. A broad basis to develop consensus, less contention</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transparency is really necessary. All people of community can speak. Thinking ahead instead of playing catch up. • Interaction with people we normally would not work with. Learn what we have in common • Much less influence of special interest groups with this process. This can build trust in the community. • Strengthen leadership with a guide for future development with goals and objectives. Can challenge future developments based on the vision development. • Take care of baby boomers who age in place, age in our homes. Look at global trends in these aging issues • Creative process – everyone involved can shape their community • Vision process will build a consensus which will allow us to move forward with Vision created from grass roots and not from the media, public officials, special interests, etc. 	<p>regulations – how to keep all parts of the spectrum engaged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited buy-in, not inclusive enough • Too detailed, specific, too certain.
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less conflict over development • Unifying force for the community • Collaboration of groups & individuals – thoughts to assist in developing a community w/ balance. • Crossing of neighborhood & political boundaries • Opportunity for ordinary citizens to have a voice where city is headed. • More of a community sense of ownership in the city • Evolutionary process designed to guide the region’s development • Support for taxation – financial and political support • Artist growth and tourism expansion – income • Coordination between public/private use/distribution of land • More equitable distribution of community resources • Forges public and private partnerships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So-called community leaders will try and control the process • Get referendums and taxes to pass; overcoming apathy • Reaching the silent majority, getting all cross-sections involved • Struggle btwn power and influence • Entrenched positions, territorial battles • Trying to avoid lack of cooperation – everyone needs to look at the big picture • Lack of cooperation between local, state, and fed gov • Lack of funds • Disconnect between volunteers and gov officials • Lethargy, lack of volunteers to carry work forward. • Conflicts of interest • Using outside contractors over local talent • Lack of racial cooperation and participation.
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in divisiveness and hostility • Enhance social cohesion • Enhance trust in public officials and the public process • Level playing field for growth and development • Provide cohesion between all units of gov’t and the public • Give us a plan to follow, and provide immediate gratifications • Promote long-term thinking • Will bring the community together in a positive way • Obtain consensus about problems and provide consensus on possible solutions • Creative ideas • Cultivate leadership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Getting broad participations • Personal agendas dominating • Entrenched power structure • Perception of a lack of implementation of previous plans • Satisfaction of status quo & citizen apathy • Need for a dedicated meeting location
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most citizens should support – they should buy into. Should support a variety of avenues to address the city’s needs • Consensus can be reached at early stages to avoid later friction. Decisions can be made regarding growth by broadening perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competing interests, money, time, fear of change • Some voices could dominate • Trying to create common ground. Getting and keeping diverse members of the community involved • Some segments under-represented. Resources and

Table	Potential Benefits	Potential Obstacles
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input from many people; fair representation of the community • Better planning for growth, making Columbia a more desirable place to live. • Better mutual understanding btwn stakeholders, educating community about issues • Bring together competing segments of the community. Potential for progress toward common goals, more responsive gov'n't • Civic education, especially for students • Creating common ground for evaluating future decisions and changes. • Create community buy-in for the future. Create a place children will want to stay in. Columbia will feel like "our" town, not "any" town. • Getting things done – trust the city to do. • Educate – involvement - ownership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> staffing • Keeping it transparent • Fear of change • City/county cooperation • Everyday people too busy to get involved. • Not accepting all contributions • Getting bogged down in minutiae • Time commitment – fear of change – difficulty of obtaining representation from all parts of the populations
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Getting more done due to broad support • More involvement by more people in decision making • Diversity – better understanding what people from diverse groups think – empathy • Include our newest members (immigrants) in the process • Moves the community to thoughtful future growth and wise use of resources, infrastructure and land use • May keep students in Columbia / feel a part of the community • Involving children and elderly will breakdown segregation by age in the community • Positive focus in a public forum – instead of the negativity of city council mtgs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immigrants don't have the tools for communication / language barriers (no strong programs to learn English) • Columbia has a somewhat transient population and may undermine relationship bldg in the process – may not have a stake in the future • Population / present fragmentation of community – could be afraid to speak up. • People in the community are more used to doing thing on own initiative – may be set in ways • Columbia's self image is skewed – it is a false one – we will have to deal w/ a more realistic view • Sustaining interest over time and seasons • Making process work and seeing results / focusing ideas into viable projects • The P.A. system • Implementing the vision – instead of putting the plan on the shelf.
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common agenda • Sense of community • More innovative plan • Include groups that are left out, especially low-income • Potentially lead to a stable community • More buy-in from people • Process is a valuable opportunity • Not a winner take-home like fed gov't • More people involved • Wider awareness of community problems and more ideas of how to address problems • Gov't need to include all aspects – cuts down on special interests • Educate people in approach of getting something done • Equal time to all – good • More overall view, rather than focus on neighborhood • Special interest groups can make their point that their interest in broad 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not positive, people won't want to do again – what affect will it have • City-county collaboration • Apathy • Conflicts between competing interests • Trying to get people from all avenues to participate • All the committee meetings • What's in it for people that already have power • Sounds expensive • Some people may feel left out • Out of town wealth • Decision makers not supporting vision • Getting buy-in from university • Big institutions must be involved (shelter – State Farm – Hospitals – banks – developers) • Now development is confrontational – this needs to change – developers need to know how to do business in the community • Making sure process is open to the public, keeping it open • Changing the rules of the process as you go along.
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More authentic, nuanced discussion – constructive conversation v contentious. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicating w/ others – part of community that's not used to talking on an ed. [educated] level

Table	Potential Benefits	Potential Obstacles
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow everyone in the community to have input • Individuals feel pride in ownership of the vision • Buy-in by more people other than those “normally involved” • For city – easier to get referendums passed • Having a plan can help ease problems of growth – esp rapid growth; prevent sprawl • Develop consensus on growth and development • Help us determine what Columbia looks like (aesthetics, appearance) – sporadic now • Possibly less traffic problems (unintended consequences) • More satisfactory employment and social outcomes for low-income? • Better city-county shared vision if county is involved • Develop skill in communicating w/others • Stem in right direction – Columbia won’t be as “backwards” – more and different ideas brought forward. • More diverse ideas for the future • Thinking about who to attract will help us do some things differently • Allow Columbia to think bigger – more planning ahead – complete plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realistic understanding of expectations and timetables / time frame for results • Univ. people may not feel invested • Potential to be so generic and utopian that practicality is lost • Getting low-income under-represented involved and interested. • Conflict btwn committee and elected officials, developers, business people • Complicated / involved • Reaching a consensus • Apathy from those not traditionally interested in the civic process • There are only 24 hrs per day – who has time to go to all these mtgs?
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See direction of the community as a whole – see what kind of community we want to be – big picture. • More community members will feel included by opening the process to all. • This process will include economically disadvantaged – taking in to account where the people are. • Priorities will be set. • Framework will help prioritize resources • Take Columbia from a large small town to a small big city. • Community ownership in the process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining high motivation levels. • Must keep process moving, don’t let it stall. • Preventing outside sources from directing where we’re going.
20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ownership in community • Proactive vs. Reactive • Helps develop leaders • Makes something unique for Columbia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritization of tasks • Costs of implementation
22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group consensus • Social and economic development • Coordinated city-county development (not just Columbia) • Sustainability for future generations • Young people & students will stay here • Improve public safety – improve communications • Public perception that there is an overall vision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inter-governmental relations • Top-down government • Getting all the constituents to talk to each other • Lethargy – get people to care (same people who don’t vote) • Getting community to understand the difference between visioning and planning. • Get community to believe anything positive will happen • Funding – this will cost money • Media buy-in
23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned, organized growth so development/ infrastructure makes sense. • Less polarization regarding growth. • Collaboration between public and private. • Process includes broad spectrum. • Coordinated planning among/ between agencies/ government/ etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lethargy • Lot of work • Mentality of scarcity • Who’s in charge? • Completion within a reasonable time period. • Talk standing for action – need results not just another document.

Table	Potential Benefits	Potential Obstacles
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactive instead of reactive momentum. • Prepare and manage change. • Increased awareness of community needs/ assets. • Consideration of future environmental issues / planning. • Practical solutions to sustainable energy/ • City/county cooperation. • University as full participant in community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No sense of community/ common good. • Distrust
24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help develop more consensus in planning process – broader range of people feel like they have a role • Will result in implementation of things • More diversity with a vision than without • Costs a lot of money to fight the battles – we’re wasting tons of money to disagree • Increase livability and viability as a result of community buy-in • Connect university students more with the community • Really good way to try to involve people • A better Columbia • Build a sense of community throughout Columbia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to involve people who aren’t involved to think about the future and want to be (daycare? Transportation? ???) • A lot of wacko people who have a loud voice and intimidate others • Could create more divide if can’t find a common vision • City staff burnout and less ??? in other areas • Money, time and commitment • Lack of agreement among participants as to how to ??? • Resistance from old guard people who feel their power might be usurped • Fear that end result might be ???as a binding document • Involving students who are transient • Lack of trust and misunderstanding.
25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involving more citizens in looking at how Columbia is and how it should be – public participation. • Opportunity to prioritize projects. • Diversity of interests – educate the public about issues of concern to other citizens. • Columbia can improve quality of life by focusing on needs of particular segments of the community. • Allow a pathway toward participating in global economy • Shared clarity of what Columbia should look and feel like • Could be impetus for better city and county gov’t cooperation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$ • Additional responsibility on city staff • Governmental turf wars • Not urban fringe of Boone County • A willingness to change – city, county, individuals • Inclusion of groups difficult to reach • Clarify the area included in the vision process.
26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of diversity of citizen voices • Giving people a sense of ownership in their community • Communities have a buy-in in the development • Focus on areas and resources that need more attention • More people involved – better idea of what community wants • “Reducing knee-jerk reaction to squeaky wheels.” • Help to develop a better understanding of what the citizens want. Help to implement a plan. • Improve the democratic process in the community. • Diversity of approaches & the synergy of the group becomes different than any individual brings to the table. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dollars to implement • People lose interest and feel they’re wasting time – only those with financial interest will continue.
27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give opportunity for more people to voice opinions • Everybody can win if all sectors come together • Formerly worked in state; people in Columbia have energy and love their town. • Builds cohesion; sense of ownership; align private and public sectors in community. • Columbia is diverse but strong thread is missing and can strengthen relationship between groups of all kinds at all levels. • Long view and get beyond red/blue state. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build incredibly cool visions – don’t have them waylaid. • County/city community that has cultural divisions; have to come together. • Have strong NIMBY, protective forces. • Have polarization of media – drives public opinion • Concerned will push its vision on citizens • How do you keep average citizens involved to the end instead of just activists • People to participate and variety of people.

Table	Potential Benefits	Potential Obstacles
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserving what's unique about Boone County and Columbia as we grow • Transportation, housing economic changes that will help community succeed in evolving international, energy, technical, environmental conditions. • Discovering shared value and learning about different perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City rotates around higher education, insurance, and medical and they all need to work together. • Making sure cross section of people and youth involved right away. • Can lead to fissures developing • Transportation and child care will be obstacles for people getting involved. • MU and City disconnect. • Breaking down "good old boy" culture – dominant culture barrier • Short views on planning and development • County relationships important – with other counties • Development south of town is not connected to transportation which makes it difficult. • Maybe some goals are mutually exclusive? People have different values.
28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The broader the support is the quicker the implementation. • It would unite the community in a common direction and it will ease some of the growing pains caused by rapid growth. • All citizens that want to participate get fair participation. • Allowing creative ideas to be discussed and considered. • We would be more thoughtful in our growth – grow by ideas in creative planning. • Learning about consensus – creating bridges, methods of agreement. • All citizens participate for the public interest, not just a few. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to get cooperation of all major entities that are stakeholders. They are highly fragmented. • Drawing out folks who don't normally participate to be involved – eg high school students. • Ideas may be too simplified or stifled by others – ideas can be diluted. • Financial backing to do the appropriate research – eg travel expenses to other cities. • Process gets too focused on specific politicized issues rather than broad community focus. • Failure to summon resources to implement ideas. • Process itself might be intimidating to some constituencies.
29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input from citizens rather than developers. • Bring commonwealth of agreement and understanding among diversity. • Put everyone on same playing field with equal voice. • Chance to refine our own thinking. • Transportation plan of use to all, including elders who can no longer drive. • Plan and anticipate problems and issues before need to respond in crisis. • Renewing a democratic process. • Create a process of fair decision-making. Allow more community members to be involved in planning process. • Well thought-out approach to growth in our community – showed awareness / ownership of community's future. • Generate hope and excitement about the community potential. • Breakdown current polarization – us v. them – to allow us to explore real parts of the issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-categorical participation. • Compromise. • Not being able to reach out to all groups – eg low income, high school, college. • Skepticism that we will get from talk to action. • Real control of \$ in this community and its pervasive impact on our lives. • Giving up when things get hard. • Long and boring process. • Decisions that are not enforceable resulting in frustration. • Arguing. • Maintaining enthusiasm and commitment to long-term process. • Lack of a regional approach to our process – ie , airport. • Past history of not being heard. • Fear of losing power. • Special interests – MU, Realtors, etc. may not participate in good faith.
30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great forum for new ideas. • Good way – if everyone gets what they need and has fun! • Positive input provided from all citizens if we reach out to them. • Release of energies. • Cooperation of groups working towards similar and diverse goals. • Shared goals among residents of community. Awareness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visioning "top-down" and is not inclusive of the disadvantaged. Need to change modality of input. • Not thinking big enough to encompass the needs of all. • Fear of the unknown. • Apathy • Greed on the part of those who hope to profit. • Where do we find fiscal and energy support? • Find communication that unifies rather than

Table	Potential Benefits	Potential Obstacles
	<p>of problems specific to different segments of the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Willingness to help make the community a better place for all residents. 	<p>separates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental stability. • Concern for each person's needs. • None – there's always a peaceful resolution alternative.

Appendix B: Worksheet and
Reporting Form – Table
Dialogue Activity

Table Dialogue: Benefits and Obstacles

Complete this worksheet when you receive instructions from the podium. Please write legibly, and leave the worksheet in the center of your table at the end of the meeting.

1. What are some of the potential benefits of undertaking a vision process in Columbia?

2. What are some of the potential obstacles of undertaking a vision process in Columbia?

PLEASE LEAVE THIS WORKSHEET ON YOUR TABLE.
WE WILL COLLECT IT AT THE END OF THE MEETING.

Table Dialogue Reporting Form

Table Number: _____

Instructions for the Table Leader

1. Write your table number in the space above.
2. When instructed from the podium, pose the questions below to the group. Go around the group and encourage each person to share his/her ideas. Record the ideas in the space below.
3. Please write legibly.
4. Leave this reporting form in the center of your table at the end of the meeting.

1. What are some of the potential benefits of undertaking a vision process in Columbia?

2. What are some of the potential obstacles of undertaking a vision process in Columbia?

Appendix C: Exit Survey

Exit Survey

Instructions

Please complete this survey prior to leaving the meeting and leave it in the middle of the table. The surveys are anonymous and voluntary.

Evaluation

1. Do you believe Columbia should develop a broad, community-based plan for the future?

Yes Maybe No

Explain: (Optional)

2. Do you believe a visioning process, as described tonight, would benefit our community?

Yes Maybe No

Explain: (Optional)

3. If the decision is made to pursue a vision process, would you be interested in participating?

Yes No Maybe

4. What is your specific area of interest? [Check all that apply.]

<input type="checkbox"/> Arts and Culture	<input type="checkbox"/> Environment	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation
<input type="checkbox"/> Downtown	<input type="checkbox"/> Government	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Social Issues
<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development	<input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhoods	

Other: (Optional)

5. Please provide any further comments you believe would be helpful. (Optional)

Questionnaire continues on the back of this page.

Demographic Information

This information will be used to document participation at the meeting. Again, this questionnaire is anonymous.

6. What is your gender: Female Male

7. Please tell us which ethnic or racial group you most closely identify with:

Black/African-American Asian White/Caucasian Other _____

8. Are you Hispanic or Latino? Yes No

9. What is your age?

under 19 20-24 years 25-34 years 35-44 years

45-54 years 55-64 years 65-74 years 75 or older

10. Please tell us about your annual household income:

Less than \$15,000 \$15,000 to \$34,999 \$35,000 to \$49,999

\$50,000 to \$74,999 \$75,000 to \$99,999 More than \$100,000

11. Please tell us about your education attainment level:

Less than a high school diploma High school diploma

Some college College graduate Post graduate study

12. How long have you lived in the Columbia area?

0-4 years 5-9 years 10-19 years 20+ years Life-Long Resident

Thank you for completing this form and for participating in this meeting of **Imagine Columbia's Future!**

PLEASE LEAVE THIS FORM IN THE MIDDLE OF YOUR TABLE.
WE WILL COLLECT IT AT THE END OF THE MEETING.

Appendix D: Community Profiles

Community Profile: Chattanooga, TN

Part 1: The Community

Overview

Chattanooga, the fourth largest city in Tennessee, is located in the southeastern part of the state in Hamilton County. Chattanooga is the largest of ten municipalities in Hamilton County. The MSA includes the Tennessee Counties of Hamilton, Marion and Sequatchie, and the Georgia Counties of Catoosa, Dade and Walker. The city is bisected by the Tennessee River, and the riverfront area on both the north and south shores have been extensively redeveloped, which has resulted in a renaissance of the downtown area with many major attractions, restaurants and shops.

Place: Geography

Total City area is approximately 144 sq. miles

Total MSA area is 2,138 sq. miles

People: Population

Total City population -154,852

Total MSA population - 489,609

City population growth rate - -0.5% (from 2000 to 2004)

MSA population growth - 2.6% (from 2000 to 2004)

People: Race Percentage Comparison

City - White 60%, Black 36%, Other 4%. Hispanic (any race) 2.1%

MSA - White 83%, Black 14%, Other 3%. Hispanic (any race) 1.5%

Prosperity: Income

City per capita - \$19,689

MSA per capita - \$19,944 (Excludes Sequatchie County which was not part of the MSA in 2000.)

City household income - \$32,006

MSA household income - \$37,411 (Excludes Sequatchie County which was not part of the MSA in 2000.)

Housing: Median Price

City median housing price – Median sold price not available; median asking price \$72,700

MSA median housing price – Median sold price \$131,800; median asking price \$82,700 (Excludes Sequatchie County.)

What's Unique About Your Community?

Enterprise South, a 1,600 acre developable site, recently was certified as a megasite, suitable for major automotive manufacturing. This is the first site in the state to be certified as a megasite. Four foundations headquartered in Chattanooga are among the 15 largest givers in Tennessee: The Maclellan Foundation, The Community Foundation of Greater Chattanooga, Lyndhurst Foundation, and Benwood Foundation.

Part 2: The Vision Process

Why did you do a vision?

In 1969, the federal government recognized Chattanooga as having the worst air quality of any city in the United States. This was a major wake-up call. Chattanooga not only set up an Air Pollution Control Board, but key industrial and civic leaders started a major effort to educate the public on health issues. Within 5 years, Chattanooga met or exceeded all air quality standards. Chattanoogaans view that response as laying the foundation for much of the action that has taken place there over the last 20 years.

Although the air was clean by the late 1970's, the future still looked bleak. The city was beset with economic recession, social tension and general urban decline. There was no plan for the future. During this time, the Moccasin Bend Task Force had been preparing a plan to revitalize the riverfront. A handful of community leaders and members of this Task Force began to look at how other communities were pulling themselves together. They began research to identify a city that was successfully taking action on challenges similar to Chattanooga's. They chose Indianapolis and visited that city. They were impressed by the work of the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee. When they returned, they began creating a similar organization and mechanism. The result was Chattanooga Venture.

How was the process conducted?

The Vision 2000 process was conducted by Chattanooga Venture in 1984. Chattanooga Venture functioned as the convener, bringing diverse factions together around a problem-solving agenda. Venture did not do community organizing, but engaged community residents at many levels in their work. The Lyndhurst Foundation helped get Chattanooga Venture started and was the major underwriter of its general operating costs. This was a key to Venture's success. Because of Lyndhurst's support of the operating budget, Venture wasn't beholden to anyone and it allowed it to put together an extremely diverse board of 60 people.

More than 1,700 people participated in the year-long Vision 2000 process resulting in a list of 40 goals for the city by the year 2000. By 1992, 37 of the 40 goals created by Vision 2000 had been either completed or partially completed. In 1992, Chattanooga Venture again invited the community to offer its ideas for ReVision 2000. More than 2,600 people participated in which 9 community meetings generated 2,559 ideas. The ideas were developed into 27 goals and 122 recommendations.

What has been accomplished?

- Chattanooga Neighborhood Enterprise (1986), The Tennessee Riverpark (1988), Miller Plaza (1988), Tivoli Theater and Memorial Auditorium renovations (1988), Council form of government, Family Violence Shelter, Human Rights/Human Relations Commission, Bessie Smith Hall, The Tennessee Aquarium (1992), Free Electric Shuttle (1992), Walnut Street Bridge renovation (1993), Coolidge Park (1999), Development Resource Center (2001), 21st Century Waterfront (2005), Renaissance Park (2006).
- In total, 223 projects and programs were implemented as a result of Vision 2000, 1,381 jobs were created, and 7,300 related construction jobs were created. Over 1.5 million people were served, and financial investments totaled over \$793 million. With a population of 285,536 in Hamilton County, the investment in the goals of Vision 2000 amounts to \$2,778 per person (private investment \$2,083, and public investment \$695).
- The following plans used the public input process as modeled by the Vision 2000: Tennessee Riverpark Master Plan (1987), Neighborhood Plans (1988-2005), ReVision 2000 (1992), Greenway Master Plan (1994), Recreation Master Plan (1999), Futurescape Visual Preference Survey (1996), Public Art Plan (2003), Outdoor Initiative Plan (2004), Downtown Plan (2004), Comprehensive Plan (2004-2005), Education Summit (2004), Moccasin Bend National Park Plan (2006).

For more information: www.chattanooga.gov, www.rivercitycompany.com

Community Profile: Champaign County, IL

Part 1: The Community

Overview

Champaign County is located approximately 136 miles south of Chicago in the heart of the Grand Prairie region. European settlement occurred in the early 19th century and the county retains distinctive Irish, German, Mennonite, and African American communities which, along with the growing Asian and Latino populations create a diverse mix. The twin cities of Champaign and Urbana along with the adjacent Village of Savoy and the University of Illinois campus make up the core of the community constituting 62% of the County population. The Village of Rantoul in the northern part of the County comprises an additional 7% of the population. The remainder is roughly split between 20 other municipalities and the intervening rural areas. Surrounding the urbanized areas is over a half million acres of the best cropland in the world. The University of Illinois, a major research university with an enrollment of over 38,000, is by far the largest employer. Champaign County, however, is also a regional center for health care, finance, and retail businesses. About 10% of County employment is industrial. The community has special strengths in technology and computer engineering. The structure of local government is complex and overlapping; all together the County contains 187 separate taxing bodies. The County has experienced and anticipates modest growth sufficient to enable it to focus on continuing initiatives to enhance its quality of life and competitive position.

[Note: Below, all references to “city” are to Champaign-Urbana-Savoy in the aggregate, including the U of I campus (unless otherwise noted). References to “MSA” are to the Champaign County portion only.]

Place: Geography

Total City area is 34.1 square miles

Total MSA area is 998.4 square miles

People: Population

Total City population - 108,389 (2000), 114,257 (2004 est.)

Total MSA population - 179,669 (2000), 184,369 (2004 est.)

City population growth rate - +5.7% (1990-2000), +5.4% (2000-2004 est.)

MSA Population growth - +0.9% (1990-2000), +3.7% (2000-2004 est.)

People: Race Percentage Comparison (2000)

City - 71.4% White, 14.7% Black, 0.2% Native Am., 9.4% Asian, 0.03% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 1.8% Other

MSA - 78.8% White, 11.2% Black, 0.2% Native Am., 6.5% Asian, 0.03% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 1.3% Other

Prosperity: Income (1999)

City per capita - \$18,664 (Champaign City), \$25,949 (Savoy), \$15,969 (Urbana)

MSA per capita - \$19,708

City median family income - \$52,628 (Champaign), \$61,927 (Savoy), \$42,655 (Urbana)

MSA median family - \$52,591

Housing: Median Price

City median housing price (2000) - \$91,200 (Champaign city), \$147,100 (Savoy), \$89,300 (Urbana)

MSA median housing price (2004) - \$129,000

What's Unique About Your Community?

At 19.4%, Champaign County has the highest percentage of individuals with post graduate degrees of any county in Illinois. Nearly 95% of the soils in Champaign County qualify as prime farmland. The Illinois Natural Areas Inventory found no areas in the County with ecosystems sufficiently intact to qualify them as "natural"; the entire landscape has been substantially altered by human action.

Part 2: The Vision Process

Why did you do a vision?

big.small.all Champaign County emerged not from any crisis or single over-riding issue but from a lingering sense that the community could do better and had to do better to remain competitive. This was manifested in three lines of thought including (1) the need for coordinated planning across the entire county, (2) a desire for more inter-governmental coordination and public/private cooperation, and (3) the need for creative approaches to deal with constrained public finances.

How was the process conducted?

The visioning project started when the Metropolitan Intergovernmental Council, a body representing governments in the Champaign-Urbana-Savoy area, requested that the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) propose a means of addressing the concerns noted above. The CCRPC proposed a visioning process and ultimately the CCRPC Commissioners directed staff to explore the feasibility of such a project as a public/private collaboration. A series of meetings with public and private sector community leaders, starting with the Chancellor of the University of Illinois, established that there was enough support in the community to make the project feasible. An *ad hoc* group brought together by CCRPC staff, along with additional members, eventually constituted itself as a Steering Committee. A Charter was drafted to guide what would be an unincorporated non-profit organization to conduct the project. A separate "Sponsor's Council" made up of representatives from the major funders was created to provide fiscal oversight. big.small.all informally contracts with the CCRPC to provide staff and logistical support to the effort, to hold the group's funds, and to act as its contract agent with the project consultants.

The Steering Committee is responsible for the design and implementation of the project, selection of the consultant, etc. They are also the core group that has mobilized the large number of volunteers needed to make the project successful. The content of the effort is solely in the hands of the participants, a broad based group of interested citizens, constituted as the "Community Assembly." From the beginning it was established that neither the funders nor the Steering Committee would put limits on or control the work of the Community Assembly or the outcome of the project.

The Steering Committee was constituted in April 2005. The contract with ACP was signed in August and the first public meeting was held on November 1. We are approximately half way through the process and expect to have our last public meeting in September, 2006.

What has been accomplished?

Almost 1,000 separate individuals have participated in the process to date. The project has developed broad support and credibility and several other groups including a school district and the Board of Health have used processes adapted from big.small.all to address particular issues they are facing.

Our goal with this project is to spur constructive ACTION. The proof of the pudding will be in the eating and so will not be apparent until sometime after the discussions are complete.

For more information:

Website(s): www.bigsmallall.cc

Community Profile: Springfield, MO

Part 1: The Community

Overview

Springfield, Missouri is a vibrant community and is located on the Ozark Plateau in Southwest Missouri. The current estimated population is 161,605. Springfield's area of economic influence reaches 27 counties and 936,502 people. The area unemployment rate has been below 4.5% for over 10 years. The health-care industry employs over 25,000 people (15% of the total workforce) with a multi-billion dollar economic impact. Annual retail sales in Springfield have reached over \$3 billion and well over \$6 billion for the metropolitan area. Springfield is a college community with over 16 colleges and universities with a total of 41,747 students. The public school system is AAA rated and has 5 high schools, 9 middle schools, and 37 elementary schools. There are also 10 private elementary and middle schools and 5 private high schools. Nationally, Springfield has been included among the top 10 best metros for business expansion; top 10 places to live and work; and top 15 cities for doing business (among mid-sized metros.)

Place: Geography

Total City area is approximately 80 sq. miles

Total MSA area is 3,010 sq. miles. (Two counties added in June 30, 2003 contributed an additional 1,179 sq. miles)

People: Population

Total City population - 161,605

Total MSA population - over 390,000

City population growth rate - 1.1% annually

MSA population growth - 19.7% (Two counties added as of June 30, 2003 contributed an additional 45,329)

People: Race Percentage Comparison

City - White 91.7%, Black 3.3%, Amer. Ind. Alaska native 0.8%, Asian 1.4%. Hispanic (any race) 2.3%

MSA - White 94.4%, Black 1.8%, Amer Ind.& Eskimo Aluet 0.6%, Asian 0.9%, Hispanic (any race) 1.7%

Prosperity: Income

City per capita - \$17,711

MSA per capita - \$18,611

City household income - \$29,563

MSA household income - \$34,661

Housing: Median Price

City median housing price - \$119,806

MSA median housing price - \$122,771

What's Unique About Your Community?

4-Seasons; AAA rated Public School District; National Fish and Wild Life Museum; world headquarters of Bass Pro; world headquarters of Assembly of God; Tree City USA recognition; 40,000 college students; friendly and helpful people; a great retirement community.

Part 2: The Vision Process

Why did you do a vision?

The visioning was the first step in the preparation of a new comprehensive plan. There has not been an update to the vision.

How was the process conducted?

The visioning was initiated by City Council as the first step in creating a new comprehensive plan. The VISION 20/20 process began in late summer 1994 with more than 350 individuals volunteering to work together to identify a community vision. A Coordinating Committee was appointed to oversee the entire process. Thirteen focus groups spent hundreds of hours over the next eighteen to twenty-four months that led to the adoption by the City of Springfield and Greene County of the *VISION 20/20 Concept Plan* in early 1997. This document contained the Vision Statements of each of the focus groups, goals and objectives aimed at achieving the vision, and interim strategies and policies for the city and county. This preliminary work provided staff and consultants with the guidance needed to prepare detailed plans for the following areas: Center City; Parks, Open Space, & Greenways; Community Physical Image; Community Facilities; Land Use and Growth Management; Historic Preservation; Neighborhoods; and Transportation. Each of these plans was developed in the context of the community's vision and coordinated with the citizen volunteers in each focus group. These plans identified policies and actions aimed at achieving the community's vision and were eventually adopted by City Council as individual plans beginning in 1999 with the *Center City* and *Parks, Open Space, & Greenways* plans to adoption of the *Transportation* plan in 2001.

What has been accomplished?

- Adoption of the VISION 20/20 Comprehensive Plan.
- Voters overwhelmingly approved a hotel-motel tax increase for Jordan Valley Park and four other Springfield attractions.
- Voters approved Parks referendum.
- Established Neighborhood Assessment Program.
- Development of Partnership Industrial Center West.
- There has been substantial reinvestment in the Center City – including new business and new public buildings. We are seeing loft development and other residential uses in the downtown area.
- Construction of the Jordan Valley Ice Park, Springfield Exposition Center, multi-level Jordan Valley Car Park, Hammons Field baseball stadium and Jordan Valley Park Phase I.
- High rating for community planning in the biannual citizen survey.

For more information:

Website(s): <http://www.ci.springfield.mo.us/>

Community Profile: Columbia/Boone County, MO

The Community

Overview

Located in the center of the state of Missouri, Columbia is situated in the center of the United States, conveniently intersected by Interstate-70 and U.S. Highway 63. Columbia is 30 miles north of the state capitol, two hours drive from both St. Louis and Kansas City, and 90 minutes drive to the Lake of the Ozarks. Transportation amenities include access to major highways, a regional airport and city owned rail and bus services.

The City of Columbia was incorporated in 1949 and has a council/manager form of government with a mayor and six councilmembers whom are elected by the citizens of Columbia and serve as non-paid members for three years.

Place: Geography

Total City area is approximately 60 square miles

Total Boone County area is approximately 685 square miles

People: Population

Total City population – 90,967 (2005 estimate)

Total Boone County population – 143,326 (2005 estimate)

City population growth rate – 7.6% (2000-2005) – 22.3% growth rate 1990-2000

Boone County population growth rate – 5.8% (2000-2005) – 20.5% growth rate 1990-2000

People: Race Percentage Comparison

City of Columbia – White 81.5%, African American 10.9%, Asian 4.3%, Native American, Pacific Islander and other 0.4%, Two or More Races 2.1%, Hispanic (any race) 2.9%.

Boone County – White 85.4%, African American 8.5%, Asian 3.0%, Native American, Pacific Islander and other 0.4%, Two or More Races 1.9%, Hispanic (any race) 2.5%.

Prosperity: Income

City per capita – \$19,507 (2000 Census)

Boone County per capita – \$19,844 (2000 Census)

City median household income – \$33,729 (2000 Census)

Boone County median household income – \$37,485 (2000 Census)

Housing: Median Price

City median housing price – \$118,500 (single-family units, 2000 Census)

Boone County median housing price – \$107,400 (single-family units, 2000 Census)

What's Unique About Your Community?

Expansion Management Magazine rated Columbia a five-star city in its 2005 Quality of Life Quotient. Measured against 362 other MSAs, Columbia fared well in traditional quality of life indicators as well as the quality of its public schools, adult education levels, standards of living, spousal employment opportunities, traffic and commute times, lower crime rate, affordable housing and continuing education opportunities.

Columbia has a strong and diverse economy based on the education, healthcare and insurance industries. More than 17,000 are employed in education and one in five workers are employed in a bio-medicine related occupations.

Other Items of Note

- The 2000 Census indicated the number of housing units reached 35,963, a 30.5% increase from 1990.
- Columbia's fire department has an ISO rating of 3. The Insurance Service Organization (ISO) rates fire departments based on available water supply, communication systems, and fire fighting capabilities. A rating of 1 indicates the lowest risk of structural damage due to fire; a rating of 10 indicates the highest risk.
- In 2005 the Business License Office reported 4,627 business licenses for the City of Columbia.
- The 2006 Docking Institute of Public Affairs, Columbia Labor Basin Study reports the nine-county Columbia Labor Basin, has a total population of approximately 357,935, a Civilian Labor Force of 202,557 and unemployment rate of 4.9%. Nearly 96% of those employees have a high school diploma and over 69% have at least some college education.
- Largest Employers with number of employees listed: University of Missouri-Columbia (7,642); University Hospital & Clinics (3,551); Columbia Public Schools (2,030); Boone Hospital Center (1,334); City of Columbia (1,187); State Farm Insurance Companies (1,079); Shelter Insurance Companies (1,019); Federal Government (1,002); MBS Textbook Exchange (935); and, US Department of Veteran's Affairs (924).
- *Sales & Marketing Management* published the 2005 Survey of Buying Power listing Columbia Metro's Median Household Effective Buying Income as \$34,891. ACCRA Third Quarter 2005 cost of living composite index percentage for Columbia posted at 92.5%. Columbia consistently ranks below the national average of 100%.