The Ingredients for Successful and Vibrant Cities
A Preliminary Report to CEOs for Cities

Pamela Blumenthal
Hal Wolman
Nancy Augustine
Edward (Ned) Hill

Authors:

Pamela Blumenthal is a Research Assistant at the George Washington Institute of Public Policy and a doctoral student in the School of Public Policy and Public Administration at The George Washington University.

Hal Wolman is Director of the George Washington Institute of Public Policy and Professor of Political Science at The George Washington University.

Nancy Augustine is Senior Research Associate at the George Washington Institute of Public Policy

Edward W. (Ned) Hill is Professor and Distinguished Scholar of Economic Development at the Levin College of Urban Affairs at Cleveland State University and Non-resident Senior Fellow of the Brookings Institution's Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy.

The Ingredients for Successful and Vibrant Cities
Executive Summary

Background

To design or plan a good city you need a theory or an idea of what a good city should be. This requires that we know what constitutes a successful city. This report provides the results of a survey in which people involved in or closely observing the policy process – public officials at the city, regional and state levels, leaders from the private, non-profit and foundation sectors - were asked to provide their personal theories as to what made for successful cities. The goal is to provide information to assist city leaders as they help the city achieve its goal and enable them to concentrate their energy and political capital.

The Survey

A survey asking participants to identify the five ingredients of a successful city was sent to 397 people. 281 of these individuals were selected as a result of their participation in another research project examining the effect of city and state policy on urban performance. The other 116 individuals are members of CEOs for Cities (CfC). 99 responses were received. In addition, 46 CfC members participated in focus groups at CfC's December meeting in which they discussed the ingredients of a successful city. This analysis uses both sets of data, resulting in a total of 145 responses.

Results

When asked what the five most important ingredients of a successful city are, those making, influencing, and observing policy generally agreed that the essential ingredients were those that fell within the categories of economy, education, leadership, public services, and vibrancy. Moreover, these five categories were clearly distinct from the remaining five, receiving nearly twice as many mentions as the next closest category. These five categories were consistently ranked the most important both by survey respondents and by CfC members who participated in CfC focus groups in December, 2005. However, differences in their rank order emerged when examining the data by different groupings, such as by professional affiliation, census region, city size, and even response method. This suggests, for example, that leaders from different sectors in a city and its region may have somewhat differing priorities that reflect their own interests and concerns and that these differences should be recognized and may need to be negotiated around. It also suggests that leaders from different regions of the country and from cities of differing population sizes are not all likely to pursue the same approach. The fact that these differences exist and that one size doesn't necessarily fit all is of continuing concern to a national organization dedicated to promoting vibrant and successful cities.

The Ingredients for Successful and Vibrant Cities

This research builds on the statement of Kevin Lynch, America's foremost urban designer, that to design or plan a good city you need a theory or an idea of what a good city should be. To develop that idea, we need to know what constitutes a successful city. Although this is obviously a subjective question, in this project we wished to probe the views of those who have arguably the greatest ability to bring about the changes necessary to achieve the "successful city" – elected and appointed public officials at the state and local levels and leaders from the private, non-profit, and foundation sectors in cities and their regions.

The central research questions for this project are:

➢ How are successful large American cities described?
➢ What are the ingredients that go into making the city successful?
➢ What public policy processes, investment strategies, and political actions are required to support the ingredients for city success?

This report provides the results of a survey that focuses on the second question and sheds light on the first. A later report will be written that discusses the responses in the context of the urban public policy literature and blends in the knowledge of the project team participants, addressing the third research question.

The study was designed to enable people involved in or closely observing the policy process to provide their personal theories as to what made for successful urban places. An open-ended format was used to avoid limiting the range of possibilities. Participants were asked, "What do you consider the five most important ingredients of a successful city, and for each of these, please explain why it is on your list." We did not define "ingredients" or "successful," allowing respondents to interpret the question from their own perspectives. (See Appendix A for survey instrument).

The survey form was sent to a total of 397 people from two different groups. The first group, the Fannie Mae group, consisted of 281 individuals whom members of the research team had interviewed in connection with a research project examining the effect of city and state policy on urban performance. The other group consisted of 116 members of CEOs for Cities (CfC), excluding those members who were in the Fannie Mae group. The sample was a sample of convenience, consisting of current and former state and local government officials, business leaders, university presidents, foundation executives, academics, and other urban policy experts. We received 84 responses from the Fannie Mae group and 15 responses from the CfC group, giving an overall response rate of 26%. (See Appendix B for a more detailed explanation of the survey procedure.)

In addition to the 99 responses we received to the survey, 46 participants at CfC's December meeting participated in focus groups in which facilitators asked groups of participants what the five ingredients of successful cities were. Those results have also been included in our analysis, providing a total of 145 usable responses.

RESULTS

Since the question was open-ended, the responses had to be grouped together to enable us to analyze them. This was done by developing a list of possible ingredients then coding each response to identify which ingredient it was discussing. The analysis process resulted in coding all responses into one of 40 ingredients or as "other." This process is similar to that used to analyze the results of the focus groups at the December meeting. (The 40 ingredients are listed in Appendix C.)[1]

Table 1 in Appendix E provides the results for the ingredients, giving the number of the 145 respondents that identified that ingredient as one of their five and the percentage of all respondents that number represents. The most common were: general education (73 respondents, 50%), cultural and natural amenities (39, 27%), basics done well (38, 26%), healthy economy (36, 25%), leadership (35, 24%), and transportation (35, 24%).

However, 40 ingredients are too many for useful analysis, and, in any case, many of the ingredients are closely related to one another. Thus, we attempted to collapse the 40 ingredients into a smaller number of categories, the same procedure followed to analyze the results of the focus groups at the December meeting. The result of this process yielded 10 separate categories[2]: economy, education and training, leadership, partnership and commitment, public services and infrastructure, government and governance, residential vitality, quality of life, diversity, vibrancy, and land use. (The categories and their constituent ingredients are identified in Appendix C. A sample of the responses is included as Appendix D to provide a sense of what people said about the ingredients. The detailed responses will be drawn on in the later report.)

Overall results by categories

Table 1 presents the number and percentage of responses by each category.[3]

---

[1] The results for the 145 individuals who provided up to five ingredients for a successful city were coded separately by two researchers who then met and resolved any discrepancies in coding.

[2] There was also an 11th "other" category which has been eliminated from the analysis.

[3] Differences among results presented in this report are informative, but cannot be generalized since the sample was one of convenience rather than a random sample. Furthermore, the results are not necessarily statistically significant.

Table 1: Categories by Respondents

Category	Number of Participants Who Selected	Percentage of Participants Who Selected
Economy	76	52%
Vibrancy	76	52%
Education & Training	71	49%
Public Services & Infrastructure	67	46%
Leadership, Partnership, Commitment	64	44%
Government & Governance	36	25%
Quality of Life	36	25%
Diversity	34	23%
Residential Vitality	32	22%
Environment & Land Use	21	14%

Total number of participants = 145, each with up to 5 responses.

As the table indicates, the five categories of ingredients that were most often stated were almost equally distributed:
- economy (76 people, 52%);
- vibrancy (76, 52%),
- education (71, 49%),
- public services (67, 46%),
- leadership (64, 44%).

Moreover, these five categories clearly demarcate themselves from the remaining categories. All of the five most mentioned categories were selected by 44%-55% of participants, while none of the remaining five categories were selected by more than 25% of the participants. There is a clear and discernible break between the two sets of categories.

Looking at the main ingredients of each of these categories helps elucidate the results. The category of economy includes the ingredients of a growing, healthy economy and a diverse economic base. Vibrancy includes cultural and natural amenities and a vibrant downtown. Education consists of only two ingredients: general education and a skilled workforce.   The two main components of public services and infrastructure are having the basics done well and transportation. Leadership, partnership and commitment have three primary ingredients: leadership, partnerships among different sectors, and civic engagement. (See Appendix C for a list of the ingredients for each category and Appendix D for examples of the responses that were coded within each category.)

Results by response method

How do the overall results compare to the responses from the focus group participants at the December meeting? Table 2 lists the responses from the December focus group respondents in column 1 and from the remainder of the 145 respondents in column 2. The top five categories of ingredients for the focus group participants were the same as for the survey respondents, but another category, diversity, was tied with public services for the fifth place. The focus group results show more variation, and the ordering was somewhat different. The economy received the highest response rate, with 74% of focus group respondents citing it. Education, vitality and leadership were all grouped at 50% of respondents or slightly above, while public services and diversity were well below at 33%.

Note also that when the focus group participants are removed from the sample and only the survey group is examined (see the survey column in Table 2), the ordering changes from that in the entire sample as displayed in Table 1. Public services and vibrancy now surpass education and the economy at the top of the list. Diversity, which was tied for fifth by focus group participants (33% mentions) received only 19% of mentions from the survey participants.

The differences between the two survey groups and the focus group participants may be due to the different composition of the groups (we will explore this more below) or, more likely, the different circumstances of response. The focus group responses were the result of intensive interaction among several groups of 8-10 people each, a process likely to lead, we believe, to less variation within each of the groups, but more variation among the groups.

Table 2: Top Five Categories by Response Method

Response Method	Focus Group (n=46)	Survey (n=99)
	% of respondents (number of respondents)	
Economy	74% (34)	42% (42)
Education	54% (25)	47% (46)
Leadership	50% (23)	41% (41)
Public Services	33% (15)	53% (52)
Vibrancy	54% (25)	52% (51)
Diversity	*33% (15)*	*19% (19)*

Results by respondent group

We also examined whether the top five categories were different between Fannie Mae respondents and all CfC respondents (both from the focus groups and the survey). As Table 3 indicates, the top five were the same -- economy, education, leadership, public services, and vibrancy – but the order was different. Almost two-thirds of CfC respondents identified the economy as important to successful cities, and 57% thought vibrancy was important. In contrast,

fewer than half of the Fannie Mae respondents identified ingredients from either category as important.

Table 3: Top Five Categories by Respondent Group

	Group	
	Fannie Mae (n=84)	CfC Members (n=61)
	% of respondents (number of respondents)	
Economy	43% (36)	66% (40)
Education	46% (39)	52% (32)
Public Services	52% (44)	38% (23)
Vibrancy	49% (41)	57% (35)

Results by professional affiliation

In addition to identifying the ingredients of a successful city, we wanted to see if the ingredients changed based on one's perspective as a government participant, business leader, university administrator, or other position. For example, do government officials and employees have different ideas about the ingredients for a city's success than academics? Each respondent was coded into one of 13 categories: elected state, elected local, government non-elected state, government non-elected local, business, professional (such as consultants and lawyers), university administration, faculty, professional associations or interest groups, foundations, non-profit service providers, non-profit researchers and other. Again, the individual types were then grouped into categories: government, business/professional, university, foundation, non-profit, interest groups, and other, with analysis performed using these larger categories. (See Appendix C for the number of respondents in each group.)

Table 4 shows the categories selected by respondents with different professional affiliations. If the four people categorized as "other" are excluded, the most important categories of ingredients again include economy, education, leadership, public services, and vibrancy. Although we remind readers that differences among these (as with all) categories should be approached with caution, since this was not a random sample, the differences are nonetheless suggestive. The business respondents gave highest emphasis to education, with 63% of respondents citing its importance, compared to 46% of government officials and the 38% of non-profit respondents who did so. Virtually all categories of respondents except government officials cited the economy as highly important; indeed, in each case it received more mentions than any other of the ingredient categories (in the range of 60% of respondents) except among government officials (only 38% of whom mentioned) and businessmen (who, as already noted, more often mentioned education, even though 58% mentioned the economy).

Table 4: Number and Percentage of Respondents Who Chose an Ingredient in Each Category by Respondents' Professional Affiliation

	Government (n=39)	Business/ Professional (n=19)	Foundation (n=16)	University (n=28)	Non-profit (n=24)	Interest Group/Prof Ass'n (n=15)	Other (n=4)
	% of respondents (number of respondents)						
Diversity	21% (8)	21% (4)	**38% (6)**	32% (9)	13% (3)	20% (3)	25% (1)
Economy	**38% (15)**	**58% (11)**	**69% (11)**	**61% (17)**	**54% (13)**	**60% (9)**	0% (0)
Education	**46% (18)**	**63% (12)**	**56% (9)**	**50% (14)**	**38% (9)**	**53% (8)**	25% (1)
Governance	28% (11)	26% (5)	0%	25% (7)	**38% (9)**	13% (2)	**50% (2)**
Land Use	18% (7)	5% (1)	6% (1)	18% (5)	25% (6)	0%	25% (1)
Leadership	**44% (17)**	**42% (8)**	**38% (6)**	**54% (15)**	**46% (11)**	**47% (7)**	0%
Public Services	**44% (17)**	**32% (6)**	**56% (9)**	**46% (13)**	**54% (13)**	**33% (5)**	**100% (4)**
Quality of Life	31% (12)	26% (5)	19% (3)	21% (6)	21% (5)	27% (4)	25% (1)
Residential Vitality	28% (11)	**32% (6)**	31% (5)	11% (3)	13% (3)	20% (3)	25% (1)
Vibrancy	**49% (19)**	**53% (10)**	**63% (10)**	**46% (13)**	**46% (11)**	**60% (9)**	**100% (4)**

Results by census region

Another question is whether the results differ by geographical location. Analyzing the results by the four census regions, Midwest, Northeast, South, and West, we have the same top five categories of ingredients. However, as indicated in Table 5, the percentages are very different among regions. For example, in the Northeast, ingredients relating to vibrancy were provided by 80 percent of the respondents and public services were identified by 73% of the respondents, suggesting that the region is suffering from stagnation. However, in the South and Midwest, economy was the most common category, with 52% and 61%, respectively.

Table 5: Categories by Census Region

		Census Region			
		Midwest (n=44)	Northeast (n=15)	South (n=44)	West (n=42)
		% of respondents (number of respondents)			
Top Five	Economy	61% (27)	47% (7)	52% (23)	45% (19)
	Education	55% (24)	33% (5)	50% (22)	48% (20)
	Leadership	36% (16)	40% (6)	45% (20)	52% (22)
	Public Services	50% (22)	73% (11)	36% (16)	43% (18)
	Vibrancy	52% (23)	80% (12)	48% (21)	48% (20)
Others	Diversity	30% (13)	27% (4)	23% (10)	17% (7)
	Governance	16% (7)	13% (2)	32% (14)	31% (13)
	Land Use	11% (5)	7% (1)	16% (7)	19% (8)
	Quality of Life	30% (13)	20% (3)	30% (13)	17% (7)
	Residential Vitality	18% (8)	20% (3)	27% (12)	21% (9)

Results by city size

Finally, in addition to focusing on geographical location, we examined city size, looking at cities with populations of less than 100,000; 100,000-250,000; 250,000-500,000; 500,000-1 million; and greater than 1 million. While there is general consensus on the important ingredients of successful cities, the results indicate that there are differences in the perspectives of the respondents. For cities with populations of more than 1 million, leadership was not one of the top five categories; instead, diversity was. Otherwise, the results, contained in Table 6, were consistent with the other analyses. As with regions, it would be interesting to explore possible reasons for the different rankings of the top five categories by respondents from cities of different sizes. For example, for the smallest cities, public services is the highest ranked category with 63%, and land use is tied for fifth with 38%. In contrast, respondents from medium (250,000-500,000) to large cities (500,000 – 1 million), public services was fifth, at 37% and 42% respectively. Vibrancy was identified by 72% of the respondents of cities with populations of 100,000-200,000, but by only 43% to 56% of respondents from other city sizes.

Table 6: Categories by Size of Respondents' City

	City Population (2003 Estimates)				
	<100,000 (n=8)	100,000-250,000 (n=25)	250,000-500,000 (n=27)	500,000-1 million (n=60)	> 1 million (n=25)
	% of respondents (number of respondents)				
Diversity	25% (2)	20% (5)	19% (5)	20% (12)	**40% (10)**
Economy	**38% (3)**	**56% (14)**	**63% (17)**	**50% (30)**	**48% (12)**
Education	**50% (4)**	**40% (10)**	**59% (16)**	**47% (28)**	**52% (13)**
Governance	25% (2)	32% (8)	22% (6)	30% (18)	8% (2)
Land Use	**38% (3)**	4% (1)	7% (2)	20% (12)	12% (3)
Leadership	**50% (4)**	**36% (9)**	**52% (14)**	**47% (28)**	36% (9)
Public Services	**63% (5)**	**56% (14)**	**37% (10)**	**42% (25)**	**52% (13)**
Quality of Life	0% (0)	28% (7)	22% (6)	25% (15)	32% (8)
Residential Vitality	25% (2)	16% (4)	19% (5)	23% (14)	28% (7)
Vibrancy	**50% (4)**	**72% (18)**	**56% (15)**	**43% (26)**	**52% (13)**

CONCLUSION

When asked what the five most important ingredients of a successful city are, those making, influencing, and observing policy generally agreed that the essential ingredients were those that fell within the categories of economy, education, leadership, public services, and vibrancy. These categories were consistently ranked as the top five mentioned. However, differences in their rank order emerged when examining the data by different groupings, such as by professional affiliation, census region, city size, and even response method. For example, among government officials vibrancy was the most common category, while for business leaders, education was identified most often. Respondents from cities in the Northeast region considered vibrancy most important while in the South region, economy was the most often mentioned ingredient.

These differences have implications as CEOs for Cities works with its members to help them build and maintain successful cities. Leaders will have different priorities and identify different ingredients on which they believe they can have an impact. Combining the ingredients of successful cities with the four lenses for viewing the comparative advantage of cities provides a matrix. The results of this research emphasize that city leaders will select different cells in that matrix for focusing their political capital, time, and other limited resources based on many factors. Ultimately, policy solutions will need to be provided for each combination.

Appendix A

Successful Cities Questionnaire

Name:
Title and function:
Organization:
City**:**

As an outgrowth of the research we were doing for the Fannie Mae Foundation on what states do to help or hinder their cities, we have begun looking at the ingredients of a successful, vibrant city: **what are the essential inputs one needs to create a successful city?** This research is expected to help focus the efforts of senior elected and appointed city policymakers, members of the business, non-profit, and philanthropic communities, and others who are involved in city renewal. Please answer the following three questions.

1. What do you consider the five most important ingredients of a successful city, and for each of these, please explain why it is on your list.

A.
B.
C.
D.
E.

2. In your experience, what is the most promising idea that a city (yours or any other) has put in place that will help it be successful, and please identify the city?

3. What is the most critical program or policy that a state government can enact and implement to improve the performance of its major cities?

Appendix B

Survey Procedure

The survey form (see Appendix B) was sent to 397 individuals. The individuals were not randomly selected, but were chosen purposely from two sources. The first group, the Fannie Mae group, consisted of 281 individuals with whom the research team had previously met in connection with a research project looking at the effect of city and state policy on urban performance. This project involved field research in cities in California— Sacramento and San Francisco; North Carolina—Charlotte and Durham; Pennsylvania—Pittsburgh and Philadelphia; Illinois—Chicago and Aurora; Michigan—Grand Rapids and Lansing; Oregon—Portland; and Washington—Tacoma and Seattle. These states were selected because their central cities performed either unusually well or unusually poorly on either indicators of the economic well being of city residents (such as per capita income) or on indicators of the quality of life (such as housing affordability). Visits were also made to officials and policy experts in the state capitol, if that were not one of the cities, resulting in a group of policy experts from 18 cities.

The other group consisted of 116 members of CEOs for Cities, excluding those members who were in the Fannie Mae group. Altogether, the sample was a sample of convenience, consisting of current and former government officials, business leaders, academics and other researchers, and other policy observers.

For all respondents, an email was sent requesting their participation in the survey. 128 of the Fannie Mae group received a prenotification on March 6, 2006, informing them that the survey would follow a week later. The survey for the prenotification group was sent by email on March 16, 2006. The remaining 153 received an email on March 6, 2006, with a request to complete the survey, which was attached as a word document. Beginning with the first follow-up for each group, an option was included to respond through the internet. Each group received two follow-ups (March 23 and April 30 for the initial group, April 3 and April 30 for the prenotification group), the last of which included a due date of May 5.

Respondents provided their names and institutions, thus it was not a confidential survey, although participants were assured that the information they provided would not be disclosed in a manner that identified them, other than disclosure to the research team.

The survey was sent to 281 people from the Fannie Mae project. Eight mailings were rejected, so presumably 273 people received the email, although we know of several people who had left the positions for which we had contact information, so it is likely that emails were not forwarded to them. We received 84 responses (2 by mail, the remainder through email, either by attaching the completed word document or completing the survey on the internet site), resulting in a response rate of 31%. Some responses were by one person representing several people in an office (this occurred at least three times). For the prenotification group, the response rate was 23%, suggesting that prenotification does not increase the response rate.

The survey, including the internet response option, was sent on March 23 to 116 members of CEOs for Cities. Follow-up requests were sent on April 10 and April 30, the last of which provided a due date of May 5. Eight mailings were rejected, so 108 presumably received the survey. Fifteen responses were received, giving us a response rate 14%. The overall response rate for the survey was 26%.

In addition to the 99 responses we received to the survey, we have the responses of 46 participants from CEOs for Cities' December meeting, when facilitators asked groups of participants what the five ingredients of successful cities were. Those results have been included in our analysis.

Appendix C
Coding Details

Categories and Their Ingredients

Category of Responses	*Ingredient*
Economy	Business climate (cost, predictability, efficiency, flexibility)
	Culture of entrepreneurship
	Diverse economic base
	Growing/Healthy economy – residents can find jobs, make living wage
	University
Education & Training	General Education
	Skilled work force (human capital)
Leadership, Partnership, Commitment	*Leadership*
	Leadership (few individuals)
	Vision (larger community)
	Optimism
	Decision making
	Partnership
	Relationships/Partnerships among business, non-profit, public, etc.
	Commitment
	Long term commitment/Stability
	Business leaders commitment
	Civic engagement
Public Services & Infrastructure	Transportation, including public transportation
	Basics done well; includes infrastructure/strategic investments
	Social services
Government & Governance	Honest, effective, efficient government (includes effective staff, representative government)
	Regional approach, going beyond political jurisdictions
	Fiscal responsibility
	Fair system of laws, enforcement
	Annexation
Vibrancy	Vibrancy
	Vibrant downtown
	Sense of place, sense of community
	Cultural/recreational amenities (parks)
	Distinctiveness, authenticity
	Attract young people, talented people, middle class people
Diversity	Diversity
	People – multicultural
	Housing styles, amenities

Category of Responses	Ingredient
	Racial and economic integration
	Tolerance; welcoming difference
Quality of Life	Quality of life
	Safety
Residential Vitality	Housing
	Neighborhoods
Environment & Land Use	Sustainable environment
	Land use planning, includes growth management
Other	Other

Professional Affiliations

Position	# of Participants
Government	**39**
Elected state official (present or former)	1
Elected local official (present or former)	6
Government, non-elected state	14
Government, non-elected local	18
Business/Professional	**19**
Business	10
Professional (includes consultants)	9
University	**28**
Administration	10
Faculty	18
Non Profit	**24**
Social service provider	3
Technical assistance/ Research	21
Foundations	**16**
Foundations	
Professional associations/ Interest groups	**15**
Professional associations/ Interest groups	
Other	**4**
Other	

Response Method

Response Method Group	# of Participants
Fannie Mae Survey	48
Fannie Mae Survey w/prenotification	36
CfC Survey	15
CfC Focus Groups	46

Appendix D

Sample Responses for the Ingredients

<u>**Economy**</u>

A strong economy is only partly a function of local politics, but without a healthy economy a city simply has no budget to be successful.

Growing, attracting and retaining high human capital – it matters because it's a good predictor of income growth and of the ability to adapt to needs of changing economy.

Family friendly and business friendly. Business is the goose that lays the golden mortgage and grocery eggs, and employment is increasingly about having a life.

Diversity of jobs and distribution of quality jobs with career ladders. This serves as the economic purpose of the city and without job growth, it is hard to provide distributional gains. Diversity also provides some resilience to changes in national economy.

A good commercial, office and industrial mix is critical to provide jobs for the community and meet their economic needs. This mix lessens the burden of paying for city services on the residential community. The mix should be broad enough to withstand any changes in the economy, both short and long term.

At least one major university in the central city, preferably a research university. Universities do so many great things for a city: educated future employees, faculty and staff who want to live in the university community, cultural assets, stable employment base, vitality on the streets. Any spin-off businesses (the thing that gets the most attention) are a bonus, in my view, to the inherent positives of a university to a city.

<u>**Education & Training**</u>

Far too many bright and average kids are not challenged and are not taught the discipline to create dreams and develop the skills to fulfill them. Schools and parents that fail to educate our kids today are saddling all of society with monumental "maintenance" costs tomorrow. Worse than having to maintain those that are net "takers" is the simple human tragedy of not being able to experience the thrill of achieving dreams.

Good quality schools are important even if residents send their children to private schools. Good schools provide a feeling of stability to the residents.

Good public schools. Any city that can do this has probably figured out how to do the other four, because this is the hardest.

Excellent public education system/workforce development—a key component of a viable, sustainable, and growth-oriented local economy is a highly-functioning human resource development system that serves youth, adults and dislocated workers. Thus, good, solid public education pre-K-12, good community colleges, good universities and related employment and training programs and systems are essential to both attract and develop the high-performing workforce that is perhaps the most critical community asset to attracting and retaining public and private employers.

Leadership, Partnership, and Commitment

Ability of city's public sector to stay focused on the "vital few" issues for an amount of time that helps to make them part of any solution, not part of the problem. Typically, public sector leadership turns over often, strategic direction changes, and that, coupled with the need in public-sector democracies to incorporate input and ideas from all, results in no action, super-slow action, or a change of direction before results can occur.

It's all about relationships, the connection between citizens and government, an inclusive vision for the future. When that connection fails, public support for institutions fail, bashing ensues, tax rates decline . . . .

Active, empowered residents, business owners, and landowners – success is not simply a product of one sector. Creating and sustaining success is a collective achievement, and it won't be unless all involved feel empowered to make the city better.

Proactive business community willing to partner, financially and as an advocate, in important projects. Elected and appointed leadership needs to know they have the financial support to initiate projects or to take some risk with public money.

Strong mayor, weak mayor – it doesn't matter. What matters is that a successful city finds its own leadership that builds and maintains a broadly–based political consensus.

One of the most important if not THE critical of a successful community is the caliber of its public and private leadership. Whether it be setting a visionary agenda for community endorsement and adoption, dealing with crises or helping a community compete for scare resources, the existence of dynamic men and women to accept and discharge critical leadership roles is paramount.

Creating a Strategic Plan that repositions a city so that it can regain its economic/social growth and develop solutions that result in a more inclusive community. This encompasses a complete self examination of the city's strengths and weaknesses so that it can capitalize on leveraging its assets to revitalize itself. This examination will evaluate the disparities from the quality of housing, good schools (including higher education), efficient transit, arts/culture, public safety, job creation, parks/recreation etc. Does the tool box have all the necessary tools required to be innovative to undertake the economic and social changes.

Good public involvement and communication processes: Successful communities continually involve the public and community partners in planning for and implementing initiatives and projects that ensure a strong and healthy community. Back room processes and decisions do not contribute to a city's success.

Public Services and Infrastructure

Visibly good services. The trash should be picked up and potholes filled. There should be an absolute minimum of lore about fixing tickets and scams to get permits. People should feel that the government and people who work for it are on their side, both in terms of residency and doing business. Make people feel wanted. Along with this is a recognition that richer and poorer parts of the city should feel that they are treated essentially the same way, to tamp down the inevitable "you got more" anger and to create an accurate impression of some degree of civic harmony and shared enterprise. It sounds like a lot, but service is *that* important.

Strategic investment is critical to community success. Investment in infrastructure ensures a community is ready to do business, protect the health of its citizens, and ensure a high quality of life.

A regional transportation system built on the goal of accessibility to jobs, housing and services rather than on mobility. Accessibility is measured by number of destinations within a given travel time; mobility is measured by travel speed and traffic service level. Accessibility is accomplished through urban design, land use mix, and land use intensity as well as by transportation investment; mobility is dependent on system expansion for larger and larger volumes of peak hour vehicle travel. Accessibility is furthered by investments in traffic management, bike and pedestrian pathways, and local transit service as well as by road system expansion.

A successful city encourages infrastructure investments that act as incentives to attract a growing share of "live here-work here-shop here-play here" residents and business owners, including design features that discourage balkanization through largely self-contained neighborhoods.

Vibrancy

Shared sense of healthy community requires vibrant downtown and healthy peripheral neighborhoods. The public sense that a community is healthy is often publicly communicated in a vibrant downtown space, but to have that sense shared by city citizens often depends on the health and safety in the surrounding neighborhoods.

A city is an alive and active organism only to the extent that people are there conducting their affairs. Public places that are designed to facilitate human interaction tend to attract ever greater quantities and varieties of those people. Things like scale, massing, safety, public space definition and sensitive aesthetics all serve to welcome and surround the human spirit. When the contextual experience is satisfying and gratifying people not only come there but they purchase, invest, watch, give, etc. further stabilizing the area.

Pride in yourself as a community. The people must truly love their city in order to "sell" it to others.

Plentiful open space for play and discovery. Gathering spaces that incorporate community-based economic activities (e.g. farmer's market + gardens + master gardeners + stage for performances).

Cultural identity. Successful communities know they're different and they celebrate their differences. Sometimes that identity is rooted in ethnic and racial history, sometimes it's a professional sports team (not that I recommend that response...), sometimes it's a grand park or other geographic feature. But in every case, the residents know that THIS is where they live.

Creative destruction and preservation – cities must enable and encourage the new while protecting the old.

Diversity

Ethnic, racial, religious, linguistic, cultural, lifestyle, culinary diversity and tolerance.

Neighborhoods of opportunity: places that are springboards for healthy, secure development of children and provide adults with economic and social opportunities for fulfillment.

Residential Vitality

Access to affordable, mixed-use and mixed income housing for all socioeconomic strata of the workforce and population. Housing access and choices assure that the vibrant city is home to the mix of people find their livelihoods in the city and reduces pressures on transportation systems. Reduced commutes enhance work-family balance.

Engaged neighborhoods that articulate priorities for government services and investment.

Government and Governance

Coordination within city departments and external partnerships with other agencies and organizations. . . . .Equally is important is the communication and coordination with state and local agencies and private partners. In today's environment of limited resources, public and private partnerships are key.

Real home rule. A city needs to have the state grant it home rule through its charter so that it can have meaningful options to generate revenue, to make appropriate investments in its future, to have options in terms of planning, etc. Having to go to the state legislature with hat-in-hand every time the city needs to do something differently than it might have done in the past is a debilitating and wasteful process.

An effective political system. Politics influences everything from school systems to bus lines to fixing potholes to garbage pick up. Without an effective political system, city services simply don't happen, which affects all aspects of quality of life.

Environment and Land Use

Planning and zoning policies that allow developers to adapt quickly to changing markets for urban neighborhoods, particularly supportive of mixed use, higher density neighborhoods.

Control/influence over growth that occurs at its fringe that takes place largely because of the existence of the central city but often is located so as to avoid political, policy and fiscal responsibility and involvement with the central city. If this can be accomplished then the central city and the inner suburbs will not be starved for resources as they age and begin to need reinvestment that will allow them to remain strong and vibrant even while growth continues at the periphery of the region.

Density encourages unplanned and frequent contacts between people who can benefit from sharing ideas and collaborating on projects of mutual interest, stimulating innovation and economic growth. Density complements diversity.

Other

Costs – at some level, costs outweigh the benefits. Cities can very easily price themselves out of existence.

Responsive to dynamic conditions. Successful cities are those that anticipate changes and position themselves to accommodate those changes.

A successful city is one that understands how it functions, its internal and external economic connectivity and the changing nature of its competitivity.

Appendix E

Results by Ingredients

Table 1: Ingredients by Respondents

Category of Responses	Ingredient	Number	Percentage
Economy	Business climate (cost, predictability, efficiency, flexibility)	10	6.9%
	Culture of entrepreneurship	9	6.2%
	Diverse economic base	23	15.9%
	Growing/Healthy economy – residents can find jobs, make living wage	36	24.8%
	University	13	9.0%
Education & Training	General Education	73	50.3%
	Skilled work force (human capital)	14	9.7%
Leadership, Partnership, Commitment	Leadership (few individuals)	35	24.1%
	Vision (larger community)	13	9.0%
	Optimism	3	2.1%
	Decision making	2	1.4%
	Relationships/Partnerships among business, non-profit, public, etc.	18	12.4%
	Long term commitment/Stability	4	2.8%
	Business leaders commitment	13	9.0%
	Civic engagement	18	12.4%
Public Services & Infrastructure	Transportation, including public transportation	35	24.1%
	Basics done well; includes infrastructure/strategic investments	38	26.2%
	Social services	2	1.4%
Government & Governance	Honest, effective, efficient government (includes effective staff, representative government)	26	18%
	Regional approach, going beyond political jurisdictions	8	5.5%
	Fiscal responsibility	11	7.6%
	Fair system of laws, enforcement	1	0.7%
	Annexation	4	2.8%
Vibrancy	Vibrancy	6	4.1%
	Vibrant downtown	23	15.9%
	Sense of place, sense of community	12	8.3%
	Cultural/recreational amenities (parks)	39	27.0%
	Distinctiveness, authenticity	9	6.2%
	Attract young people, talented people, middle class people	6	4.1%

Category of Responses	Ingredient	Number	Percentage
Diversity	Diversity	14	9.7%
	People – multicultural	8	5.5%
	Housing styles, amenities	1	0.7%
	Racial and economic integration	10	6.9%
	Tolerance; welcoming difference	7	4.8%
Quality of Life	Quality of life	11	7.6%
	Safety	30	20.7%
Residential Vitality	Housing	23	15.9%
	Neighborhoods	14	9.7%
Environment & Land Use	Sustainable environment	6	4.1%
	Land use planning, includes growth management	18	12.4%
Other	Other	34	23.5%

145 respondents each provided up to 5 responses. Number represents how many of the 145 selected that ingredient; percentage represents the portion of the 145 respondents who selected that ingredient.