



ALLIANCE *for*
REGIONAL
STEWARDSHIP

**Metropolitan
Regional
Grantmaking**
Promising Practices
and the
Stewardship of Place



MONOGRAPH SERIES
OCTOBER 2003

Monograph sponsored by:

Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities
1500 San Remo Avenue, Suite 177
Coral Gables, FL 33146
www.fundersnetwork.org

Distributed by:

Alliance for Regional Stewardship
1009 Grant Street, Suite 203
Denver, Colorado 80203
303-477-9443
Email: info@regionalstewardship.net
URL: www.regionalstewardship.org

Prepared by:

Nick Bollman
John Parr
Ben Starrett
David Lampe
Emma Arguelles

The Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities informs and strengthens philanthropic funders' individual and collective abilities to support and connect organizations working to advance social equity, create better economies, build livable communities, and protect and preserve natural resources.

The Funders' Network is an active resource and focal point for foundations, nonprofit organizations and other partners working to solve the environmental, social, and economic problems created by suburban sprawl and urban disinvestment. It informs funders of critical policy and grassroots developments; enables program staff to share effective strategies and tools; builds the capacity of key constituencies to promote smart growth and livable communities; and raises awareness about the interdisciplinary nature of these issues and the need for sustained engagement by a diverse coalition of funders.

For more information on the Funders' Network
for Smart Growth and Livable Communities,
please visit www.fundersnetwork.org



Table of Contents

Foreword	4
Chapter 1 – Executive Summary	5
Chapter 2 – Introduction	9
Chapter 3 – Metropolitan Regional Grantmaking: The Stewardship of Place	10
Chapter 4 – Case Studies	14
Community Foundations	14
• East Bay Community Foundation	
• The Greater Cincinnati Foundation	
• New Hampshire Charitable Foundation	
• Vancouver Foundation	
Private Foundations – Single Region	19
• Barr Foundation	
• The Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation	
• The George Gund Foundation	
• Lyndhurst Foundation	
• Marshall L. and Perrine D. McCune Charitable Foundation	
• The McKnight Foundation	
• The Rauch Foundation	
• William Penn Foundation	
Private Foundations – Multiple Regions	28
• Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation	
• The Joyce Foundation	
• Charles Stewart Mott Foundation	
Private Foundations – National	32
• The Ford Foundation	
• John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation	
• Surdna Foundation	
Chapter 5 – Opportunities and Challenges for the Smart Growth Field	36
Chapter 6 – Recommendations for the Funders’ Network	40
Appendices	
Directory of Interviewees	41
Interview Questions	43

Foreword

L. Benjamin Starrett
Executive Director
The Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities

THE Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities strengthened its interest in metropolitan regional grantmaking as a result of a two-year strategic assessment of the smart growth and livable communities movement—both nationally and in selected regions. The strategic assessment, begun in mid-2001, validated the proposition that significant traction, leadership, and opportunity to advance the smart growth and livable communities agenda exists in regional geographies that care about place.

To further understand this potential, the Network commissioned John Parr of the Alliance for Regional Stewardship and Nick Bollman of the California Center for Regional Leadership to conduct research to identify the characteristics associated with “metropolitan regional grantmaking.” This research project was designed to explore more deeply two of the four key themes that emerged from the strategic assessment project.

First, while every region of the country is unique, they are more alike than different in the key issues in play and the needs of the organizations and people leading the smart growth and livable communities movement. This suggests the strong possibility that there could be not only economies of scale in delivering certain services, but also a more cohesive national/regional philanthropic approach to meeting the needs of numerous regions.

Second, the majority of the traction in the smart growth and livable communities movement exists in states and provinces, metropolitan regions, and local communities. This does not mean that national funders are not essential to the movement; on the contrary, this report emphasizes their important role. Yet regional and community funders, with their long-term commitment to place and reputation in their communities, increasingly are emerging as leaders in the field. These leaders are using their grantmaking and other resources to advance innovative metropolitan regional strategies that meet local and regional priorities and needs. Profiles of 18 such funders are presented in this report. We believe the work of these funders offers important lessons and promising practices that are of value to the field of philanthropy as a whole.

On behalf of the members, board and staff of the Network, we are pleased to share the results of this research project. The Network will continue to explore the characteristics of regional grantmakers presented here, and will study the recommendations for our future work identified by the authors.

Chapter 1—Executive Summary

METROPOLITAN regional grantmaking is a relatively new phenomenon in philanthropy. Not that foundations haven't been making grants *in* metropolitan regions for decades. What is relatively new is that this grantmaking is explicitly "regionalist," as opposed to merely ubiquitous across a region. This new regional grantmaking supports *regional strategies, regional institutions and regional collaboration*; encourages local policy and programs to think and act more regionally; and promotes state policy and programs to support such thinking and action.

This report focuses on foundations in the smart growth field, broadly defined to include, for example, public health and education issues, as well as traditional land use, transportation, housing, and other well-accepted smart growth issues. It is worth noting, however, that a number of foundations, including not a few national foundations, have explored or implemented new regional strategies to advance a wide variety of goals, from social equity to civic engagement. Further, though this report shines a light on metropolitan regional grantmaking, many foundations apply similar strategies to rural grantmaking as well, and particularly where urban and rural meet, at the "urban edge."

The central finding of this report is that metropolitan regional grantmaking is a distinctive and coherent "style" of grantmaking, one we would call the "stewardship of place." This style is strategic, proactive, values-based, issue-driven, consultative-collaborative, cross-disciplinary, pragmatic (non-ideological), innovative, durable, and accountable. Though one may find this style and many of its characteristics among grantmakers in other fields – and among other grantmakers in the smart growth field – we observe that they are not present to the extent or at the depth to which they are found among regional grantmakers. Further, this style appears to be independent of the kinds of institutions in which they work. It occurs across all types of philanthropic institutions. Though there are certainly important differences among them, based on size, issue focus, and the particular regions in which the grantors operate, the similarities far outweigh the differences.

We found thirteen major characteristics in this grantmaking style, most of which we found true of most of the grantmakers we interviewed. These are listed below, and are described more fully in Chapter 3, "Metropolitan Regional Grantmaking: The Stewardship of Place."

- **Regionalism as strategy, not just by charter or chance.** This grantmaking is by definition voluntary and strategic, not occasioned simply by a corporate charter or the place of the founding donor's residence. Rather, the region is chosen as the scale of work necessary to achieve foundation goals.
- **Stewardship, not just geography.** These grantmakers care deeply about the place in which the foundation resides, and of course, about the people who inhabit the place. They take responsibility for the region in a stewardship mode (i.e., they seek to act in a manner that restores, protects or improves the region in a way that can be sustained for future generations).
- **Regional issues require regional strategies.** These grantmakers care about regions, and therefore work on issues (such as transportation and land use) on

which they can have tangible impact; at the same time, the issues they choose must be addressed through regional as well as local, statewide and national strategies.

- **Follow where the path leads: one size does not fit all.** The idea of “region” is functional, not jurisdictional, and the actual scale and scope of the region shifts with the nature of the issue addressed or strategy employed.
- **Complexity embraced through interdisciplinary approaches.** Regional grantmakers appreciate that the elements that detract or contribute to the quality of places are multiple and interconnected. Accordingly, effective grantmaking requires intervention across this range of issues in a manner that plays across them to achieve positive outcomes.
- **Regional grantmakers are responsive and generative, entrepreneurial and accountable.** This is community-based (and experience-based) grantmaking at its best, but because it is relatively new, the field is ripe for innovation and initiative.
- **“Silos” don’t work for sustainable communities and regions.** These grantmakers cross program boundaries in a thoroughly pragmatic way when necessary to achieve foundation goals.
- **Supporting or building new institutions and capacities.** Because there aren’t many institutions working this way at the regional level, foundations often must help create them, or support the transformation of existing organizations.
- **Servant leadership: the grantmaker as agent of change.** Because of complexity and the scarcity of regional partners, these grantmakers often get directly involved, beyond their grantmaking. They are conveners, brokers, communicators, and sometimes advocates. This is not institutional ego, but leadership as a form of service.
- **Collaboration among grantees: functional choice, not an end in itself.** The pragmatic credo of these regional grantmakers might be formulated as follows: If the situation calls for collaboration, encourage it; if not, don’t waste your time (or the grantees’).
- **Cooperation and collaboration among grantmakers.** Because they are (literally) working on the common ground of a region, grantmakers must cooperate with each other. But they often would prefer not to enter formal collaborations where the terms of the collaborative arrangement can become a barrier to innovation and responsiveness to new circumstances. In other instances collaboration seems right. In either case, the choice is not theoretical, but pragmatic.
- **Assessment by active judgment, not formal evaluation.** It’s not hard to assess the effectiveness of regional grantmaking, but it is often hard to organize, document and convey that assessment by conventional social scientific methods. Many grantmakers bring the exercise of continuous learning into the grantmaking process itself, rather than keeping it at arm’s length through formal evaluation.
- **Institutionalizing good practice through tradition, leadership, initiative, or renewal.** Some regional grantmakers are more interested than others in how to institutionalize this style of grantmaking beyond the individual grantmaker or individual program area. For many, the issue is resolved because by one means or another, the stewardship-of-place approach is embedded in the organization itself. On the other hand, in foundations with more conventional program “si-

los,” where the “stewardship of place” approach is embedded in a single program area, grant officers worry about its transferability and endurance. Yet others are more philosophical about the “institutionalization” question, and feel fortunate and appear content that they have institutional support to practice this style of grantmaking.

Opportunities and Challenges for the Smart Growth Grantmaking Field

Based on our interviews with the executives or program officers of 18 foundations – and a roundtable discussion at the Funders’ Network’s 2003 annual conference in Minneapolis – we believe the lessons learned from regional smart growth grantmaking present certain specific opportunities (and challenges) for helping to develop an effective, region-based national smart growth movement. Other national institutions and associations, including the Congressional Smart Growth Caucus and the array of very effective national and regional non-governmental organizations, will lead in this effort. Consequently, this report does not try to address the question of how the field in general should be strengthened or what organized philanthropy specifically should do to help strengthen the field.

However, as the Funders’ Network has now posited in a public and proactive way, philanthropy can contribute to the development of the smart growth field overall by strengthening and improving the role of philanthropy in the movement. Moreover, we suggest that growing and improving this style of grantmaking based on the concept of “stewardship of place” is a very promising strategy for strengthening smart growth philanthropy.

To do so, philanthropy must embrace and promote to interested grantmakers the elements of philanthropic effectiveness as conveyed by the sample of foundations profiled in this report. But it must also communicate with those who are indifferent or skeptical about this style. Two proactive strategies are suggested: (1) Share the actual experience of this grantmaking style with others not now in the circle of smart growth grantmakers (these we call *associative* strategies); and (2) Make the case to other funders through new forms of assessment and analysis (these we call *evidentiary* strategies). In Chapter 5, “Opportunities and Challenges for the Smart Growth Field,” we explain why grantmakers are assuming this proactive role and list the factors to be considered in developing these two proactive strategies.

Recommendations for the Funders’ Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities

The Funders’ Network is the leader in expanding and improving smart growth philanthropy. To continue to support the quality and reach of individual regional grantmakers and the growth and development of this grantmaking field, based on the interviews and roundtable discussion, we recommend the following:*

- Stay the course. With respect to professional development, continue to provide learning opportunities, through publications and through national and regional meetings. Actually, the preparation of this report has already shone the spotlight on this work and illuminated important questions yet to be answered about regional grantmaking efficacy and spread.

* In the current constrained climate of assets and grantmaking budgets, the general caution given by interviewees was not to plan for or expect major new initiatives in the short-term. That is not to say that this couldn’t be a time for thoughtful planning and exploration, awaiting the return of philanthropic capacity.

- Sponsor functionally tailored educational programs on regional grantmaking based on the concept of “stewardship of place.” Devise educational and engagement programs targeted at the particular roles played by different individuals and foundations. Because program officers and/or chief executives in smaller foundations often are the most familiar and secure in practicing this kind of “stewardship of place” philanthropy, programs to help senior management and board members appreciate and support this approach would be helpful. This might also encourage chief executives and board members to use their own community or regional leadership standing to help advance the goals of the grants program.
- Support the exploration of innovative associative as well as evidentiary strategies for growing the field, perhaps in partnership with the MacArthur Foundation and other funders. This could include expanded, direct peer-to-peer support as well as expanded internet-based communications and exchange. It also could include further exploration of a process for capturing data about intended but not predicted smart growth outcomes, such as regional smart growth indicators reports or other innovative measurement techniques.
- Pursue targeted communications strategies, within philanthropy and beyond, to help create the climate and conditions for expanding the role and impact of metropolitan regional grantmaking.

Recommendations for the Funders’ Network

- Stay the course—continue to offer educational publications and national meetings to build awareness, knowledge and skills.
- Sponsor educational programs in regional grantmaking based on the “stewardship of place.”
- Support exploration of strategies for growing the field of regional grantmaking.
- Pursue outreach to expand the role and impact of regional grantmaking.

Chapter 2—Introduction

METROPOLITAN regional grantmaking is not only a fast-growing segment of American philanthropic activity, particularly in the smart growth field, but also the setting for some of the most innovative strategies in all of philanthropy. This monograph was prepared to enable grantmakers to learn about this promising new practice. Specifically, this report has three purposes in mind:

- Showcasing the grantmaking strategies and practices of a varied group of metropolitan regional grantmakers;
- Synthesizing and presenting lessons learned by these grantmakers; and
- Gathering ideas for possible further Funders' Network activity in this field.

To gather information, we interviewed grantmakers from 18 foundations known to be engaged in metropolitan regional grantmaking (the interviewees and interview questions may be found in Appendices A and B). They were deliberately selected by the Funders' Network to be a very diverse group, by size and geographic location. The work they do in smart growth is also varied, and ranges from planning and policy support to neighborhood-based community development. The definition of "region" among them also varied. For most it included a single large metropolitan area or several such areas. For others it included a whole state or province, with a focus on urban, rural and "urban edge" issues. Some of the foundations interviewed have been metropolitan regional grantmakers for ten years or longer (two have been at it for more than 50 years), while others are just starting out, either because they are new foundations or because they have recently undergone a thorough strategic review. Virtually all of the foundations are committed to going forward with this work, but many of them have begun to ask in a more systematic way, "What impact are we having in the region and across the nation as a whole?" The interviews were approximately an hour in length.

Preliminary findings were shared with a roundtable of grantmakers, including many of those interviewed for this report, at the Funders' Network's 2003 annual conference in Minneapolis. This discussion, and other sessions at the conference, helped to further refine the analysis and recommendations presented here.

Case Studies. In this report we present a set of foundations that practice metropolitan regional grantmaking: community foundations and private foundations (single region, multiple regions, and national). Though the descriptions of these foundations and their work is brief, we have tried to give enough detail to interest the reader in learning more about their work, and we've provided contact information and website addresses for those who wish to learn more.

Chapter 3—Metropolitan Regional Grantmaking: The “Stewardship of Place”

A distinctive and coherent style. Metropolitan regional grantmaking is a distinctive and coherent “style” of grantmaking, expressing what we call the “stewardship of place.” This style is characteristic of grantmakers across all types philanthropic institutions. Though there are certainly important differences among them, based on size, issue focus, and the particular regions in which such philanthropy is practiced, the similarities outweigh the differences.

Characteristics. We found the following common characteristics, described below. Please note that most of the foundations we interviewed exhibited most of the characteristics of this style of grantmaking. Further, the case studies supply a richer portrait of how these characteristics come together robustly in individual grantmaking programs and strategies.

- **Regionalism as strategy, not just by charter or chance.** This grantmaking is not motivated by the direction to work across a specific regional geography in a corporate charter (as with community foundations), or because the donor happened to live there (as with many private foundations). The grantmaker chooses to work at the regional level and throughout the region because the scale, scope, complexity, and connectedness of the place is fundamental to effectively addressing the issues or problems on which the foundation is focused.
- **Stewardship, not just geography.** These grantmakers care deeply about the place, and of course, about the people who inhabit the place. They take responsibility for the place in a stewardship mode: That is, they seek to restore, protect or improve the place in a manner that can be sustained for future generations. This idea of intergenerational, future-oriented grantmaking is a powerful antidote to the temptation to “drop in” on communities and their issues, which is sometimes characteristic of “expert-driven” as opposed to community-driven and expert-supported philanthropy. Community foundations, of course, are well situated to adopt stewardship approaches (though not all of them do so, as we know). But among private foundations, we found a strong inclination toward stewardship – particularly among local, donor-led foundations – where this was a driving principle of the benefactor, and of such quality as to rival that of the best community foundations.
- **Regional issues require regional strategies.** These grantmakers choose issues that require regional solutions. It is not clear, however, whether these grantmakers select issues to work on and discover that they require regional strategies (such as transportation and land use) or select issues to work on because they must be resolved in order to improve or sustain the region and its communities. This is a “chicken and egg” phenomenon, but not one that needs to be resolved because it is a linear and therefore false dichotomy. These grantmakers embrace the region, regional issues, and regional strategies as a holistic and dynamic phenomenon.
- **Follow where the path leads: one size does not fit all.** The idea of “region” is functional, not jurisdictional, though for the sake of convenience, existing political boundaries may be used to identify the region in which the foundation oper-

ates (such as a state or a defined set of counties in a metropolitan region). Nonetheless, boundaries within the region are meant to be crossed, and boundaries between regions are seen as connective rather than separating the region from forces beyond itself. Further, these grantmakers often move up and down the geographic scale, depending on what needs to be done to address the issue. In smart growth, for example, grantmakers may be (and often are) simultaneously and strategically interested in well-designed neighborhoods, well-managed cities, multi-jurisdictionally planned regions, and effective state policies.

- **Complexity embraced through interdisciplinary approaches.** Albert Einstein once said, “Things should be made as simple as possible, but not any simpler.” Regional grantmakers appreciate complexity because an approach driven by the idea of stewardship of place and the reality of places is inherently complex, and thus the most direct path to effectiveness. The reality is also complex over time, because change is inherent to the idea of place. The idea of region is itself a useful, though temporal, physical approximation. With respect to smart growth, a hundred years ago cities were the focus of civic and political work. The region is the right scale at this moment and perhaps for many years well into this century, but this too will change as settlement patterns, mobility and modes of communication evolve. Interestingly, an ever-evolving, place-focused foundation motivated by a stewardship ethic can serve its community as a reassuring center for continuity, efficacy and permanence. Regional grantmakers embrace this complexity of time and place.
- **Regional grantmakers are responsive and generative, entrepreneurial and accountable.** This is community-based (and experience-based) grantmaking at its best, but because it is relatively new, the field is ripe for innovation and initiative. On the one hand, the commitment to place, and to the well-being of the people in that place, demands a sensitivity to community interests and concerns that makes “top-down,” heavy-handed philanthropy unthinkable, ultimately because it will be “out of place,” and therefore ineffective. But the regional lens and cross-program, integrative approaches open the way to real innovation in response to the region and its communities.
- **“Silos” don’t work for sustainable communities and regions.** These grantmakers do not permit program boundaries to impede grantmaking effectiveness. Though for focus and efficiency, they name and define issues and program areas of interest, they also are flexible and responsive to new discoveries and realities. Thus, they add issues of interest, connect them in new ways, or redefine them to include strategic possibilities that would have been impossible with a rigid concept of program boundaries. We also found that the culture of collaboration among program officers was palpable and part of the foundation’s way of being, either because of program boundary-crossing or the other way around.
- **Supporting or building new institutions and capacities.** Because the institutional landscape at the regional level is often sparsely populated, and the professional or civic volunteer engagement at that level relatively new or non-existent, these grantmakers often find themselves helping to create new institutions and supporting new modes of practice. Unlike traditional “generative” philanthropy, however, in which foundations attempt to create new institutions or modes of practice based on a theoretical model, these grantmakers also prize their respon-

siveness to the needs of the place. They therefore consider themselves both responsive and generative, but often this leaves them without a well-defined theoretical model (which, in this style of grantmaking, therefore, must be built from empirical evidence). For many, articulating even an experience-based theory of change is still a challenge.

- **Servant leadership: the grantmaker as agent of change.** These grantmakers often assert their own relevance (beyond the grants themselves) and take on new, proactive roles, either because no organization exists or could be created to fill a void, or, more often, because the grantmaker believes that playing this kind of role is appropriate and effective (appropriate *because* effective). For example, many grantmakers convene others (grantees, public and private sector partners, etc.) using the foundation's "neutrality," reputation, facilities, and professional capacities – and even the dangled possibility of grant support – to bring together parties that cannot or will not otherwise convene. In this style of grantmaking, however, it is not institutional ego but a functional strategy that motivates the act. Taking care not to let the one become the other, however, is a continuing challenge of which these grantmakers are aware.
- **Collaboration among grantees: functional choice, not an end in itself.** Regional grantmakers tend not to want collaboration for its own sake (an end in itself), but because in a given situation (issue, strategy, desired outcome) it enhances effectiveness. Therefore, they do not want to impose collaboration on their grantees. They are not reluctant to give a strong "nudge" in that direction, however, especially where false barriers between grantees exist that are impediments to their effectiveness in the aggregate. And many regional grantmakers reward collaboration through grant funds, not merely as incentive but also because collaboration usually costs more time and energy, not less.
- **Cooperation and collaboration among grantmakers.** We found a great deal of alignment and cooperation among grantmakers in the same region, though less formal collaboration (as in "pooled" grantmaking arrangements) than we had expected. And perhaps for the same reason. A "stewardship of place" approach requires responsiveness to the ever-changing needs and possibilities of a region, and with few actual regional institutions, grantmakers serving that region – particularly when working on the same or similar issues – are very sensitive to the need for mutual accommodation and sometimes outright division of labor among grantmakers. However, formal collaboration could actually impede responsiveness, because once cobbled together it often is difficult, or at least time-consuming, to change direction to meet changing needs. The most appropriate model for alignment would appear to be cooperation, therefore, and not collaboration. An exception is the instance where a national foundation that is not "of" the place but wants to work "in" the place may seek a more formal alignment with local or regional grantmakers, especially community foundations (whose familiarity with the region often will exceed that of the national foundation).
- **Assessment by active judgment, not formal evaluation.** For reasons more fully developed below, regional grantmakers generally have not established formal mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of their work. This is not to say that they don't have explicit goals and strategies, or that they don't have the capacity to assess their effectiveness as grantmakers, or to understand what works and what doesn't and to make adjustments to reflect that understanding. On the

contrary, grantmakers who take the “stewardship of place” approach are deeply committed to learning, in a continuous feedback approach. But the nature of the learning process is not patterned on conventional social science models, and there is even a strong resistance to such models because they might tempt the grantmaker to measure the things that can be measured, in lieu of measuring the things that matter. The regional grantmaker does not make a formal distinction between doing and learning, but incorporates the learning into the manner of grantmaking. This we call active judgment, and the regional grantmakers who practice this experience-based form of assessment appear to be highly skilled and effective learners. Whether and how this learning can be effectively documented and conveyed to others, however, is an open question. It is a question of great interest to some grantmakers (who would like to engage other grantmakers in their regions or fields of interest in this style of grantmaking) and of less interest to others, who are satisfied that they are making a difference in their regions and that solving the documentation and communications problem would not be cost-effective, and could possibly (as discussed above) have an unintended distorting effect.

- **Institutionalizing good practice through tradition, leadership, initiative, or renewal.** As with assessment, some regional grantmakers are more interested than others in how to institutionalize this style of grantmaking beyond the individual grantmaker or individual program area. For many, the issue is resolved because by one means or another, the stewardship-of-place approach is embedded in the organization itself (mission, board intentions and actions, executive leadership, and grants officer performance). On the other hand, in foundations with more conventional program “silos,” where the “stewardship of place” approach is embedded in a single program area, grant officers worry about its transferability into other program areas and its survivability beyond their own tenure. Yet others are more philosophical about the “institutionalization” question, and feel fortunate and appear content that they have institutional support to practice this style of grantmaking.

Though these characteristics are one way of understanding this style of grantmaking, in the following section we present a brief description of the 18 foundations we studied, and how each of them brings these characteristics together to advance smart growth and livable communities in their regions.

Chapter 4—Case Studies

COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS

East Bay Community Foundation

Oakland, California

Interviewee: Ed Church*, Director, Livable Communities Initiative

Service Area. The East Bay Community Foundation (EBCF) defines its region as the two counties (Alameda and Contra Costa) directly east of San Francisco Bay. The Livable Communities Initiative focuses on three communities within that region: downtown Oakland, the Tri-Valley (suburban) region and eastern Contra Costa County (the rural area centered on the small town of Brentwood). Recently, the Foundation has added three additional focus areas: a low-income neighborhood in the cities of Richmond and Pittsburg as well as an affordable housing campaign in unincorporated Contra Costa County.

Objectives and Strategies. The Initiative grew out of an interest, led by a board champion, in moving toward a more initiative-based approach to grantmaking in the foundation's environmental program. The foundation has received support for the initiative from the Ford, Irvine and Surdna foundations. It has tailored its strategies to address the unique characteristics of the three original communities, based on a common set of smart growth principles. Success in the three communities is intended to be mutually reinforcing: infill development in Oakland will help to reduce the pressure for sprawl development; more efficient use of the land, including the development of more housing in the job-rich Tri-Valley area, will help reduce the pressure for commuter expansion toward the eastern county; and agricultural preservation in the eastern part of the county redirects development toward existing communities. The foundation seeks a "cultural change" among land-use decision makers in the public and private sector (politicians, planners and developers).

Funding Activity. A significant amount of the annual budget of \$400,000 supports the direct work of the foundation, because it has taken a community organizing approach to its work, and the Initiative staff and consultants have not found many nonprofit organizations with the capacity to act as change agents as effectively as the foundation could itself. Building capacity and acting aggressively to show results can be trade-offs of each other, and in this instance the foundation leaned toward results. Some of the foundation's grants had more the feel of contracts than traditional arms-length grants. This has required the foundation to take several "confidence-building" steps with activists and decisionmakers to assure them that – though values-based – the Initiative is not pursuing a "hidden" development agenda. For example, when low-income community advocates were concerned that the Oakland development would not produce enough low-income housing, the foundation financed a study to examine independently the financial feasibility numbers used by the developer, as well as a search for parcels in neighborhoods surrounding the development that could be placed in an urban land trust to prevent "collateral gentrification." Not all activity has been at a "big systems" level, but has been strategic nevertheless. For example, the foundation paid for the new Brentwood Mayor and a team of community leaders to attend an American Farmland Trust conference.

*No longer with the foundation.

Commitment to Collaboration. The Initiative is an active partner with a wide variety of local organizations in the public and private sectors, and in fact staffs the major growth-related partnership in the Tri-Valley, a Housing and Planning Committee.

Gauging Effectiveness. EBCF has developed and is just beginning to implement an evaluation framework for the Initiative. Because the development process is long and complicated, the foundation will not seek to establish effectiveness through “shovels in the ground,” but rather look for indicators that foundation activity has altered the development trajectory toward an increased acceptance and promotion of smart growth in the three communities.

Lessons/Next Steps. Taking the “initiative approach” has enabled EBCF, as a community foundation, to insulate itself somewhat from the possible controversy attendant to Initiative activities. This may also have contributed, however, to the foundation’s not using its board to advance the objectives of the program, and the underutilization of the foundation’s community leadership assets. Further, because the planning and development field is primarily occupied by actors in the public and private sectors (i.e., ineligible for grants from the foundation), the change strategy has been more directly pro-active than imagined in advance. But if less capacity is left “on the ground” in the nonprofit sector, it is hoped that direct engagement with the planning and development community will have a greater “cultural shift” impact than imagined. The Initiative is heavily dependent upon private foundation support for work that takes many years to accomplish. Whether private foundations will continue to support this long-term work beyond 2004 remains undetermined.

The Greater Cincinnati Foundation

Cincinnati, Ohio

Interviewee: Ellen M. Gilligan, Vice President for Strategic Initiatives (including the Regional Initiatives Fund)

Service Area. The Greater Cincinnati Foundation (GCF) serves the eight counties and 220 individual jurisdictions in the three-state region that comprises metropolitan Cincinnati. As the region has grown, GCF’s prior focus on “inside the beltway” needs has gradually extended outside the beltway as well.

Objectives and Strategies. The Regional Initiatives Fund grew out of a 1999 study commissioned by the Metropolitan Growth Alliance, a business group, to determine how greater Cincinnati could attain an economic competitive edge in the global marketplace. The recommendation from the study’s author, Michael Gallis, was that all major public and private institutions needed to begin thinking and acting regionally; this has been an important catalyst for change for GCF and many other public and private institutions. The foundation committed a lead gift for the Regional Initiatives Fund (RIF) and recruited 12 other funding partners (including private foundations and small community foundations within the region) to raise a total of \$1.25 million. Through an extensive planning process over the course of a year, the partners determined that they would focus on the four priority areas identified in the Gallis report: (1) strengthening the urban core; (2) improving the region’s unique quality of life, especially arts and cultural and environmental amenities; (3) developing workforce and education strategies for a knowledge-based economy; and (4) improving transportation.

Funding Activity. Through an open-ended RFP process, the RIF partners selected 16 grantees in June 2001. Grants ranged across subject matters and activities as diverse as tax reform, urban land assembly and brownfield redevelopment, promoting reading proficiency among middle and high school students, training for more than 200 volunteer regional planning commissioners, organizing the older suburbs for sustainable development (“First Suburbs”), and promoting a bio-tech industry cluster. Among the grantees is a business improvement district, certainly a non-traditional recipient of community philanthropy.

Commitment to Collaboration. As discussed above, the Initiative includes smaller community foundations in the region, and this has helped build a non-competitive relationship between them and GCF. The partners meet monthly and other areas of collaboration have emerged. The RIF is not highly visible to the broader community but is quietly building a set of relationships that will help the aggregate funding of the partners achieve greater synergy.

Gauging Effectiveness. Overall, the idea of strategic initiatives has enabled GCF to move beyond its traditional “responsive” philanthropy in its six established areas of program focus. As a result, it now has strategic experience in community development and regionalism, and it has begun work in police-community and race relations. In addition, as a result of an extensive community listening process conducted in 2002, GCF launched four new strategic initiatives in community progress and the environment, early childhood development, youth behavioral health, and arts and culture. Among other intangible results is the fact that new relationships have been formed among individuals and organizations. Further, the example of the initiative approach has been instructive to the foundation’s donor advisers, who themselves have become more interested in strategic philanthropy. The RIF has an outside evaluator, whose initial report was delivered in December 2002. Though progress generally was made across most grants, the evaluator recommended a narrower focus for greater strategic impact. Also, to retain partner interest, the RIF will move to quarterly meetings with guest speakers. The board of the foundation has been pleased with the progress on regionalism, particularly given the deeper and more difficult challenge the region has experienced in the past two years in race relations.

Lessons/Next Steps. Taking the “initiative approach” in the field of regionalism has enabled GCF to attract partners and adopt focused goals and timeframes. The Regional Initiatives Fund is now followed by a potentially much larger GCF effort to address Cincinnati’s challenging race relations crisis. The foundation has embarked on an effort to raise \$20 million with funder partners to establish a multi-year race relations initiative. With respect to the RIF focus on regionalism, it is too early to tell whether it will yield sustained results. In part this depends on the extent to which local units of government begin themselves to move toward some form of regional governance—a decidedly uphill terrain.

New Hampshire Charitable Foundation

Concord, New Hampshire

Interviewees: Racheal Stuart, Vice President of Programs and Meredith Hatfield, Program Director, Livable New Hampshire

Service Area. The foundation serves the state of New Hampshire as a whole, but largely organizes its work through seven regional divisions, each serving a

particular area of the state. Livable New Hampshire is a statewide initiative of the New Hampshire Charitable Foundation (NHCF) that works with and through the regional divisions to promote smart growth.

Objectives and Strategies. New Hampshire's public sector is, by design, relatively weak at the state and county levels, but possesses a strong tradition of home rule in local government. Consequently, Livable New Hampshire (LNH) is focused primarily on building a culture of expectations for how the private and nonprofit sectors will build, develop and preserve New Hampshire's quality of life throughout the state. The state's nonprofit community has been encouraging NHCF to get involved in growth and planning issues over the years, but the foundation, like many other community foundations, was wary of possible controversy and concerned about its ability to make a real impact on such a complex issue, and thus delayed entering the field. On the other hand, as the state's largest funder and with a relatively weak state government, NHCF is expected to demonstrate leadership on policy issues. It is also expected to be a neutral convener and a nonpartisan problem solver. A deciding factor in moving forward with Livable New Hampshire has been that, whatever one's political or philosophical viewpoint, the impact of growth and development on New Hampshire's way of life is palpable, especially in the Boston-impacted southern part of the state.

Funding Activity. NHCF's smart growth related grants have covered a broad range, including transportation reform, partnerships with developers to promote minimum-impact development, regional (multi-town) affordable housing development, and alternative economic strategies for resource-dependent towns and watershed communities. With LNH, the foundation has gone beyond grantmaking activity to help build relationships behind the scenes and focus on leverage points to change state-level policy.

Commitment to Collaboration. The regional divisions are encouraging donor advisers to match the discretionary funds committed to Livable New Hampshire, and NHCF has received important support from the Jessie B. Cox Charitable Trust in addition to seeking national foundation support. There is also a growing commitment to collaboration among the foundation's grantees. New Hampshire's political culture tends to be litigation-averse, so finding collaborative ways to resolve conflicts is valued highly. In planning LNH, the foundation brought developers, environmentalists, public health, transportation, and business and industry to the table, using systems thinking to examine issues related to growth and begin to build connections for collaborative action. One early result is an invitation by the state Department of Transportation to have Livable New Hampshire convene and chair the state's long-range transportation plan.

Gauging Effectiveness. Livable New Hampshire initially developed a "logic model" with concrete identifiable outputs and short- and long-term indicators of success. As relationships and opportunities have emerged (e.g., the state DOT long-range plan), expectations for short-term outputs and outcomes have shifted. However, the long-range goals remain the same. Though no outside evaluation is involved, NHCF believes it will be able to identify the impacts of its work through establishment of specific indicators.

Lessons/Next Steps. Livable New Hampshire is the fourth such recent initiative at NHCF, and generally the foundation is pleased with initiative-style grantmaking.

It believes that engagement in regional growth issues is of particular interest to community foundations because of its high impact on quality of life. Moreover, although the potential for controversy is always present, the fact that a community foundation is well-grounded in multiple communities of interest, as well as communities of place, gives it a comparative advantage and credibility for doing this work well. The initiative has required an even-handed approach to the issues, based on genuine respect, not just as a tactic to get people to the table. It has also helped internally to knit together collaboration among the regional division staff, and it is believed that this success will lead to other internal staff partnership opportunities as well.

Vancouver Foundation

Vancouver, British Columbia

Interviewee: Mauro Vescera, Program Director

Service Area. The Vancouver Foundation serves the province of British Columbia, Canada. In addition to its own direct grantmaking, the foundation provides annual support to and works with and through British Columbia's 35 community foundations. It also works very closely with both the provincial and federal governments, which have recently set up several endowments at the foundation, including a \$30 million fund for habitat restoration, \$20 million for disability employment, a Living Rivers Trust Fund, a BC Parks Fund, and a Fund for Heritage.

Objectives and Strategies. The province has a wide variety of smart growth challenges, ranging from the search for alternative economic development scenarios in rural regions that have been deeply dependent on resource extraction, to managing growth through progressive transportation planning in greater Vancouver. The foundation acknowledges a global dimension as well: Because Canada is a signatory to the Kyoto protocols on global warming, it is exploring ways to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The foundation is increasingly interested in public policy, and because of its reputation as a "partner" to government (as well as its independence and stature), when it takes on an issue it does so with great care, knowing that it is likely to have significant visibility. Though government bureaucracy in the province is very strong, particularly at the municipal level, regional planning is not a strength, so the foundation felt the need to move into that field of endeavor. It is particularly interested in promoting region-to-region collaboration.

Funding Activity. The foundation's interest in livable communities ranges across its eight program areas, and by virtue of not "siloeing" that interest into a single program area, the foundation can remain innovative and flexible in its grantmaking. Its approach to livable communities/quality of life issues is broader than the usual smart growth focus on land use, transportation and other planning issues; consequently, the foundation recognizes that achieving sustainable and more livable communities requires equal commitment to social, economic and environmental priorities. Through a sustained effort to bring together diverse individuals and organizations in a holistic manner, the Vancouver Foundation connects neighborhoods and regions, focusing on people as well as their communities. Its leadership is committed to inclusiveness, diversity of participation, multi-disciplinary approaches and a focus on the common good of the community as a whole in an effort to enhance the quality of life across British Columbia.

Commitment to Collaboration. Working with and through the 35 community foundations in the province enables the Vancouver Foundation to take advantage of local knowledge and thereby achieve greater impact with its grant dollars. In

addition to working closely with the public sector and other philanthropies, the foundation also involves 130 people on its grant advisory committees, thereby reaching into virtually every corner of British Columbia society. The foundation encourages collaboration among its grantees (but doesn't require it) and provides financial support for costs associated with collaboration.

Gauging Effectiveness. The foundation routinely conducts formal evaluations of its initiatives, though no assessment of its work in smart growth or livable communities is planned at this time.

Lessons/Next Steps. The foundation has moved into regionalism and regional approaches to its grantmaking in a pragmatic fashion, taking regionalism as a strategy, not an end in itself. Ultimately, changes in behavior come about through building new relationships and partnerships. The foundation is moving cautiously forward to encourage public officials in particular to look at inter-regional impacts and the need for inter-regional cooperation.

PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS, SINGLE REGION

Barr Foundation

Boston, Massachusetts

Interviewee: Marion Kane, Executive Director

Service Area. The Barr Foundation defines its region as metropolitan Boston westward to the I-495 corridor (approximately 40 miles east to west).

Objectives and Strategies. The Barr Foundation focuses on smart growth, regional action and systems thinking as part of its environmental funding priorities. The foundation supports projects that reinforce awareness of the essential connection and interdependency of the natural and built environments, with improved quality of life in Boston as the overall goal.

Funding Activity. The foundation's regional funding has supported transportation, pedestrian-friendly development, public transit advocacy, land use and open space (urban parks, land preservation, open space acquisition), planning for smart growth-style development, infill and reinvestment (brownfield redevelopment in Boston), equity (environmental justice), and environment (water-supply protection, riparian ecosystems, urban ecology, recycling, active living, parks, open space, urban habitat, watershed associations).

Commitment to Collaboration. Marion Kane (the interviewee) describes the Barr Foundation as promoting "aligned activity" and "synergy" among its grant recipients with an emphasis on "systems thinking." The foundation itself participates in 11 collaboratives with other funders, including a group of green funders and a smart growth funders group.

Gauging Effectiveness. The Barr Foundation requires regular reports from its grantees and periodically hires outside evaluators to measure the effectiveness of its regional grantmaking. In addition, it is working to refine its internal evaluative system to emphasize outcomes and well-articulated theories of change. Aware of a need to build the capacity of grant recipients and foundations alike, the Barr Foundation also convenes groups of grantees into learning clusters facilitated by partners such as the Aspen Institute to facilitate peer learning and sharing of best practices.

Lessons/Next Steps. According to Kane, the Barr Foundation has identified a need for “cross-sectoral knowledge and activity to more effectively address regional and environmental matters.” Part of the challenge of effective joint action, Kane says, lies in building trust and understanding among different kinds of organizations in order to facilitate the formation of new problem-solving networks. The foundation intends to continue pursuing its regional grantmaking at current levels (depending on market conditions), with greater emphasis on education and outreach to minority/immigrant urban populations and issues of environmental stewardship. Also targeted for increased environmental funding are in-school and after-school environmental education programs, outdoor environmental experiences for urban students, and urban environmental health education.

The Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation

Washington, D.C.

Interviewee: Carolynn Mambu, Program Officer

Service Area. The Cafritz Foundation serves the District of Columbia and its inner-ring suburbs in Maryland and Virginia (i.e., metropolitan Washington, D.C.).

Objectives and Strategies. Since its establishment in 1948, the Cafritz Foundation has targeted its philanthropy on metropolitan Washington, D.C. Formally, the foundation supports activities that contribute to building a stronger community. With respect to regionalism, Cafritz has concentrated its grantmaking on organizations seeking to build public awareness of the spatial, social, economic, and ecological relationships among the District and its surrounding communities.

Funding Activity. The foundation is committed to efforts that educate residents and public officials about the benefits of addressing environmental, planning and social issues on a metro-wide basis. Consequently, Cafritz has supported such D.C.-area groups as the Smart Growth Alliance, the Coalition for Smarter Growth and the Center for Watershed Protection. In the area of social equity, it has funded research and planning efforts to link housing, transportation and jobs. In-school and general outreach programs promoting environmental stewardship, as well as research projects to compile regional statistics on public health and environmental factors, are also a focus. A recent grant supported the Washington Area Bicycle Association in a project that connects neighborhoods to transit centers in two jurisdictions, promotes physical activity to improve personal health, and protects air quality.

Commitment to Collaboration. Cafritz supports local coalitions of nonprofit organizations with similar or complementary missions. They also convene grantees, funders and public representatives engaged in overlapping activity to promote better coordination and strategic use of resources. Additionally, a foundation staff member co-chairs the Washington Regional Association of Grantmakers’ Sustainable Communities Working Group, which raises awareness of the need to direct philanthropic resources to support regional/smart growth activity. The foundation also participates in regional public/private community development initiatives and funding collaboratives.

Gauging Effectiveness. While the foundation requires regular reporting from grantees to track their program effectiveness, there has been no formal evaluation of its metro-wide philanthropy. Given the foundation’s emphasis on funding civic

education and advocacy efforts, it considers evidence of increased public awareness and political debate of regional and smart growth issues an indicator of the success of its philanthropy.

Lessons/Next Steps. The foundation is convinced that its regional and smart-growth funding is influencing both public opinion and local government decision making. Grant support, convening and staff outreach efforts advocate more coordinated planning efforts that emphasize transit-oriented development and walkable, mixed-use, mixed-income communities. With the metropolitan area projected to grow by one million within the next ten years, there has been considerable progress in planning efforts that incorporate these smart growth principles. The foundation will continue to support activities that engage local communities and educate government officials about the relationship between the built environment and quality of life issues across jurisdictional boundaries.

The George Gund Foundation

Cleveland, Ohio

Interviewee: Jon Jensen, Senior Program Officer

Service Area. While the Gund Foundation applies no formal definition of “regional,” it targets its environmental grantmaking to the nine-county area of Northeast Ohio.

Objectives and Strategies. The foundation entered the field of regional grantmaking principally through its concern for watershed protection, which necessarily required multi-jurisdictional action. More generally, the foundation seeks to promote greater understanding, in organizations, government and among the public, that issues of growth and development are crosscutting, both spatially and thematically. It has been active in the smart growth/anti-sprawl area.

Funding Activity. The Gund Foundation’s regional philanthropy supports transportation (planning, advocacy and small capital projects), land use (parks, greenways, county-wide local land trusts, coordinated green space planning), economic development and reinvestment (support of a regional association of CDCs which, in turn, re-grants to local CDCs), equity (principally through support of groups actively investing in depressed areas), and environment (advocacy and planning of green space protection, support for land acquisition). The general range of environmental and regional activities funded by the foundation includes education, research, advocacy, outreach, and occasional legal action.

Commitment to Collaboration. The foundation has supported many collaborative projects, either directly or through “additive” grants that “sweeten” the resources made available by government and other philanthropies. In league with other foundations, the Gund Foundation has sought specifically to sustain the regional dialogue over smart growth and green building.

Gauging Effectiveness. While the Gund Foundation does not systematically evaluate its regional grantmaking, it is convinced that future advocacy of smart growth and regional environmental issues is necessary, as there are few regional mechanisms for collaboration on sprawl policy in Northeast Ohio, outside its Metropolitan Planning Organization.

Lessons/Next Steps. Given the region's weak commitment to interjurisdictional action, the Gund Foundation plans to sustain its support of education, advocacy and information exchange around issues of smart growth, including the funding of a statewide network for smart growth that would unite policymakers around the issue.

Lyndhurst Foundation

Chattanooga, Tennessee

Interviewee: Jack Murrah, Executive Director

Service Area. For purposes of environmental protection or conservation, the natural landscape defines the Lyndhurst Foundation's region. It is the train of mountains in the five-state area of Tennessee, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Alabama that form the Southern Appalachian region.

Objectives and Strategies. In 1992, the Lyndhurst Foundation redirected its efforts to center around the enhancement and enrichment of the social, natural and built environment of Chattanooga and the surrounding region. Recognizing that the area's biological diversity was threatened due to retirement and second home development, a concerted effort was established with other local foundations and organizations to protect the region's biological diversity and aesthetic and cultural character. The foundation was one of several that helped organize and fund the Southern Appalachian Forest Coalition. The coalition is made up of about 12 organizations that agreed to work together to protect the natural environment.

Funding Activity. The foundation focuses its resources on strengthening both the natural and urban environments. In its urban focus, the foundation supports housing, including infill and affordable housing development. It has provided funding to assist neighborhood and community organizational development. In this effort, the foundation channels its funding through such organizations as Chattanooga Neighborhood Enterprise. The foundation helped to establish a local public education foundation that has become the vehicle for civic and private support to be channeled to public education. In its environmental focus, the foundation has centered its work on environmental protection in the Southern Appalachian region that includes open space preservation and water and air-quality assurance. The foundation also funds research and data-collection activities to help strengthen and support policy recommendations.

Commitment to Collaboration. The foundation promotes collaboration in many of its urban and environmental efforts. The Southern Appalachian Forest Coalition and Chattanooga Neighborhood Enterprise are examples of efforts built around collaboration. Each participating entity has a particular role within the coalitions. The participating entities focus their work on a set of general goals that the whole group has embraced. Where appropriate, the foundation has provided additional funding if organizations were willing to collaborate on activities that were similar in focus and impact.

The Lyndhurst Foundation also seeks to collaborate with other foundations. The effort has been more successful with local foundations since there is an element of shared interest in improving their own local natural and urban environment.

Gauging Effectiveness. The Lyndhurst Foundation uses both informal and formal measures of gauging effectiveness. Formal measures rely on such data as the number of acres protected from year to year to gauge the success of efforts to protect the region's biological diversity. Each grantee is asked to provide the foundation with data on appropriate measures, which assists them in the benchmarking of progress. Annual perception surveys are also conducted to gauge citizen concern and obtain feedback. The foundation relies on a combination of hard data and educated opinion to evaluate the success of its funding initiatives.

Lessons/Next Steps. The foundation has learned important lessons about data-collection and collaboration activities. It is difficult to assess data because questions arise as to its accuracy, timeliness and relevance. But new capacities and tools now are available. The foundation has helped to marry the technical skills of its university with the community-based skills of its nonprofit research organization to build a community information system that previously did not exist. They now collect and connect diverse data streams on health, education, population, and income that traditionally have been collected by disparate government agencies. This robust and reliable bank of information can be queried on a neighborhood level. In terms of collaboration, efforts have been difficult and the foundation is pragmatic: sometimes it makes sense and sometimes it does not. It believes that it is particularly difficult for foundations to collaborate because of their unique missions and the long-range planning that often is necessary before committing to a particular path.

Marshall L. and Perrine D. McCune Charitable Foundation

Santa Fe, New Mexico

Interviewee: Owen Lopez, Executive Director

Service Area. Funding is restricted to New Mexico, with preference given to organizations that operate programs in the Santa Fe or Northern New Mexico region. Funding is targeted to community-based, community-driven projects.

Objectives and Strategies. The objective of the foundation, broadly, is to improve the physical and spiritual well being of all New Mexicans, which it does through what it calls "opportunistic grantmaking." According to Owen Lopez, the interviewee, "timing is everything" in responding to opportunities that present themselves. In the last several years, the foundation has convened groups to help identify problems, possible causes, and strategies to address them. Lopez also believes in making grants to cover operating expenses (more than 90 percent of the foundation's grants are for operations).

Funding Activity. The foundation does not restrict its funding to any particular area or interest. The focus is widespread, including arts, education, environment, youth, health, social equity, and social services. In recent years the foundation has pursued economic development as an area of concentration. Significant investment has been provided and pursued for downtown Albuquerque's revitalization and re-development. Through public-private partnerships, effort has gone into infill and affordable housing developments. The foundation has provided seed money to start up several research and policy organizations, including a nonpartisan institute to evaluate the New Mexico tax structure, and Think New Mexico, a think tank organization that in its first year succeeded in persuading the legislature to adopt and fund all-day kindergarten.

Commitment to Collaboration. The foundation pursues collaboration with other philanthropies, and encourages its grant seekers to work with other groups engaged in similar projects. A specific example of how the McCune Foundation has supported collaboration is the Rio Grande Alliance, through which a number of entities that would not ordinarily have worked together united to protect the Rio Grande. The funders involved agreed to a three-year funding commitment if the participants agreed to collaborate. Additional funding was provided for participants to allocate among themselves. After the first three years, the funders agreed to an additional three years of support.

Gauging Effectiveness. The McCune Foundation assesses its grants through a “seeing is believing” approach, rather than efforts aimed at developing measures. For example, the foundation provided a \$10,000 grant to start up the Rocky Mountain Youth Corps, aimed at providing at-risk kids with training and skills. Eight years later, the organization has a \$2 million annual operating budget. In Santa Fe, the foundation invested \$1.3 million in the construction of affordable housing. Today, 700 units are occupied.

Lessons/Next Steps. The most important lessons learned are that this approach takes time and energy, and that collaboration takes more money, not less.

The McKnight Foundation

Minneapolis, Minnesota

Interviewee: Dan Bartholomay, Senior Program Officer

Service Area. The McKnight Foundation serves a seven-county Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan urban statistical area (MUSA), primarily, with lesser influence on six other counties on the metro area’s fringe.

Objectives and Strategies. The McKnight Foundation has a formal “Regional Program” consisting of five points: housing, neighborhood improvement, transportation, open space preservation, and regional growth management. Having evolved from the foundation’s traditional work emphasizing the welfare of children, families and communities, this agenda is explicitly interdisciplinary, and seeks to promote compact metropolitan growth in part by improving circumstances in communities in or near the urban core.

Funding Activity. McKnight’s regional grantmaking targets transportation (Transit for Livable Communities, Metropolitan Council planning), land use (I-35W Transportation Coalition, Planning and Design Center for the American Urban Landscape), housing (production of smart growth and job-base housing), urban infill, reinvestment and economic development (Mercado Central, a corridor-oriented redevelopment in a predominantly Latino neighborhood), and environmental protection (habitat preservation, water contamination, air-quality improvement through reduced automobile dependency, promotion of better sub-regional planning). The Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area, uniquely, has a well-developed scheme of commercial-industrial tax base sharing, which The McKnight Foundation currently is monitoring, given growing concern over the size of the pooled tax base.

Commitment to Collaboration. McKnight promotes collaboration among some of its grant recipients formally through its Smart Growth Organizing Program and informally by targeting grants to organizations working in the same or comple-

mentary service areas. The McKnight Foundation brings together other funders regularly to encourage regional thinking and collaboration. It's also convening business leaders to encourage their involvement in growth-management issues.

Gauging Effectiveness. The foundation currently is structuring a specific set of objectives, with appropriate measures and benchmarks, for purposes of evaluating its regional grantmaking. In terms of tangible outcomes, the foundation points to actual housing production according to the smart growth model, as well as the collaboration stimulated by the Smart Growth Organizing Project, as successful outcomes of its regional philanthropy. An intangible index of the foundation's effectiveness in the field of regionalism and smart growth is an apparent, albeit gradual, influence on public opinion, represented by the passage of a smart growth ballot initiative in Dakota County in November of 2002.

Lessons/Next Steps. While The McKnight Foundation seeks to stimulate collaborative action on metropolitan matters, it has learned that it cannot impose preconceived agendas on its grant recipients, even though it is the largest foundation of its kind in Minnesota. Instead, McKnight prefers to let its grantees set their own goals and objectives within a general framework emphasizing collaboration and smart growth. The foundation's five-point regional agenda has only recently been "solidified," and Dan Bartholomay (the interviewee) anticipates that it will remain stable for the next three to five years, at roughly current levels of funding (depending on equity market conditions).

The Rauch Foundation

Garden City, New York

Interviewee: Patricia Schaefer*, Program Officer

Service Area. The Rauch Foundation focuses its work in the places it calls home—Long Island and Maryland.

Objectives and Strategies. Two brothers, Louis Rauch and Phillip Rauch, Jr., established the foundation in 1961. Until the mid-1980s, it funded a wide range of projects in the arts, environment, health care, and education. In the late 1980s the foundation made a strategic decision to focus and invest intensively on fewer areas, in order to have a more substantial impact on each. Efforts toward regional grantmaking emerged out of the recognition that problems in one area affected all. The problems that arose due to political and social fragmentation were identified as symptoms of such systemic problems as poor planning and reactive policymaking. The foundation's board of directors recognized that social and environmental problems were interconnected, and decided to observe the practices and strategies of organizations addressing similar problems in other regions. Board members traveled to other parts of the country—Portland, Oregon, Cleveland and Minneapolis—to see what other regions were doing. In a process that has taken place over the last five to eight years, the board has been directly involved in projects to determine the best approach the foundation can take in its region.

Funding Activity. The Rauch Foundation's traditional area of focus was children and families. In the 1990s, the mission was altered to include the environment, transportation, smart growth, and open space preservation. The rationale for funding in these areas is that these kinds of issues impact children and families. Smart growth, for instance, speaks to the issues of affordable housing and trans-

*No longer with the foundation.

portation, which disproportionately affect families in disadvantaged and distressed communities. Rauch takes the view that good planning and better policy will vastly improve the community for everyone, particularly those most in need, resulting in a higher overall quality of life. The foundation seeks to tailor its philanthropy to the needs of its grant recipients at a particular place and time.

Commitment to Collaboration. The foundation is committed to collaboration but is flexible in its approach, relying on the context and nature of the work being proposed. The foundation pursues collaboration in a number of ways, from brokering relationships to convening groups for mutual learning. In terms of collaborating with other foundations, the Rauch Foundation has pursued formal relationships to jointly fund particular programs and offered supplementary support to projects that other funders have initiated.

Gauging Effectiveness. The Rauch Foundation gauges effectiveness by looking at the specific outcomes of the grants it has awarded. The foundation endeavors to articulate its expectations before making a grant in order to ensure a measure of comfort in evaluating results and outcomes. Rauch is considering the development of an indicators project that would help it and other funders evaluate changes and trends over time in specific issue areas. With respect to its regional activities, the foundation is in the early stages of this work, so outcomes have not yet been realized. The foundation has, however, begun to bring people together, access the university community and its resources, and open discussions about what kind of indicators project might be pursued.

Lessons/Next Steps. The Rauch Foundation has learned that regional grantmaking is a “messy process.” There are no rules, there are no right or wrong answers, and it really depends on the context. What works in one location may not necessarily work on Long Island. Many people have just as many ideas about what is needed, yet despite the differences, the foundation has observed that people are pretty much on the same page in terms of what the main issue areas are for their region – areas such as affordable housing, transportation and education – but with differing priorities and unique, place-based strategies.

The Rauch Foundation plans to do even more regional funding, not less, and will seek community input to help focus its grantmaking. It is likely that future grants will focus more around information, data, and indicators, as opposed to specific programs.

William Penn Foundation

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Interviewee: Andrew Johnson, Program Officer (for Geraldine Wang, Program Director)

Service Area. Virtually all grants are made to organizations located in and serving constituents within the Greater Philadelphia region. The foundation defines its geographic region as greater Philadelphia and southeastern Pennsylvania, southern New Jersey, and a stretch of the Delaware River watershed running north to Warren County and south to the C&D Canal.

Objectives and Strategies. The William Penn Foundation has an explicit and fairly recent smart growth priority, as well as a growing commitment to grantmaking that integrates environmental and community program interests in a regional con-

text. Through its Environment and Communities Program, the foundation has identified three priorities: (1) protecting and restoring watersheds and related ecosystems; (2) stabilizing and revitalizing communities around existing infrastructure; and (3) promoting smart growth and livable communities within the region. The foundation views its entire Environment and Communities Program through a smart growth lens. As one of Pennsylvania's largest philanthropies, the foundation expects to spend approximately \$20 million in 2003 on smart growth related issues.

Funding Activity. The foundation's Environment and Communities Program has distributed more than 100 grants totaling over \$37 million in the past three years. The foundation's funding emphasizes an integrated approach to planning and policy. In older communities, efforts are focused on stimulating private market investments and attracting new residents and businesses through policy reform and targeted investments in Philadelphia and Camden. The foundation funds watershed-protection efforts, including research and advocacy, innovative demonstration projects and land acquisition that complements policy initiatives, with an emphasis on multi-jurisdictional planning and approaches to land use and resource protection.

Commitment to Collaboration. The foundation's commitment to collaboration is embodied in its role as a convener. This is a strategy that is pursued both subtly and overtly in its grantmaking efforts and through the partnerships it has established with other foundations. In the process of reviewing and developing proposals with grant applicants, for example, it seeks to educate organizations about similar work being done by others. The foundation also convenes groups with similar interests and goals, but different approaches, to identify potential common agendas.

Beyond grantmaking, the William Penn Foundation also hopes to assist its grantees by helping expand the pool of philanthropic dollars available for smart growth and livable communities work. In that vein, the foundation seeks to collaborate with its colleagues in the funding world to promote smart growth and livable communities activities. The foundation recently convened funders in the Greater Philadelphia/Southern New Jersey region to share information and strategies on smart growth activities, and commissioned a scan by the Funders' Network of smart growth activity among funders and key practitioners. The foundation hopes to encourage ongoing communications and networking among funders and more direct collaborative activity.

Collaborations with other funders have included support to (1) The Reinvestment Fund and the Philadelphia Neighborhood Development Collaborative, a funders group comprised of financial institutions, intermediaries, government and private philanthropies, to facilitate implementation of more coordinated investment strategies in Philadelphia and Camden; (2) the Brookings Institution and Metropolitan Area Research Corporation for a statewide study of Pennsylvania development patterns, in conjunction with the Heinz Endowments; and (3) the Open Space Institute to capitalize a land-acquisition loan fund for New Jersey established by the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation.

Gauging Effectiveness. The foundation is in the process of developing assessment indicators in its smart growth, watershed and community-revitalization priority areas. Organizations are being funded directly to track indicators as part of

their grants. The foundation also has directly funded outside organizations to help them collect data and information to develop indicators on a regional scale. Because the foundation is in the initial stages of developing its indicators, the outcomes and impacts of its funding have been visible primarily in the policy sphere. For example, new governors in Pennsylvania and New Jersey have adopted and promoted smart growth policies developed by the foundation's grantees.

Lessons/Next Steps. The foundation has learned that grants for policy development must be flexible enough to enable the grantee to respond to opportunities that come up that were not anticipated in the grant proposal. It expects to take a more active leadership role in the region, including more convening of funders, grantees and other experts.

PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS, MULTIPLE REGIONS

Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation

Morristown, New Jersey

Interviewee: Robert Perry, Program Officer

Service Area. The Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation acknowledges three definitions of "regional" for purposes of its grantmaking. The first is essentially political, and includes all of New Jersey and some of Southern New York. The second is ecological and spatial, consisting of New Jersey's highlands-to-ocean watershed, New Jersey's Pinelands, and the Delaware Bay shore area. The third is process oriented, embracing shared inter-municipal decision making around issues of smart growth, redevelopment of major New Jersey cities, and protection of open space.

Objectives and Strategies. The Dodge Foundation entered the field of regional grantmaking after attending an early organizing meeting of the Funders' Network in 1999. Since then, the foundation's funding of smart growth and other regionally oriented activity has been cast, for internal purposes, as an extension of its environmental mission to protect air quality, watershed and endangered species habitat in New Jersey. Dodge's support of urban projects is explicitly seen as a means of reducing sprawl by increasing the appeal of older/existing neighborhoods and communities.

Funding Activity. The Dodge Foundation has supported regional activity in the areas of transportation (planning and advocacy, the Tri-State Transportation Campaign), land use (planning and zoning policy, the Pinelands Commission), open space preservation (New Jersey Conservation Foundation, master planning, watershed restoration), housing (funding of a Trenton-based organization called "Isles," which produces central-city and inner-ring suburban housing according to both affordable housing and "new urbanist" models), infill and reinvestment (planning in Newark and other large New Jersey cities, inner-city school improvement to attract/retain middle class residents), and environment (planning, zoning, advocacy, land acquisition).

Commitment to Collaboration. The Dodge Foundation has supported formal collaboration in only a few instances (Robert Perry, the interviewee, describes true collaboration among grant recipients as "not easy to achieve"), but the interviewee believes it certainly has promoted informal collaboration through its funding of the New Jersey Conservation Fund and The Nature Conservancy. It currently collabo-

rates with other foundations on environmental and smart growth issues, including the Victoria Foundation, the Fund for New Jersey and the William Penn Foundation.

Gauging Effectiveness. The Dodge Foundation’s program officers require specifically structured reports from all their grantees, and the foundation has recently mounted a major assessment initiative designed to increase the organizational capacity of grant recipients. Perry observes that “it takes capacity to build capacity,” and that only about ten percent of his grant recipients are willing to evaluate themselves rigorously. Commitment to evaluation and capacity building, Perry notes, depends on organizational leadership.

Lessons/Next Steps. Given the foundation’s commitment to a wide range of issues and organizations in New Jersey, to which it annually grants approximately \$3 million, Dodge intends to pursue its smart growth and regional program for about two to three more years at current or higher levels of funding, and perhaps change direction thereafter. (The foundation self-consciously entered the field with the objective of catalyzing interest and attracting other philanthropies to it.) According to Perry, however, the heavily urbanized New Jersey population appears to have been won over to the smart growth concept, and media attention and public opinion are beginning to influence decision makers in government.

The Joyce Foundation

Chicago, Illinois

Interviewee: Margaret O’Dell, Senior Program Officer

Service Area. The Joyce Foundation serves the upper Midwest and Great Lakes bioregion. It works in the metropolitan region centered on Chicago, including northwest Indiana (and arguably across a single extended metropolitan area surrounding Lake Michigan, stretching from northwest Michigan down through northwest Indiana and up through Chicago and Milwaukee). The foundation increasingly sees the Great Lakes basin as a single, though complex region for environmental purposes, and as a “meta-region” of linked and mutually impacting human communities organized at the metropolitan scale.

Objectives and Strategies. The foundation is interested in the preservation of a natural ecology and promotion of livable and economically strong communities in a region where population growth and settlement patterns over a long period have made it imperative that the human community “live with” its natural resources: preservation of vast swaths of wilderness simply isn’t an option. Though the Joyce Foundation works in several program areas, the omnipresence of the Great Lakes and the longstanding interest of the foundation in that ecosystem furnishes a natural systems reference point for understanding the idea of quality of life and livable communities. This informs its work across all of its program areas.

The foundation has a strong interest in public policy (and advocacy). Because its ecological region – and even the metropolitan region of interest – crosses several state boundaries, the foundation is interested in the orientation and behavior of local, state and federal governments, and whether and to what extent their policies are aligned to support ecological health and quality of life. There are few institutions active at the scale at which the Joyce Foundation operates (important exceptions are the Council of Great Lakes Governors and the Great Lakes Protection Fund,

with which the foundation often partners). There is, however, a tradition of collaboration among more localized advocacy groups, and the Joyce Foundation tries to reinforce that whenever possible.

Funding Activity. The Joyce Foundation funds local, state-level and sometimes national organizations on a strategic basis; the point is to serve the region, and organizations outside the region can be helpful. Currently, and not surprisingly, a large part of the foundation's funding focuses on water, and water infrastructure. Again, however, the intersection of the natural water systems and the built community is of special interest (for example, encouraging the water-supply and wastewater-management systems to talk with each other). The foundation is also interested in transportation and energy systems, and their impact on livable communities and the natural environment. Beyond grantmaking, the foundation gets directly involved in advancing policy ideas, sometimes acting as liaison for its grantees with policymakers.

Commitment to Collaboration. The foundation encourages collaboration among its grantees (much of which occurs naturally), but doesn't force it. It works closely with other funders (Mott and Gund in its region, for example), but prefers not to join in "pooled" funding arrangements where the distinct contributions of separate funders can sometimes become blurred; alignment of conjoined funding achieves the same result without causing funder compromise. The Joyce Foundation also works closely whenever possible with public sector leaders.

Gauging Effectiveness. The foundation does retrospective evaluations to better understand what happened with a particular grant or grant strategy, but prefers not to embed formal evaluations into its grant strategy: Because the foundation is interested in public policy outcomes, evaluation is difficult to organize and might well produce inconclusive causal linkages. Rather, the foundation, together with its grantees, looks for indicators of progress (for example, "what the Senator from Indiana says on the floor of the Senate"). The foundation is particularly interested in the extent to which decision makers are using the ideas and data developed by its grantees. How? Because the foundation actively builds relationships with policymakers, it asks them directly.

Lessons/Next Steps. Because the foundation is interested in good public policy, it is hard-headed, yet risk-taking in its approach. It has learned that without champions for an idea among elected officials, the advocacy challenge is very steep indeed. It knows that good strategies are often insufficient, because of the serendipity of forces and events well beyond the control of the foundation and its grantees. "Who gets elected Governor makes a difference," and often that is a matter of a few swing votes, unrelated to the issues on which the foundation works. Because policy change takes so long, the foundation puts a premium on building relationships, with decision makers and with grantees, which can endure over time. This also requires consistency and durability within the foundation, board patience and support, and program and staff continuity.

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

Flint, Michigan

Interviewees: Lois DeBacker, Program Director, Environment

Christine A.W. Doby, Program Officer, Pathways Out of Poverty

Service Area. Though the Mott Foundation works nationally and internationally, and has a well-known focus on its hometown of Flint, for the purpose of this report, the focus is on its Michigan work in growth management and urban revital-

ization, as well as its regional strategies work in the national “Pathways Out of Poverty” program for community organizing and issue advocacy.

Objectives and Strategies. Though the Mott Foundation has been involved in Michigan land-use issues for the past ten years, in 1999 it decided to make the approach a cross-program area of interest, in which funds from the core budget for growth management and urban revitalization (housed in the Environment program) and other program budgets are used to support individual grants. Staff from the foundation’s Environment, Pathways Out of Poverty, Flint Area, and Civil Society programs are involved in review of projects and exchange of information. This enables the foundation to take a broad approach to its work in land use. The focus is largely on influencing state policy, because the foundation sees policy reform as fundamental to securing improved land-use decision making across the state. Despite the focus on state policy, support for regional organizations is essential because their work and influence can be helpful in advancing state policy. While there is a growing consensus on the need to reform Michigan’s land-use policies, not all interest groups are yet in agreement on the specifics of a reform agenda. One challenge in advancing regional growth management is the tradition of strong local home rule in Michigan and relatively weak regional councils of government.

Through its Pathways Out of Poverty Program, the foundation provides support for community organizing, which can contribute greatly to regional reform. The foundation is supporting community organizers to be effective advocates at the regional level, and sometimes at the state level as well. This evolved in response to the interest of its grantees, who felt they needed to work at those levels in order to get beyond certain barriers to success they ran into at the purely local level, such as advancing school reform beyond the district level, where poor communities often have little influence. The foundation and its grantees are highly selective in identifying areas where regional strategies could be effective, in order not to spread resources too thinly without achieving real impact. This program area also works closely with the environmental program on urban revitalization.

Funding Activity. Growth-management grants range across a variety of issue and organization types, including research to document the negative consequences of current growth patterns, support for environmental advocacy organizations, and projects that involve diverse stakeholders, including the business sector in growth-management issues.

Additional grants relevant to growth management include support for tax-policy research, community organizing, reform of urban land assembly policies, and other efforts directly relevant to urban revitalization. Mott’s focus within community organizing is on building the capacity of the field, through direct support of organizing networks, funding for Intermediary Support Organizations (ISOs), and other forms of technical assistance in research, development and communications.

Commitment to Collaboration. The foundation works closely with a core group of eight to ten Michigan foundations, most of which have been meeting three or four times per year for the past ten years. The approach is one of collegiality and cooperation rather than formal collaboration. This enables various combinations of funders to co-fund projects in a manner that best suits their individual interests. Mott also encourages collaboration among its grantees. Two years ago it funded several of its grantees to undertake a year-long process to sort out their theories of

change, political analysis and policy priorities, resulting in a joint state policy agenda. The new Governor of Michigan formed a Michigan Land Use Leadership Council, on which several of Mott's grantees were asked to serve. Six Michigan foundations provided funding for the council's work. The Michigan foundations active on land use-related issues hope that the council's recommendations will advance policy reform in the state.

Gauging Effectiveness. The foundation has not conducted a formal evaluation of its land-use work since 1997, but because of its hands-on involvement with grantees, it "keeps a finger on the pulse" continuously. In all of its programs, the foundation identifies specific outcomes that it hopes will be advanced through its grantmaking, and progress toward those outcomes is assessed annually by staff.

Lessons/Next Steps. The Mott Foundation appreciates that fundamental change takes time and that progress is almost always incremental. Focusing on Michigan as a region enables the foundation and its grantees to understand the context for smart growth efforts and develop strategies to influence the positions of stakeholder groups critical to policy reform.

The foundation is particularly pleased that the cross-program approach to growth management has brought program officers together in new ways, helping to break down the "silos." With respect to the focus on land-use policy, the foundation believes that understanding politics is of paramount importance. Nevertheless, a credible fact base, combined with advocacy that speaks the language of policymakers, is essential to success. With community organizing, the challenge is being truly responsive to the grantees and the communities they serve, yet also "generative" in bringing helpful ideas and strategies to the table (without supplanting community-based leadership). However, delivering concrete results in a manner that honors the time and commitment of folks in communities who get involved isn't always easy because regional scale outcomes are hard to "concretize."

PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS, NATIONAL

The Ford Foundation

New York, New York

Interviewee: Linetta J. Gilbert, Program Officer

Service Area. This report addresses the Ford Foundation's work in its Community Philanthropy and Civic Culture program, and specifically its regional strategies in the American South and along the U.S.-Mexico border. In addition to these "meta-regions," the foundation is interested in metropolitan strategies in particular areas, such as New Orleans and Atlanta.

Objectives and Strategies. Overall, the Ford Foundation's regional grantmaking focuses on issues of race and equity, seeking to bring a community development, leadership development and community empowerment agenda to the livable communities field. The strategy employed emerges from an asset-building (intellectual and financial) approach, to enable individuals and communities to escape poverty. The foundation has a growing interest in rural economic development and the role that individual donors, family foundations, public charities, religious organizations and others can play in advancing community-based development while working across racial divides.

Funding Activity. The program works with and through community foundations and other public charities, philanthropic networks (such as the Florida Philanthropic Network), community-based philanthropy (such as non-traditional donors), religious institutions and congregations, and such non-traditional vectors as women in community ministry.

Commitment to Collaboration. The foundation collaborates closely with others, and has worked especially closely with the Mott, Kellogg, Babcock and Warner Foundations and the Jessie Ball duPont Fund in support of community grantees. It is wary, however, of “forcing” collaboration on its grantees.

Gauging Effectiveness. The foundation assesses the effectiveness of its work largely through continuous interaction with its grantees, as well as through formal evaluation. It is just beginning to select an outside evaluator for its work on the U.S.-Mexico border.

Lessons/Next Steps. Because community organizing, civil society and conventional community economic development have traditionally focused on the neighborhood, city, rural small town, or countryside, it is challenging to build a “sense of place” across a large sub-state region and encourage a broader set of regional activities. Therefore, the work enhances a state-by-state strategy, linking key philanthropic, nonprofit and religious institutions and government agencies to increase philanthropic assets in the region. However, this approach is promising in that it enables people to focus on issues of race and equity through a regional problem-solving approach, which can engender cooperation across income and racial divides without always having to address these difficult issues “head-on.”

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation

Chicago, Illinois

Interviewee: Erika Poethig, Program Officer

Service Area. The MacArthur Foundation, through its regional policy grantmaking strategy under its Program on Human and Community Development, has long been a major funder in its “home” regions of greater Chicago and south-eastern Florida. It has also supported regional policy work at the national level.

Objectives and Strategies. The foundation’s work in its home regions involves a comprehensive, multi-focal approach to regional and community development. Its general approach has emphasized institution building rather than issues, which has furnished the foundation and its grantees the flexibility to address issues based on saliency rather than a predetermined program construct.

Funding Activity. In southeast Florida, MacArthur has pioneered a multi-focal program that seeks to preserve the natural environment (the Everglades and the Florida Keys), promote more sustainable residential and commercial development and link community economic development to regional strategies. The foundation is in an active partnership with Florida Atlantic University and the Collins Center for Public Policy in Florida. In Chicago, the foundation strongly supports activities to develop or redevelop the urban core: community economic development, affordable housing development, transportation planning and policy, and education reform. It also supports the regional civic planning and engagement work of Chicago Metropolis 2020. Nationally, the foundation supports the core activities of the Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution.

Commitment to Collaboration. The foundation collaborates closely with other foundations at the national and regional levels, through the Funders' Network and in other ways. For example, it has taken a lead role in helping to convene funders to think about the future of regional grantmaking in the United States. MacArthur also is known for its close collaboration with its grantees, establishing hands-on partnerships; this keeps the foundation's work fresh and responsive to the dynamics of the regions in which it is active. Further, wherever mutual agendas arise and are welcome, the foundation works actively with state and local public sector leadership.

Gauging Effectiveness. The foundation is moving forward on what could be a major effort to assess whether formal or informal metropolitan governance is a contributing factor to regional success measured by both social and economic outcomes. Examples of formal metropolitan governance include: Portland Metro, Twin Cities Metro, city and county consolidations such as Louisville, Kentucky, or Jacksonville, Florida. Informal metropolitan governance is still emerging in places, but examples include metropolitan mayors caucuses in Denver and Chicago and networks of private, nonprofit and public organizations moving a regional agenda forward. Research under consideration by the foundation would examine those places that are performing across a continuum in a certain domain, such as poverty deconcentration, the ability to attract new capital and jobs, or educational achievement. Comparative case studies would enable scholars to develop theories about the key indicators of regional success, and specifically whether informal or formal metropolitan governance is a factor leading to progress. This research could yield evidence for funders and practitioners about which issues are most effectively addressed at a regional scale.

Lessons/Next Steps. The foundation will continue to fund its work in its home regions, but will likely devote much of its time and energy (and some resources) over the next three to five years on the research project described above.

Surdna Foundation

New York, New York

Interviewee: Hooper Brooks, Program Director for Environment

Service Area. The Surdna Foundation funds nationwide, but the perspectives summarized here relate primarily to its environmental grantmaking in the area of smart growth, which has been limited to New Jersey, Utah, New Mexico, and Maryland.

Objectives and Strategies. The Surdna Foundation entered the field of regional grantmaking specifically because it acknowledges that certain problems and policy issues are not suited to action by existing jurisdictions (i.e., discrete units of local government). As a matter of principle, Surdna is interested in changing the practices of organizations and institutions, not merely securing desired outcomes. Consequently, the term "regional" does not appear in its formal guidelines for grant applicants. In other words, regionalism is a means, not an end.

Funding Activity. The Surdna Foundation has supported projects in the areas of bio-diversity (fisheries and forest management, species preservation); transportation planning; energy conservation; community revitalization; and smart growth (statewide in New Jersey, the urbanized corridor west of the Continental Divide in

Utah, statewide in New Mexico, and the greater Baltimore region in Maryland). Functionally, the foundation's environmental grantmaking seeks to prevent irreversible damage to the environment and promote more efficient, economically sound and equitable use of land and natural resources.

Commitment to Collaboration. Surdna encourages collaboration among its grantees and seeks to work with them in supportive, collegial relationships. The foundation also recognizes the importance of collaborating with other foundations, corporations and governmental bodies.

Gauging Effectiveness. Given the idiosyncratic nature of regionally oriented projects – and the typically long success horizon of such efforts – evaluation is informal and intuitive.

Lessons Learned/Next Steps. According to Hooper Brooks (the interviewee), the foundation community must refine its understanding of the kinds of projects that should appropriately be addressed on a regional basis. Additionally, Brooks notes that regional and collaborative approaches should be undertaken when and where they have potential for adding value and effectiveness to a given initiative. The Surdna Foundation's smart growth funding in the regions referenced above was intended as a five-year "catalytic" demonstration initiative. It winds down in the Spring of 2004.

Chapter 5—Opportunities and Challenges for the Smart Growth Field

THE smart growth field is at a critical juncture. On the one hand, it now has had sufficient impact in enough places to have attracted public attention and political support, as well as opposition from those who feel threatened enough to organize against it. On the other hand, it is not yet a national, culturally embedded movement, and it may not become one, because some aspects of smart growth are and always will be local in nature, driven by local political culture and state, regional and local policies and programs.

If the platform of choice for smart growth strategies is the region, grantmakers are presented with an extraordinary opportunity to grow their role as a vital connective link. There are very few other public or private institutional networks that are built around this regional construct. In the public sector, perhaps the House of Representatives comes closest, but it is impaired by deep partisan differences, program “siloism” and relatively weak institutional support in the regions (districts) themselves; neither are they really organized to connect their “regions” as “places.” The relatively new Congressional Smart Growth Caucus is an important step in the right direction, but hasn’t yet emerged as an irresistible force in federal policy development. Also at the federal level, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Smart Growth program and the Smart Growth Network have been vitally important in promoting the smart growth movement since 1996.

National organizations representing metropolitan planning organizations (for federal transportation funds) and regional councils of government are well positioned to connect these networks, and very important dialogue takes place among their members. Typically, however, they haven’t developed the kind of public-private partnerships or issue agendas required for sufficiently robust smart growth impacts. Moreover, they have emerged as a result of policy or funding decisions, not as a grassroots, values-based movement. Nonetheless, some regional agencies have begun to engage in comprehensive, multi-issue collaboration. This holds promise.

There are a number of national organizations with local or regional chapters, affiliates or programs that over the past ten years have embraced the idea of regional, multi-issue strategies on national policy. These include the Alliance for Regional Stewardship, the American Farmland Trust, the American Planning Association, the Enterprise Foundation, the Local Initiatives Support Corporation, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Surface Transportation Policy Project, the Trust for Public Land, the Urban Land Institute, and, of course, Smart Growth America and the Growth Management Leadership Alliance. These and similar organizations are jointly responsible for much of the success of the smart growth movement.

The Role of Philanthropy

Above and beyond the good work of the advocacy sector, organized philanthropy possesses inherent institutional and experiential advantages in strengthening a regionally based, national smart growth movement:

Institutional Advantages

- *Resources.* Unlike other change agents in the field, philanthropy has access to very substantial discretionary grant funds and other resources. Even in the cur-

rent era of diminishing foundation assets and grant programs, none of the smart growth advocates command similar resources.

- *Independence.* Foundations enjoy a measure of independence, and while values-based are not driven by ideology or hidden agendas.
- *Sustainability.* Philanthropy is here to stay, and regionalist grantmakers are willing to make investments over a very long term, which is what is needed to help grow and develop this movement.
- *Well-organized regional and national networks.* Through national affinity groups, regional associations of grantmakers and the growing national network of community foundations, philanthropy does not have to invent a structure that makes interaction across the nation's regions possible and effective; it's already in place and merely needs to be organized for this purpose.

Experiential Advantages

The regional stewardship experiences of the 18 foundations profiled in this report furnish a knowledge base that should be adopted widely in smart growth philanthropy and used to inform smart growth strategies more generally.

Why “Stewardship of Place” Grantmaking Should Be Emulated

- Metropolitan regional grantmaking holds promise for addressing the many complex and interconnected issues related to growth and planning.
- This body of work is trustworthy and credible because it has grown up from the regions themselves, rather than being imposed either on the grantmaking community or on its grantees by some artifice of academic or other “expertise.”
- Because the regional “frame” is relatively recent and based more on experience than theory, it encourages innovative thinking, grantmaker cooperation, and grantmaker-grantee partnerships.
- Because this grantmaking is driven by “stewardship of place,” it is able and willing to grow and adapt to new realities and lessons learned.
- The practitioners of this grantmaking are among the best in the business: passionate, caring, curious, collaborative, interested in learning and sharing lessons learned, and therefore worthy of emulation.

Why “Stewardship of Place” Grantmaking Is Hard to Emulate

- This style of grantmaking is highly individualized and therefore difficult to standardize for replication purposes.
- Where institutionalized, this grantmaking is powerful and significant, but where it is not infused with the vision and values of the grantmaking institution, its survival/sustainability is threatened.
- This grantmaking is challenging for large national foundations, but without them it is hard to imagine a successful national movement. By virtue of being place-based and place-focused, this grantmaking is very specifically tailored to the unique characteristics of individual regions. This is especially challenging for

large national foundations that must work in many places at the same time. Therefore in emulating the work of regional grantmakers, national foundations may be tempted to over-standardize their approach, in order to ensure sufficient national “coverage” with existing staff and grants capacity. Moreover, this work often rests on active and close regional partnerships, and it is difficult for national foundations to be “on the ground” in a manner that enables such partnerships. Consequently, working with and through intermediary regional partners may be the best approach.

- Complexity is often a barrier to effective communication, especially where grantmaking is distributed across many distinct regions. Thus, a major task for regional smart growth philanthropists is the formulation of a coherent set of national messages.

The Advantages and Disadvantages of “Style”

This style of grantmaking is best exemplified by the knowledge, attitudes, and practices (i.e., the *persona*) of the individual professional grantmaker. This is certainly a great advantage with respect to the continuity and efficacy of the grantmaking itself. The individual grantmaker is often passionate about the work; willing to stay in place; interested in forming partnerships; willing to take funding risks and play unconventional roles; a storehouse of knowledge and experience; and often highly respected in both the grantmaking and non-grantmaking communities. These qualities result in substantially more influence than is often the case with conventional foundation program officers.

Sometimes this style or persona is also embodied in the grantmaking institution itself, especially where the board or executive leadership of the foundation embraces the “stewardship of place,” either by tradition or as a result of a recent strategic review. This was more often the case with the community foundations we studied than private foundations. In the case of private foundations, it was more common among those that had recently experienced a thorough strategic review. Where the grantmaking style is not embedded endemically in the institution, there is one noticeable strategy for sustainability—serial program initiatives. Particularly for community foundations, this style is expressed in foundation-led initiatives, one after the other. As long as the institution’s leadership and the community are supportive of initiative-based philanthropy, this style of grantmaking will continue.

Often, however, the style is contained within a specific individual or program area, and does not characterize other program areas or the institution itself. This raises questions about whether and to what extent the style may survive the inevitable staff turnover that comes to all organizations. Consequently, sustainability may well rest on the extent and depth to which community and grantseeker expectations have been fostered or whether the style gets “lifted up” through an institutional strategic review.

Spreading this Style Throughout Smart Growth Philanthropy

It is unclear whether this style of grantmaking is transferable to other professional grantmakers or foundations that have not already adopted it. *In the absence of such transferability, it seems unlikely that the goal of a national, regionally based philanthropic smart growth network can be achieved.* The challenge for the field is to convey the efficacy of the work to those who are not yet “true believers.” There may be

many ways to do so, including what we call *associative* and *evidentiary* strategies.

Associative strategies assume that the experience of grantmaking based on the stewardship of place is so compelling that it will attract and retain others by virtue of that experience, and may include:

- Collaborative or partnership grantmaking – practiced by many metropolitan regional grantmakers.
- “Pooled” grantmaking – practiced less frequently.
- Peer-to-peer professional development – particularly through the support infrastructure of philanthropy itself, such as the Funders’ Network.

Evidentiary strategies consist of what we call the “MacArthur Challenge,” because the MacArthur Foundation appears ready to embark on an effort to try to verify the efficacy of regional governance (broadly construed), and thus of metropolitan regional grantmaking focused on that outcome. The evidentiary strategy assumes that evidence credibly gathered and well presented can convince grantmaking organizations that this style of philanthropy is effective and capable of producing comparatively better results than other, more conventional forms. There are three pathways in the evidentiary realm:

- Testimonial, in which grantmakers and grantees offer their experience-based judgment that this grantmaking is effective – most of the grantmakers we interviewed would appear to be satisfied that this is a sound approach.
- Experimental, in which traditional social science outcome or impact methodologies could be used to show results – many are skeptical about the utility of this approach because this style of grantmaking entails great complexity, long duration and exceptional dynamism. These characteristics make it very difficult to establish or convey cause-and-effect connections between the grantmaking and community or systems outcomes.
- Non-predictive anticipation, in which grantmakers hold themselves accountable for pursuing actual, transparent results, and look for and try to document those results without being able to predict those results or trace causal connections between intervention and outcomes.

Chapter 6—Recommendations for the Funders’ Network

TO support the quality and reach of individual regional grantmakers and the growth and development of the field, based on the interviews and subsequent roundtable discussion at the Funders’ Network’s annual 2003 meeting, we recommend the following:*

- Stay the course. With respect to professional development, continue to provide learning opportunities, through publications and national and regional meetings. The Network’s Strategic Assessment Project and the preparation of this paper have already shone the spotlight on this work and illuminated important questions yet to be answered about regional grantmaking efficacy and spread.
- Devise educational and engagement programs targeted at the particular roles played by different individuals in foundations. Because program officers and executives in smaller foundations often are the most familiar and secure in practicing this kind of “stewardship of place” philanthropy, strategies to introduce senior management and board members to this approach would be helpful. These efforts might also encourage executives and board members to exploit their community and regional relationships to advance the goals of the grants program.
- Support exploration of innovative associative and evidentiary strategies for growing the field, perhaps in partnership with the MacArthur Foundation and other funders. This could include expanded, direct peer-to-peer support as well as expanded internet-based communications and exchange. It also could include further exploration of a process for capturing intended but unpredictable smart growth outcomes, such as regional smart growth indicators reports or other innovative measurement techniques.
- Pursue targeted communications strategies, within philanthropy and beyond, to foster the climate and conditions necessary for expanding the role and impact of metropolitan regional grantmaking.

With leadership from the Funders’ Network, smart growth philanthropy in the “stewardship of place” fashion will continue to evolve and appeal to more grantmakers. As the network of funders expands, the field of smart growth advocacy and practice will enjoy new opportunities for learning and impact. The 18 grantmakers profiled in this report have shown the way, and will continue to do so.

* In the current constrained climate of assets and grantmaking budgets, the general caution given by interviewees was not to plan for or expect major new initiatives in the short-term. That is not to say that this couldn’t be a time for thoughtful planning and exploration, awaiting the return of philanthropic capacity.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Directory of Interviewees

Community Foundations

East Bay Community Foundation

DeDomenico Building
200 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza
Oakland, CA 94612
510-208-0839
www.eastbaycf.org

Interviewee: Ed Church*, Director, Livable Communities Initiative

The Greater Cincinnati Foundation

200 West Fourth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
513-241-2880
www.greatercincinnati.org

Interviewees: Kathryn Merchant, President/CEO, Ellen Gilligan, Vice President for Strategic Initiatives

New Hampshire Charitable Foundation

37 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
603-225-6641
www.nhcf.org

Interviewees: Racheal Stuart, Vice President of Programs, Meredith Hatfield, Program Director, Livable New Hampshire

Vancouver Foundation

555 West Hastings Street, Suite 1200
Box 12132
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6B 4N6
www.vancouverfoundation.bc.ca

Interviewee: Mauro Vescera, Program Director

Private Foundations, Single Region

Barr Foundation

The Pilot House
Lewis Wharf
Boston, MA 02110
617-854-3126

Interviewee: Marion Kane, Executive Director

* No longer with the foundation.

The Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation

1825 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
202-223-3100
www.cafritzfoundation.org

Interviewee: Carolyn Mambu, Program Officer

The George Gund Foundation

1845 Guildhall Building
45 Prospect Avenue West
Cleveland, OH 44115
216-241-3114
www.gundfdn.org

Interviewee: Jon Jensen, Senior Program Officer

Lyndhurst Foundation

517 East Fifth Street
Chattanooga, TN 37403-1826
423-756-0767

Interviewee: Jack Murrah, Executive Director

Marshall L. and Perrine D. McCune Charitable Foundation

345 East Alameda
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505-983-8300

Interviewee: Owen Lopez, Executive Director

The McKnight Foundation

710 Second Street South, Suite 400
Minneapolis, MN 55401
612-333-4220
www.mcknight.org

Interviewee: Dan Bartholomay, Senior Program Officer

The Rauch Foundation

229 Seventh Street, Suite 306
Garden City, NY 11530-5766
516-873-9808
www.rauchfoundation.org

Interviewee: Patricia Schaefer*, Program Officer, Environment

William Penn Foundation
Two Logan Square, 11th Floor
100 North 18th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-988-1830
www.wpennfdn.org

Interviewee: Andrew Johnson, Program Officer

Private Foundations, Multiple Regions

Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation
163 Madison Avenue
P.O. Box 1239
Morristown, NJ 07962-1239
973-540-8443
www.grdodge.org

Interviewee: Robert Perry, Program Officer

The Joyce Foundation
Three First National Plaza
70 West Madison Street, Suite 2750
Chicago, IL 60602
312-782-2464
www.joycefdn.org

Interviewee: Margaret O'Dell, Senior Program Officer

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
1200 Mott Foundation Building
Flint, MI 48502-1851
810-766-1714
www.mott.org

Interviewees: Lois DeBacker, Program Director, Environment, Christine A.W. Doby, Program Officer, Pathways Out of Poverty

Private Foundations, National

The Ford Foundation
320 East 43rd Street
New York, NY 10017
212-573-5154
www.fordfound.org

Interviewee: Linetta J. Gilbert, Program Officer

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
140 South Dearborn Street, Suite 1300
Chicago, IL 60603-5285
561-626-4800
www.macfound.org

Interviewee: Erika Poethig, Program Officer

Surdna Foundation
330 Madison Avenue, 30th Floor
New York, NY 10017
212-557-0010
www.surnda.org

Interviewee: Hooper Brooks, Program Director for Environment

Appendix B: Interview Questions

1. For purposes of your grantmaking how do you define regional?
2. What are your goals/reasons for doing regional grantmaking?
3. By what process did you decide to pursue a regional strategy?
4. In what types of issue areas have you funded? (see examples below)
5. What types of organizations/activities have you funded? (see examples below)
6. Have you promoted collaborative activities among any of your organizations through your funding?
7. Has any of your funding been done collaboratively with other foundations?
8. How have you approached evaluation of your regional grantmaking?
9. What kinds of outcomes/impacts have you seen?
10. What are the lessons you have learned from this (for them, for you)?
11. What are your future plans in regional grantmaking? Do you plan to do more or less regional funding, change direction?
12. The Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities is exploring ways of supporting this work through a new initiative that will assist funders in using more regional approaches. What types of activities would be helpful to you and your foundation? (see examples below)

Examples of issue areas:


- Transportation Reform (e.g., funding, transit-oriented development and design)
- Land Use Reform (e.g., planning, zoning, policy, funding)
- Housing (e.g., supply, affordability, location)
- Infill and/or Reinvestment (e.g., NIMBYism, code & entitlement reform, gentrification, neighborhood revitalization)
- Open space, ag-land, habitat preservation (e.g., planning, conservation funding)
- Tax Reform (e.g., decreasing the fiscalization of land use)
- Social and Economic Equity (e.g., center city-suburban collaboration, other regional equity strategies)
- Regional Economic Development (e.g., location decisions, workforce access, etc.)
- Environmental (e.g., water quantity, air quality)

Examples of activities/uses of funds:

- Core support
- Communications
- Visualization, Visioning & Public Engagement
- Facilitation/Mediation
- Leadership Training
- Data and/or Knowledge Development/Transfer
- Policy and Political Skills/Capacity-Building
- Organizational Development (e.g., fundraising, revenue diversification)

Examples of Funders' Network services:

- Convene funders (and perhaps others) for mutual learning
- Network national and regional funders
- Prepare monographs and other publications
- Provide peer-to-peer coaching, technical assistance
- Foster collaborative funding
- Facilitate demonstration projects
- Measure adoption/progress of smart growth policies and principles



The Alliance for Regional Stewardship (ARS) is a national, peer-to-peer network of regional stewards who benefit by sharing experiences and working collaboratively on innovative approaches to shared regional challenges.

ARS is for proven leaders who recognize the interdependencies of their regions' economy, environment, and society—and are seeking practical ways to effect change as regional stewards.

These stewards can come from the business, government, education, nonprofit or community sectors, but share a common commitment to collaborative action and regional stewardship.

ARS activities include:

- Semi-annual leadership forums
- John W. Gardner Academy for Regional Stewardship
- Ongoing affinity groups on topics of specific interest
- Comprehensive website and monthly e-newsletter
- Monograph series on key regional topics
- Innovation scans of regional best practices
- Stewardship Awards program

For more information on the Alliance for Regional Stewardship, please visit our website at www.regionalstewardship.org



1009 Grant Street, Suite 203
Denver, CO 80203
303-477-9443

Copyright © 2003 Alliance for Regional Stewardship. All rights reserved.