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INTRODUCTION

Managing growth in our cities and counties is clearly a major challenge in the 1990s. Yet, the principal stakeholders - developers, municipal officials and citizens' groups – are often caught in complex, multi-party conflicts. All too often they fail to work together to find mutually beneficial solutions. Most local decision makers deal with issues on a piecemeal basis within their own jurisdictions, isolated from other units of government. They willing or unwillingly fail to take into account impacts on neighboring communities or the region as a whole (Cogan, 175). Citizens' groups become polarized by confrontations and feel powerless; developers suffer costly delays and damaged reputations; and municipal officials are forced to take sides, causing public backlash. Disputants often end up in an administrative tribunal or the courts for a decision in a costly, win/lose and divisive adversarial process. Tallahassee and Leon County are no different. The unincorporated area on the northeast edge of Tallahassee known as Bradfordville serves as a good example.

This case study examines the mediation between several homeowner associations and Leon County as a result of an injunction issued by Circuit Judge Kevin Davey on December 3, 1998. In effect, the injunction placed a moratorium on all new construction in the Bradfordville Study Area (BSA). The BSA is a rapidly developing area of mostly residential subdivisions in the unincorporated area just northeast to the city of Tallahassee. Judge Davey ruled the county had failed to conduct a stormwater study and enact protections as promised in the Tallahassee-Leon County Comprehensive Plan (the Comp Plan). The county's promise was also part of the mediated agreement of an earlier
dispute involving the siting of a Publix shopping center in the BSA. With the assistance of a mediator, the homeowner associations and the county reached an agreement in early January which, in part, allows limited site home building and homeowner renovations. The injunction remains on all commercial development. The mediator, Arden Siegendorf, called the process in this particular case the most difficult one he had handle in twelve years. Speaking of the varied interests and parties involved, he said “it was like herding cats.”

The purpose of this case study is to investigate and analyze a dispute rich in conflict dynamics by characterizing a few elements of the resolution process. This includes identifying parties and issues, collecting and cataloging data information, analyzing outcomes of the dispute and explore the structure of the dispute. First, the research methodology is explained and presented as evidence and back-up information to help identify and validate the components of the case. Secondly, a case history and a timeline of the mediation is provided to identify phases of case structure and development. This type of chronological study allows the investigator to cover many different types of variables and not be limited to a single independent or dependent variable. The third part of this review is an analysis of the dispute that investigates parties interests and issues, assesses the character of the dispute, and describes the nature of the conflict. Finally, the case outcomes are discussed and conclusions are drawn based on this case study.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data collection for this case study came from three sources; newspapers, public documents and records, and personal interviews. The multiple sources of data were critical to understand the context of the case and analyze the dispute. The use of multiple sources helped guard against data bias problems.
Data Collection

Newspapers

Case research was gathered through a series of articles from the major local newspaper, the Tallahassee Democrat. Research from editorials and articles were important to establish background information, a timeline of events, providing insight into the issues and interests, and the dispute resolution process. One must be very careful when disseminating this information. Although the articles focused on many facts of the case, the reporter’s sources may present biased viewpoints, skewing public perception.

Public Documents

Public documents for the case research were provided by the participants in the mediation process. These included letters, staff reports, maps, and legal documents related to the case. The technical substance of the documents varied depending on its purpose. The documents were used to corroborate factual and temporal information obtained from the articles and interviews, delineate most of the case issues and interests, and identify outcomes of the process.

Interviews

Extensive personal interviews provided the richest detail about the background to the dispute, the personalities, issues, emotional dimensions, the underlying interests and the conduct of the mediation process itself. As expected, the interviews gave more varied perspectives and greater sense of the subtleties of the issues than could be obtained through either of the other two sources. (Carpenter & Kennedy, 1988) Interviews were conducted with a total of eight individuals. A questionnaire was developed according to
guidelines and techniques established by Carpenter and Kennedy (1988) (see Appendix D) Each interviewee was provided with a copy of the questionnaire prior to the interview but was also given free reign to expand on the questions as they wished. The circumstances surrounding the interviews varied due to the limited time given for research combined with the time demands on the participants given the fact the dispute is ongoing.

The first interview was conducted with the mediator in the case, Arden Siegendorf, in order to obtain a broad overview of the process, issues, and identify a good cross section of different perspectives. It is believed that as the mediator, he was probably able to give the most objective view of the situation and the information he gave helped ensure the appropriate questions were asked of the right people. A final wrap-up interview was conducted with Arden Siegendorf after all of the other interviews in order to clarify details and any discrepancies.

Separate interviews were conducted of two of Leon County’s representatives in the mediation process. Gary Johnson, Director of the Leon County Community Development Department, spoke from the perspective of a county staff member. Cari Roth, of the law firm Lawrence, L & Walker, spoke from the perspective of a county legal representative.

Three representatives of the home owner associations were interviewed. Phillip Speake and Leanne Jowers spoke as officers of participating associations in the mediation. Randie Denker spoke as the attorney for all four of the associations involved in the mediation. None of the three were able to make themselves available for individual interviews. However, all three consented to being interviewed during and immediately
after a special topics class on the Bradfordville injunction held in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at Florida State University. Randie Denker had also previously responded to the questionnaire in writing by e-mail.

The remaining two interviews were conducted by telephone with parties outside the full mediation process who only participated in the special public meeting. The objective of interviewing Jack Buford, the Tallahassee Builders Association, and Marshall Conrad, an attorney for a commercial property owner, was to gain their perspective as outside parties with a direct interest in the outcome of the mediation.

CASE HISTORY

A limited background history of this case is important in order to understand the cycle of conflict which led to the litigation and the resulting injunction by Judge Davey. A historical background helps establish the frame of mind in which each party approached the mediation process. Even the particular mediator in this case was chosen because of his prior role in the historical background of this case. A description of the mediation process itself is also provided in order to assist the reader in understanding the conflict analysis.

Background

Taking a closer look at two different events arising out of Bradfordville's rapid growth illustrates the challenges facing the key stakeholders as they try to coordinate their respective interests. The first event involved the proposed siting of the Bradfordville Village Center, a shopping center located at the intersection of Thomasville
Road and Bradfordville Road, eventually anchored by a Publix supermarket. First proposed in 1989, the project went through several convoluted incarnations before finally winning approval in 1994 and subsequently being built. The second event involved the siting of the new Northeast High School. Located off of Thomasville Road a short distance across from and to the north of the shopping center, the school was first proposed in 1994. The school is currently under construction and is scheduled to open for the fall 1999 term. The school was specifically exempted from Judge Davey’s injunction.

Both projects involved long delays, intergovernmental conflicts, and the active involvement of citizens' groups. Many of the key issues involved in each project - stormwater runoff, commercial development, character of the area, consistency and concurrency - are still at issue in a series of lawsuits that continue to dominate the newspaper headlines to this day. Judge Davey’s injunction was, in large part, fallout from these earlier two events.

Though the overall growth rate for Leon County is a modest 2.5 percent annually, almost three quarters of that growth settles in the "Red Hills" region in the northeast section of the county and includes Bradfordville. The Leon County Schools, using census data, show the northeast area (north of I-10 and east of Meridian Rd.) as having a population of just over 6,000 in 1970, growing to over 34,000 in 1990, and a projected population in 2020 reaching almost 60,000 (Tallahassee Democrat, 6/23/96). The resulting pressure for commercial development and its consequences in Bradfordville are at the heart of most of the land use conflicts in the area. In 1996, the city and county
were estimated to need to build $600 million worth of roads and $100 million worth of stormwater facilities to handle development that was already built or under way in the area at the time (Tallahassee Democrat, 6/23/96).

The siting of a supermarket based shopping center on the northeast corner of Bradfordville Road and Thomasville Road was a long and contentious effort with a diversity of issues and opinions. In June 1989, O'Conner Development corporation, in connection with Winn Dixie, contracted to buy land on the northeast corner of Thomasville Road and Bradfordville Road. The contract was contingent on the owners applying for a rezoning of the property which was denied due to concerns about stormwater runoff. About the same time, the Monticello Drug Company submitted a proposal for a 150,000 square foot shopping center. This request was also denied based on the Planning Commissions recommendation and citizen opposition.

Two significant results came from the denials of the proposals above. The first was two lawsuits challenging the denials. This began a long pattern of respective parties resorting to the courts to resolve conflicts. The second was the creation of the Citizens Task Force in November.

Appointed by the County Commission, the task force produced a study establishing three goals, including proper location of land uses, design standards and review, and maintenance of historic resources. Though the findings were never formally adopted by the County Commission, the findings have played a significant role in subsequent debates on development in the area because of the support from the neighborhood associations. Based in part on the Task Force’s findings, Bradfordville
residents later pushed through amendments in 1994 to the Comp Plan aimed at preserving the area’s “rural character”, giving the concept legal authority or force of law and thus the power to participate in decision-making (Johnson, 194).

After the Tallahassee-Leon County Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 1990 and prior to the 1994 amendments, John Lauder filed for a rezoning in 1991 for 16 acres on the southwest corner of Thomasville and Bannerman Roads. Monticello Drug Company also tried again by submitting a new planned unit development. This proposal was for a mixed-use planned development. Concerns over stormwater runoff into Lake McBride, land use compatibility, and the lack of water and sewer lead to the Planning Commission's recommendation to deny and the subsequent denial by the County Commission.

At this stage Publix replaced Monticello Drug Company as the primary mover of the project. After a year and a half, Publix was finally able to guide the proposal to an approval from the County Commission in May, 1993, based on a settlement designed to resolve all of the outstanding lawsuits. However, the victory was short lived, and in June, 1993, Commissioner Anita Davis changed her vote, and voted against the settlement. This eventually resulted in lawsuits by both the neighborhood associations and Publix against the County.

The Second Judicial Circuit Court eventually ordered the parties to mediate the dispute and appointed Arden Siegendorf as mediator in the case. A settlement was mediated by Siegendorf and Dr. Tom Taylor in April, 1994 which was then approved by the County Commissioner. Finally the neighborhood associations, the developer and the municipal officials each got most of what they sought from the beginning.
A window of opportunity to end the cycle of conflict and build on improved relationships between the parties was soon lost. Section 4.b. of the Bradfordville Village Center Mediation Agreement, along with objectives and policies in the Comp Plan, calls for the County to study and create a stormwater management plan to handle future development. The study was postponed from 1995 to 1997, and was finally funded in September, 1998. The delays in funding and implementing the study were reported as primary reasons for last week's freeze on new development in the Bradfordville area (Tallahassee Democrat, 12/4/98).

The second event involved the acrimonious three year process which resulted in Leon County starting construction last fall on its first new high school in twenty-three years. A site selection committee consisting almost entirely of city and county employees selected the Middlebrooks site just north of the Publix Shopping Center and outside of the Urban Services Area (USA). In this particular conflict, the homeowner associations sided with the County and the School Board in requesting an amendment to the Comp Plan calling for an exception for capital infrastructure to be provided to schools outside the USA.

On the other side of the issue were the Florida Department of Community Affairs, the City of Tallahassee, and two non-profit advocacy groups, 1000 Friends of Florida and Tall Timbers. They were concerned about urban sprawl, consistency with the Comp Plan, and the increasing cost of public infrastructure. Each of these issues was adversely affected by the precedent of extending the USA.
A key event in the process was the election in November 1995 that placed John Paul Bailey on the City Commission and Bill Montford in as School Superintendent. The latter pushed hard to finalize the process and the former proved to be the swing vote in a 3 to 2 vote by the City Commission to reverse its previous decision and approve the expansion of the USA to include the Middlebrooks site. A final agreement was reached and signed between DCA, the City, the County, the neighborhood associations and the property owner, Harry Middlebrooks. The settlement placed a five-year moratorium on developing 17 acres Middlebrooks owns next to the high school site and called for future cooperation in school siting cases by proposing to put an education element into the local Comp Plan (Tallahassee Democrat, 8/28/97). The agreement also called for completion of the drainage studies called for in the earlier Publix agreement (Tallahassee Democrat, 8/28/97). This issue points out how even when the County and the homeowner associations were on the same side of the dispute of the school siting, their differences regarding the issues of stormwater and overall development in Bradfordville were still a major concern.

Much of the results of land use conflicts like those related above has been uncertainty about what development can take place where. In an effort to bring some predictability to the process, the County moved away from mixed use A, or performance zoning, to a more site specific zoning. Bradfordville homeowner associations requested and got an exemption from the change and the area around the Bradfordville/Bannerman/Thomasville Road intersections remained mixed use A. Part of the reason for the request was a belief by residents that less commercial development would occur under mixed use
A while they waited for the promised stormwater study to guide the new site specific zoning for the area.

In September, 1998 at the final hearing for a renewed proposal by the County to change Bradfordville to site specific zoning, the issue of the stormwater study dominated debate. Earlier the same evening, the County Commission finally approved funding to conduct the long promised stormwater study agreed to years earlier as part of the Bradfordville Village Center agreement. Homeowner association representatives pleaded with the County Commission to wait on the zoning proposal until the study was completed. Those favoring the change were mostly landowners seeking some certainty as to what they could and could not do with their property in terms of development.

The Commission voted to approve the change for Bradfordville to site specific zoning. Three of the homeowner associations, represented by Randie Denker then chose to file suit against the county. On December 3, 1998 Circuit Judge Kevin Davey ruled against Leon County in favor of the homeowner associations. The oral order virtually froze development in Bradfordville. The subsequent written order, issued on December 15, 1998 specifically exempted the ongoing construction of the Northeast High School and the widening of Thomasville Road. The ruling is, in large part, fallout from the earlier two events. It is a culmination of the distrust and animosity built over the years between the County Commission and neighborhood groups.

The basis for the ruling was the same elements recommended by the Citizens Task Force in 1989, promised by the Commission as outlined above and still unfulfilled. The Court determined the County Commission had never fulfilled its promise to the residents
to conduct the stormwater study, or create provisions for protecting historic properties and environmentally sensitive areas.

**Mediation**

Facing mounting political pressures and with limited time for the County to choose to appeal the injunction, County representatives were amenable to the suggestion by Randie Denker to try and mediate the conflict and avoid further litigation. The parties quickly agreed to ask Arden Siegendorf to be the mediator based on his prior experience in the Publix dispute. Siegendorf was chosen for his familiarity with the parties, their issues and concerns, and the trust each party had in him. Siegendorf’s experience with the Publix mediation led him to request from the Judge Davey a court order that gave Siegendorf, in part, control over determining the parties to be included, the place and number of sessions to be held, and a provision calling for the process to be confidential. A total of four sessions were held along with one public session aimed at including stakeholders not named as parties in the underlying lawsuit.

The first session was held on December 28, 1998 and was devoted to Siegendorf explaining the process of mediation, working with the parties to establish agreed upon ground rules (including who should attend future sessions), and developing issues and concerns. The following session was devoted almost entirely to further developing the parties issues and concerns. The public meeting was held on January 4, 1999 and was attended by various stakeholders with an interest in the outcome of the mediation. The attendees included real estate interests, developers, other commercial interests, property owners, an individual homeowner, and lawyers (see appendix F). Siegendorf had returned
to Judge Davey and requested an amendment to the earlier order to allow for the public meeting and extending the request for confidentiality to cover the meeting in order to keep the issues out of the press. The third session began the process of moving towards an agreement. The final session was a thirteen hour day that concluded around 11:00 PM with the parties signing an agreement.

The parties were free to call for a caucus at any point during the process. Each session consisted primarily of plenary sessions with frequent caucuses called by each side interspersed throughout the process. The mediator attended respective caucuses as requested by the parties. During caucuses the mediator would primarily help the respective parties explore possibilities and consequences of positions. He chose to use the plenary sessions for substantive negotiations rather than shuttle between the parties as they caucused.

**DISPUTE ANALYSIS**

The analysis of the conflict derives from the concepts and procedures developed by Carpenter and Kennedy (1988). Parties interests, positions, sources of power and information, and the prioritizing of issues are all identified in the Conflict Analysis Tables. The views of the homeowner associations and the County are presented and evaluated. They will be further discussed in a separate section of the study.

The tables help to organize the collected data into a chart for review and evaluation of the issues. Each of the party interests and issues are identified and ranked according to level of importance (high, medium, low). This organization method is useful
in determining a resolution plan and resolution management method. Thorough analysis of the table information provides insight into inconsistencies and gaps in information, as well as party perception of the issues.

The tables identify six criteria for evaluation of the resolution process. They are party issues, interests, importance of issues, sources of power and influence, party positions/opinions and collaborative effort. The issues identified are concerns and questions that define each faction's interest in the conflict. Interests are the needs and bargaining tools that parties can use to satisfy their concerns and reach agreement. These are ranked according to importance and based on the party's tenacity of position. (Carpenter & Kennedy, 1988) The source of power can originate from financial resources, position within the community, and relationship and influence with media and political figures in government. The position/opinion a party takes recognizes the rationalization of their interest. And finally, the extent to which the parties are willing to participate and resolve the conflict has bearing on the negotiation and resolution process' success.
CASE OUTCOMES

This portion of the study will address individual party perception of the resolution process. Discussion of solution efficiencies and process effectiveness will be presented from case study observation and dispute documentation.

Participant Satisfaction

The mediation process offered the parties an opportunity to address their concerns and develop interim solutions. The parties were able to reach an agreement prior to the deadline by which the County had to decide to appeal the injunction or not. Each of the party representatives expressed in their personal interviews a high level of satisfaction with the process and the results given the constraints of the circumstances. Each saw the outcome as an opportunity to end a long cycle of conflict and enter a new period of cooperative problem solving.

In the agreement, the County agreed not to appeal the injunction, to request the Tallahassee City Commission to join in protecting the Lake McBride basin, and withdraw pending Comp Plan amendments altering the Bradfordville element until the stormwater study is completed. The homeowner associations agreed to in most part to abate, dismiss, or withdraw six other pending lawsuits related to stormwater or development related actions taken by the County.
The primary result of the agreement was to allow the injunction to be lifted for most single family residential construction while continuing the injunction on all other construction until the proposed stormwater study for the Bradfordville area is completed. The parties also agreed to establish a comprehensive process to include all stakeholders in developing a strategic plan for Bradfordville to include the following elements: 1) implementation of the stormwater study once completed; 2) determination of commercial needs in the area; 3) implementation of a design standards charette; 3) realignment of Bannerman and Bradfordville Roads; 4) protection of Lake McBride; 5) modification of the 163 agreement on the Lauder property; and 6) safeguards to implement the agreement itself.

Observations

Unfortunately, the agreement now stands on the edge of falling apart as a result of issues not included in the agreement and disagreement over the interpretation of language in the agreement. Given the complexity of the case and its long background history, the following observations will focus on the two key points that constrained the process and impacted the implementation of the agreement.

Representation Issue

The first task facing the parties was deciding who should be included in the process. The parties quickly agreed to limit each side to five representatives in order to assure consistent representation, a good working size for the group, and categories of interest were covered. (Carpenter & Kennedy 1988, 103) The four homeowner associations were each represented by an officer. The fifth member was their attorney in
the case, Randie Denker. The County was represented by the County Attorney, the County Administrator, the Director of Community Development, a county planning staff member and a county environmental staff member.

The County representatives insisted that stakeholders outside the underlying lawsuit had to be included in order to consider all of the issues and avoid possible challenges. The homeowners adamantly wanted to exclude outside parties in order to keep the process manageable and focused on their concerns. With the assistance of the mediator, a compromise was reached. Only the parties to the lawsuit would be allowed to attend all of the sessions, negotiate and sign the final agreement. Outside stakeholders were invited to a separate public meeting and allowed to express their concerns about the injunction, but they were not allowed to participate in any of the private sessions or in devising the final agreement.

All of the parties, including the participants in the public meeting, expressed dissatisfaction with the public meeting. By and large everyone felt it was a waste of time. The idea of including the concerns of other area stakeholders failed to prevent subsequent challenges to the agreement. Three lawsuits, all by participants at the public meeting, have been filed challenging all or part of the agreement.

The homeowner associations also requested that at least one County Commissioner participate in the mediation. They felt this would give the agreement a spokesman and defender on the Commission in future debates thus strengthening the agreements possible implementation. The County declined. The mediator pointed out how such participation would place the respective Commissioner in a difficult political
position should the mediation fail. (Carpenter & Kennedy 1988, 242) The political downside for a Commissioner was too great. County staff and legal representation also preferred not to have a Commissioner present in order to focus discussion on issues and concerns and less on politics.

*Time Constraints*

A significant time constraint was placed on the process by the procedural requirement of the state court system which required the County to file an appeal of the injunction within 30 days of the issuance of the written order (issued on December 15, 1998). The agreement was signed late on January 12, approved by the County Commission on January 14, and entered by the court on January 15, 1999. This limit forced the parties to meet quickly, for long periods of time, and placed constraints both on the development of issues and concerns as well as the ability to include parties not part of the underlying law suit. (Carpenter & Kennedy 1988, 109)

As mediator Siegendorf points out, while the pressure to come to agreement forces the parties to focus on their primary concerns, it also may result in an issue being left on the table. In this case, Randie Denker raised an issue the day after the agreement was reached that threatened to abrogate the agreement. Denker stated when she looked at the agreement in "light of day" the day after the final all day session, she realized the County was not required to defend against a third party challenge to the agreement. This issue was important enough to the homeowners for them to threaten to abrogate the agreement. The County, from its point of view, felt betrayed and that the homeowner associations were using dirty tactics to force them into one more concession. The County eventually
agreed to additional language (see section 2.b. in Interim Settlement Agreement, Appendix C). However, the good will and trust generated by the process was undermined.

(Carpenter & Kennedy 1998, 154)

In their interviews, the respective parties and the mediator speculated that given more time to negotiate, the issues of including additional parties and the County defending against legal challenges might have been addressed. The implementation of the agreement itself and future cooperation between the parties would have been greatly enhanced.

STUDY CONCLUSIONS

Several conclusions can be drawn from this case. First, the historical background to this case illustrates how difficult it is to end the cycle of conflict. Strong personal animosities between the parties have developed during the past ten years as a result of a series of disputes including the siting of the Publix shopping center, the siting of the Northeast High School, changes in the areas zoning and failure to conduct a stormwater study for the area. An attorney, after stating he/she would never recommend this for any other client, was willing to recommend that future negotiations be conducted without any attorneys present “if it would get the attorney for the other side out of the room.”

Several interviewees on both sides pointed to individuals on the other side and said the individual was “crazy”, “unreasonable”, “not to be trusted”, etc.

Second, by limiting the number of parties and issues to be discussed, the parties leave the final agreement vulnerable to attack by third parties. Even the partial solution offered by the public meeting was a complete failure by all accounts. The participants
felt they had no voice in the process and the meeting was a complete waste of time. In this case, stakeholders not included in the full process have filed suit against both the injunction and the implementation of the agreement. On the other hand, if all of the possible stakeholders, interests and issues had been put on the table, the process would have been unmanageable, especially given the tight time table imposed by court procedures.

Third, the time table imposed on the process by the deadline for filing an appeal placed constraints on the process. Arguably, the pressure pushed the parties to work together, as the alternative of no agreement was far less acceptable. Both parties wanted to end the costly litigation and neither wanted to take the chance they would lose the appeal. Both sides were also under pressure from the public to end the dispute, and neither side wanted to be portrayed to the press as the obstacle to a solution. The mediator stressed the uncertainty of appeal to both parties at the very start of the process. Yet, given only thirty days, the parties were unable to broaden the scope of issues and parties to be included. Issues such as the County defending the agreement in court were left out and had to be put in at the last minute, re-igniting smoldering distrust of each side's motivations and tactics.

Finally, this is the second time a mediation process has offered the parties a chance to end the cycle of conflict and develop a long term cooperative relationship. The first opportunity after the Publix shopping center siting was lost and the cycle renewed. Already there are serious signs the lode of goodwill generated by the mediation of the injunction will be wasted again. The two sides will be in court again tomorrow trying to
resolve a dispute over the interpretation and application of section 3.c. of the settlement agreement. Both sides have exchanged angry letters accusing the other of undermining the agreement. The portion of the agreement promising to work together and with other interested parties to form a strategic plan for the Bradfordville area has been put on indefinite hold pending the outcome of the latest hearing.

Ultimately, even if the agreement holds, it is an interim agreement until the stormwater study for the Bradfordville area is completed, hopefully late next year. By then another election cycle will have occurred. The make-up of the County Commission at that time will largely determine how the study is utilized and what, if any, regulations will be implemented as a result. The parties have an opportunity to set the ground work prior to completion of the study to ensure the results are consider and implemented in a collaborative manner.

In order to end this perpetual cycle of confrontation and forge a common understanding of the appropriate growth pattern for the area, key stakeholders must work toward three conditions. First, most residents must be willing to have society make a deliberate choice about what growth strategy ought to be followed, rather than leaving development to market forces. Second, government mechanisms must exist for determining and adopting growth-related policies that would be enforceable throughout the metropolitan area. Third, a sufficient consensus must be generated from diverse viewpoints to support a coherent and effective growth strategy (Downs, 183).
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