

**A Report From**

---

**THE CENTER FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION  
AND PUBLIC POLICY**

---

Supported by the Northeast Ohio Research Consortium

At Cleveland State University

---

**Intergovernmental Collaboration:**  
A Review of Literature

---

**Kent Sowards**  
Kent State University  
April 2010

**Tegan Beechey**  
Kent State University  
April 2010

Copyright © 2010  
KSU-CPAPP

# **Collaboration Literature Review Outline**

## **I. Introduction and Definition**

- A. Collaboration Defined**
- B. Historical Interpretation(s)**
- C. Collaboration Examples**
  - 1. Intergovernmental Collaboration**
  - 2. Government and Non-Profit Collaboration**
  - 3. Government and Profit Collaboration**
  - 4. Other Forms of Collaboration**

## **II. Inducements Toward Collaboration**

- A. Factors that Encourage Collaboration**
- B. Potential or Perceived Benefits**
- C. Empirical and Normative Lessons from the Literature**

## **III. Barriers to Collaboration**

- A. Factors that Limit Collaboration**
- B. Potential or Perceived Disadvantages**
- C. Empirical and Normative Lessons from the Literature**

## **IV. Case Studies**

- A. Broad Spectrum (International and National)**
- B. Regional Collaborations (Inter-State, State, and Regional)**
- C. Focused Concentration (Counties, Cities, and Townships)**

**Agenda 360. 2009 A Regional Action Plan: Building Talent, Jobs and Economic Opportunity for All-Government Collaboration. Cincinnati, Ohio: Agenda 360. 25-27.**

- Focus on economic development opportunities for four county region in Cincinnati, OH region, as well as collaboration with N Kentucky region within Cincinnati Metro area
- One of six imperatives identified for transforming community was government collaboration – to work together toward common goals
- Developed via input from community dialogues and a survey of the community itself, Agenda 360 identified set of community priorities and methods to attain them
- Factors in collaboration identified during the research were:
  - Expand shared services practices
  - Increase regional leadership capacity
  - Exploring multi-jurisdictional revenue sharing

**Agranoff, Robert. 2006. Inside Collaborative Networks: Ten Lessons for Public Managers. *Public Administration Review*. Special Edition (December 2006): 56-65.**

- Paper offers practical insights for public managers as they work within interorganizational networks
- Based on the author's empirical study of 14 networks involving federal, state, and local government managers working with nongovernmental organizations.
- Findings suggest that networks are hardly crowding out the role of public agencies; though they are limited in their decision scope, they can add collaborative public value when approaching nettlesome policy and program problems.
- If networks are so important to public managers, why not study it in the same sense that hierarchical organization or human resources or the budget process is examined?
- Paper offers some empirically based experiences, addressing 10 important features of collaborative management
- Uses "cooperation" (the act of working jointly with others, usually to resolve a problem or find a corner of activity) as a term that fits the activity of cooperation or mutual action without being so broad that it encompasses every human connection.
- Ten Lessons:
  - Lesson 1: The network is not the only vehicle of collaborative management.
  - Lesson 2: Managers continue to do the bulk of their work within the hierarchy.
  - Lesson 3: Network involvement brings several advantages that keep busy administrators involved.
  - Lesson 4: Networks are different from organizations but not completely different.
  - Lesson 5: Not all networks make the types of policy and program adjustments ascribed to them in the literature.
  - Lesson 6: Collaborative decisions or agreements are the products of a particular type of mutual learning and adjustment.
  - Lesson 7: The most distinctive collaborative activity of all of the networks proved to be their work in public sector knowledge management.
  - Lesson 8: Despite the cooperative spirit and aura of accommodation in collaborative efforts, networks are not without conflicts and power issues.
  - Lesson 9: Networks have their collaborative costs, as well as their benefits.
  - Lesson 10: Networks alter the boundaries of the state only in the most marginal ways; they do not appear to be replacing public bureaucracies in any way.

**Ahedo, Manu. 2004. Cluster Policy in the Basque Country (1991-2002): Constructing 'Industry-Government' Collaboration Through Cluster Associations. *European Planning Studies* 12(8) 1097-1113.**

- Focuses on the theoretical causes of collaborations between public and private entities in Spain in the early 1990's, and isolates 2 primary outcomes: the development of cluster associations among businesses, and the creation of a public-private collaborative dynamic. Key features: Cluster associations are of growing importance in the development of initiatives and the analysis of the success of collaborations throughout Europe. The meaning and importance of these associations is somewhat unclear, though.
- Ahedo describes cluster associations as social processes which begin within traditions, build interaction dynamics, and result in organizational and institutional learning (1098). Under this description, successful collaborations clearly should result in cluster associations. Building a case for collaboration, Ahedo emphasizes the importance of adaptability, negotiation, and strategic planning on the part of the government. According to the author, the relationships built between businesses and government due to regional proximity- based on shared territory, historical trust, and technological change- increase both the importance and feasibility of collaborations on a local and regional level.  
Successful collaboration is difficult to achieve, however. Using qualitative interviews and document analysis, Ahedo evaluates the formation of cluster associations through collaboration, the barriers to successful cluster association formation, the benefits of the formation of these associations, and the potential weaknesses which arise.
- The initial barrier to successful cluster associations was a weak network of business associations. Through the government's implementation of the Industrial Competitiveness Program, groups of business representatives were created to confront various issues in the business arena. Through this encouragement of collaboration, the government took advantage of preexisting regional relationships and encouraged problem-solving among individuals with common interests. While this resulted in integration of interests and knowledge bases among businesses, however, it also proved to be somewhat imbalanced in favor of the public sector. Ahedo emphasizes the importance of balanced collaborative relationships in building long-term and more successful collaborations.

**Andrew, Caroline and Michael Goldsmith. 1998. From Local Government to Local Governance: And Beyond? *International Political Science Review* April 1998: 101-117.**

- Offers an overview of local government studies, and offers an assessment of the factors which influence the operation of local government. Andrew and Goldsmith then makes the case that local government is transitioning to local governance. Finally, the authors outline the forms of local government which would be most desirable considering these changes.
- External Factors: economic interdependence, changes in the centers of power, changes in technology, changes in financial centers, changes in the importance of various forms of capital. Each of these changes, the authors argue, are tied to globalization: the bottom line is, local governments must make the area under their jurisdiction competitive on a global scale. Political influences also play a role in the associations which are acceptable and the barriers to various forms of development. Also, legitimacy becomes important when representing ones community to the world at large.
- Internal Factors: migration and mobility, the emergence of elderly populations, welfare responsibilities. Legitimacy also becomes an important factor here, from the perspective of constituents. Andrew and Goldsmith argue that the legitimacy (political support) of local government is in the decline.
- The authors emphasize that local government is no longer perceived as a multi-purpose service providing entity. The issues which local government should resolve (according to the authors): changing modes of service delivery, decreasing cost of an inflated welfare system, and reducing tax levels. The authors argue that local governments should turn to collaborations with private industry to reduce costs and transfer responsibility for some service provision to private industry.

- Best practices: local governments should work in a diplomatic capacity, negotiating between various entities and delegating responsibilities. Additionally, local governments should encourage economic development which will be produced and used locally, thus reducing dependence on global markets.

**Artigas, Francisco, Dom Elefante, and Alex Marti. 2009. Geographic Information Sharing: A Regional Approach in Northern New Jersey, USA. *Information Policy* 14 127-139.**

- Case study describes a five year effort by the New Jersey Meadowlands Commission (NJMC; a regional planning agency in northern New Jersey with jurisdiction over 14 municipalities) to serve geographic knowledge to 14 towns in the region by sharing resources and infrastructure through a centralized Geographical Information System (GIS)
- Serving this information required funding, convincing towns to participate, specialized staff, software licenses and equipment and follow-up with training and updates
- A main challenge was to understand the business processes and information needs from the individual units within each local government and also, to develop a system that could accommodate different levels of involvement in data collection and updating according to each town's capabilities
- Greatest challenges encountered:
  - Data integration from disparate sources
  - Matching topology between datasets
  - Detecting updates
  - Differences in levels of expertise
- If this entire program is evaluated strictly in terms of adoption, author concludes it is a success.

**Benjamin, G. 2007 Intergovernmental Collaboration in Context Lessons from a Reading of Thirteen Case Studies. NY: New York State Local Government.**

- Discusses regionalism in local context of New York state
- Case of The Shared Municipal Services Incentive Program
- Discusses other cases and their particulars with little conclusions made

**Bentrup, Gary. 2001. Evaluation of a Collaborative Model: A Case Study Analysis of Watershed Planning in the Intermountain West. *Environmental Management* 27(5) 739-748.**

- Focuses on the process which collaborations move through as described by Selin and Chavez, from problem setting, to direction setting, to implementation, and finally to the monitoring and evaluation phases. Bentrup tests to see if this model accounts for the variety of factors which influence each stage of a collaboration, and also attempts to isolate these factors.
- Important factors include the involvement of stakeholders in data collection and analysis, the establishment of measurable objectives, in-person communication, and the inclusion of stakeholders in each stage of the process.
- Bentrup found that Selin and Chavez' model accurately described basic collaborative elements.

**Berardo, Ramiro. 2009. Processing Complexity in Networks: A Study of Informal Collaboration and its Effect on Organizational Success. *The Policy Studies Journal* 37(3) 521-539.**

- Focuses on the impact the number of collaborative partners has on both the likelihood of getting funding, and the success of a collaborative project.
- Found that organizations with more partners are more likely to get funding.
- Also found that addition of partners must avoid excessive complexity, or the collaboration is at risk of collapsing.
- Overall, organizations should seek out partners who fill non- redundant roles and provide new resources, while keeping a careful eye on how many partners their collaboration can effectively manage.



**Billett, Stephen, et al. 2007. Collaborative Working and Contested Practices: Forming, Developing, and Sustaining Social Partnerships in Education. *Journal of Education Policy* 22(6): 637-656.**

- Explores the best practices for the formation, development, and maintenance of social partnerships among government and nongovernment entities.
- The principles identified for the best social partnerships are: shared goals, relations with partners, capacity for partnership work, governance and leadership, and trust and trustworthiness.
- Billett emphasizes the importance of remaining conscious of the varying goals of partners. Different practices must be undertaken in the case of dominant partners than in the case of partners who are more cooperative. When issues of dominance emerge, Billett encourages practices such as:
  - Identifying the appropriate contact within a partner organization
  - Isolating suitable goals for each partner, as well as for the entire collaboration
  - Organizing structured, effective meetings
- On a related note, effective leadership was emphasized as another critical way of avoiding conflicts amongst partners and the dominance of a particular partner's goals. Leadership fits into two phases, with two distinct sets of requirements:
  - In the first phase of leadership, the goal must be to formulate consistent, transparent, and workable guidelines and procedures for the partnership and for governance of the collaboration.
  - In the second phase of leadership, the goal is one of maintenance, focusing instead on developing and supporting close relations and communication between partners, and maintaining the legitimacy of the collaboration's governance structure.
- Trust is a third critical element in the establishment of a successful partnership. As with leadership, trust building involves two phases:
  - Initially, building trust involves the creation of processes that engage and inform partners.
  - Over time, trust building involves a clear focus on partners' needs and expectations, and ensuring these needs and expectations are addressed appropriately.

**Blumenthal, Dana and Jean-Luc Jannink. 2000. A Classification of Collaborative Management Methods. *Ecology and Society* 4(2): Article 13.**

- In recent years, a wide variety of methods have been developed to facilitate collaboration on natural resource management.
- Because these methods are relatively new and come from different disciplines, little attention has been paid to drawing comparisons among them.
- Thus, it is very difficult for potential users to sort through the increasingly large literature regarding such methods.
- Suggest the use of a consistent framework for comparing collaborative management methods, and develop such a framework based on five criteria: participation, institutional analysis, simplification of the natural resource, spatial scale, and stages in the process of natural resource management.
- Apply this framework to six of the more commonly cited methods: soft systems analysis, adaptive management, ecosystem management, agro-ecosystem analysis, rapid rural appraisal and participatory rural appraisal.
- Comparisons suggest that, although much work has been done to improve collaborative management of natural resources, both in the development of collaborative methods and in related social science disciplines, the results have not been shared among disciplines.
- Further organization and classification of this work is therefore necessary to make it more accessible to both practitioners and students of collaborative management.
- Authors identify several things that can be done to facilitate learning about collaborative management.
  - First, must stop to examine wheels that have already been designed.
  - Second must, now with a passable understanding of the idea of the wheel, is to pay more attention to pieces of wheel, which, luckily, have already been well studied

- Grounding collaborative methods in theory will help to compare and improve upon methods, and also will provide a road map for those wishing to explore particular aspects of collaborative management in more detail.

**Booher, David. 2004. Collaborative Governance Practices and Democracy. *National Civic Review*. Winter 2004: 32-46.**

- Explores the role of collaborative projects in dealing with issues which are particularly contentious. By bringing together representatives which have legitimacy in the eyes of people on either side of the debate, these collaborations have proven successful in managing issues which otherwise divide communities and build a sense of distrust and frustration. To confront this issue, several forms of collaboration have emerged:
  - Public policy consensus building: A process where stakeholders build consensus on actions to address specific public policy problems
  - Community visioning: A process where members of a community build consensus on a description of the community's desired future and on actions necessary to achieve that future.
  - Collaborative network structures: A process in which participants work together to address ongoing problems of mutual concern which they cannot individually address
- Also identifies challenges for collaborative democratic governance
  - Pluralism challenge: the public is neither informed enough nor inclined to be actively involved in the formation of public policy. Elected officials are used as a proxy for public will, as citizens can hold them accountable. Collaborative government is therefore potentially viewed as illegitimate because of the perception of limited control on the part of citizens.
  - Activism challenge: The perception that there are significant injustices in society which must be confronted. This leads to the conclusion that collaboration may interfere in necessary confrontation.
  - Institutional challenge: existing institutions are structured around adversarial approaches to collective decision making.
  - Transaction cost challenge: the deliberative process takes time and money.

**Bovaird, Tony and Elke Loeffler. 2007. Assessing the Quality of Local Governance: A Case Study of Public Services. *Public Money & Management* 2007: 293-300.**

- Examines the quality of local governance in a small UK town. Pays particular attention to the importance of using performance assessment systems which provide the necessary information for evaluation of local governance systems.
- Defines local governance as the way in which local stakeholders interact to influence the outcome of public policy.
- Bovaird and Loeffler conclude by revisiting the evaluation measures currently used in assessing local governance, and necessary changes.
  - Recognizes that most evaluations of local governance have used performance measures focusing on service quality and efficiency.
  - Emphasizes the importance of evaluating how well local agencies:
    - contribute to improving the quality of life of citizens
    - how transparent they are
    - how well they consult with others
    - how fair they are
    - how well they work in partnerships.

**Carr, Deborah S. and Steven W. Selin. 1998. Managing Public Forests: Understanding the Role of Collaborative Planning. *Environmental Management* 22(5) 767-776.**

- Examines the benefits of collaboration and the barriers to its success through two case studies examining collaborative projects between the USDA Forest Service and external affiliates
- Benefits of collaborative efforts include:
  - Increased trust between partners
  - Potential for future collaborative efforts
- Barriers to collaborative efforts include:
  - Restrictive organizational structure
  - The Private Partner's perception that public processes are too drawn out and expensive
  - The cost of time and resources needed to perform a good collaboration
  - Misperceptions on the part of each partner regarding the other partner's motivations and intentions.
- Changes necessary to the success of future collaborations:
  - Increased civic literacy regarding the issues which the collaboration hopes to confront
  - Training in collaborative processes and public administration skills for those who will take part in collaborative planning
  - The role of each participant must be clarified
  - Procedural rules must be established and agreed upon by all participants
  - Organizational barriers to implementing collaborations must be addressed.
  - Collaborative processes must be designed to maximize citizen input
  - Relationship building should continue throughout the collaborative process

**Citizens Research Council (2008) Approaches to Consolidating Local Government Services. Michigan: Citizens Research Council of Michigan.**

- The weakness of Michigan's economy, which has translated into fiscal and operational pressures on local governments, has created a renewed interest in consolidation of governments and governmental services.
- In 2005, the Citizens Research Council of Michigan catalogued the service delivery methods of local governments.
- Analysis of survey data indicates that patterns exist among the governmental units that collaborate for the provision of services and among the types of functions/services provided collaboratively.
- Identifies patterns of services and activities consolidated via collaboration or consolidation
- Develops list of imperatives for locals and state entities to facilitate cooperation

**Coggen, Carolyn and Laurie Gabites. 2007. Safety and Local Government- Partnerships and Collaboration: How to Find All Those Intersections and Actually Do Something About It. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 32: 94-105.**

- Used the Case of Wellington, New Zealand's implementation of WHO's standards of public safety to examine the benefits of efforts which bring together multiple partners.
- Emphasizes the importance of policies that encourage successful partnerships and networking between individuals, private, and public organizations.

**Conley, Alexander and Margaret A. Moote. 2003. Evaluating Collaborative Natural Resource Management. *Society and Natural Resources* 16:371-386.**

- Examines the general evaluative models used when assessing collaborations- specifically, in the natural resource management movement in the United States, and more broadly, in the assessment of collaborations in general.

**Dawes, Sharon S. and Theresa A. Pardo. Building Collaborative Digital Government Systems. Chapter 16.**

- Successful digital government policies and applications often depend on the ability of multiple organizations to collaborate toward shared objectives
- Despite compelling benefits, these efforts are fraught with problems, and often fail.
- The developmental experiences of 18 collaborative digital government initiatives in New York State reveal five systemic constraints that account for the common difficulties:
  - Divergent roles
  - Multiple missions
  - Operational diversity
  - Changing technology
  - Limited ability to adapt to change.
- The project experiences also offered ten guiding principles that can help make collaborative systems more successful.
  - These focus on purpose, stakeholders, partnership, leadership, managing complexity, skills, resources, communication, work processes, and explicit design methods.

**Department for Communities and Local Government (2006) Structures for Collaboration and Shared Services: Technical Notes. London, UK: Department for Communities and Local Government.**

- Technical document that sets out how local authorities can collaborate in order to deliver shared services
- The publication does not present arguments for shared services but takes joint working as a sensible way forward for many activities.

**Department of Local Government (2007) A Guidance Paper Collaboration and Partnerships between Councils. Nowra, Australia.**

- Australian model and guidance paper
- With limited resources and competing demands it is critical that councils find new ways to plan and deliver services so that local government is sustainable and able to flourish.
- Strategic collaboration and partnerships are ways that councils can respond to these challenges
- purpose is to reduce duplication of services, provide cost savings, access innovation, enhance skills development and open the way for local communities to share ideas and connect with others
- provides specifics of several case studies with a variety of collaboration purposes and formats
- Section 4 provides a practical guide to developing strategic partnerships

**Dudas, Andrew et al. 2009. Does Collaboration Beget Collaboration?: From Cooperation to Co-Production in Township Government. Center for Public Management and Regional Affairs, Miami University. Done for the Ohio Commission for Local Government Reform and Collaboration. <http://www.cpmra.muohio.edu/OTAohio/Commission/OTA/reports.html>. Accessed on 2/08/2010**

- Authors ask three primary questions in this study:
  - What types of collaboration are going on at the township level especially in rural areas?
  - What factors led township officials to collaborate?
  - Does the experience of collaboration predispose officials towards additional collaboration?
- The process of building collaboration also relies on a series of inter-related events.
- As a multitude of factors may influence and affect the outcome of the collaboration, knowing these factors in advance, planning and preparing for the impacts of these factors, and avoiding any pitfalls brought about by these factors could go a long way towards encouraging subsequent local government collaborative effort
- A common argument found in the literature is that collaboration allows governments to take advantage of economies of scale and cost-effectiveness.

- Some of the barriers to collaboration identified in the literature include that local officials might not make cooperation with other governmental units a priority; indeed, quite the opposite, some officials might make cooperation a very low priority. Furthermore, the public may not call for, or appreciate, collaborative efforts.
- Study results lead the authors to conclude the following:
  - There are already significant levels of collaboration taking place across townships in Ohio.
  - Collaboration is not a simple concept that should be narrowly defined in the context of informal and formal agreements.
  - Collaboration moves through a progression that may ultimately lead to co-production.
- The authors recommend:
  - Continue developing mechanisms that provide financial incentives to local governments to collaborate.
  - Clearly, educational outreach directed toward elected officials and citizens concerning the positive benefits of interlocal collaboration leads to more collaboration. Consequently, the Commission should contemplate developing informational and educational programs for local officials and citizens that provide relevant and useable knowledge for local officials contemplating collaboration.
  - Develop more statutory incentives to promote public/private partnerships.
- Authors are quite fond of using terms like obviously and clearly, although no empirical evidence beyond the opinion survey is provided herein

**Dustin, Jack, David Jones and Myron Levine. 2009. Collaborative Local Government in the State of Ohio. Wright State University. Done for the Ohio Commission for Local Government Reform and Collaboration.**

<http://www.cpmra.muohio.edu/OTAohio/Commission/OTA/reports.html> . Accessed on 2/08/2010

- Finding 1 Interest in local collaboration in the United States has escalated almost in parallel with the transformation and globalization of the economy.
- Finding 2 Collaboration requires local government to recognize shared interests, mutual dependency, and the need to move beyond ad hoc arrangements that are typically short-lived and one-time agreements to collaborate.
- Finding 3 Local government collaboration has the potential for significant service cost savings.
- Finding 4 The State can play a vital role in removing barriers to collaboration and helping communities surmount obstacles, such as demographic difference and interlocal economic competitiveness, which too often thwart collaborative efforts.
- Finding 5 Ohio cities and counties with populations of 100,000 or more were required by House Bill 66 (126th General Assembly) to complete an inventory of cooperative agreements.
- Finding 6 The research team conducted a survey of Ohio local governments and received over 400 responses. In general, most counties, cities, villages and townships reported some form of collaboration.
- Finding 7 The research team also conducted two focus groups. Key thoughts from local officials about collaboration include; 1) collaboration is a way of life for communities; 2) citizens do not always support collaboration even if there is cost savings; 3) the State does not fully understand the range of local collaborations; and 4) communities would like to collaborate more but want to do it on their own terms and believe the State has been more of a barrier than supporter of collaboration.
- Recommendations - State policy that promotes increased local collaborations is an idea whose time has come. The State of Ohio can play a much more aggressive role in encouraging service collaborations:
  - Provide a guide for collaboration and shared service agreements.
  - Incentivize service collaboration through grants that pay all or part for: 1) local feasibility studies; 2) one-time startup costs; 3) regional collaborations that entail more than simple cooperation with their immediate neighbors; and 4) regional-based nongovernmental organizations that promote more extensive collaborations.
  - Mitigate the barriers to more extensive collaboration.

- Become a model of collaboration.
- Standardize local government accounting to better measure performance and critically evaluate inventive collaborative arrangements.
- Support regional processes that inform and invite public participation when discussing possible service delivery collaborations. Processes should 1) create a vision that acknowledges mutual dependency, common goals, and the need to share services; 2) adopt metrics to measure service delivery performance and change; and 3) establish a coordinating body that provides oversight to analyses and shared service implementation.

**Feiock, R.C., Annette Steinacker and Hyung Jun Park. (2009). Institutional Collective Action and Economic Development Ventures. *Public Administration Review* 69(2):256-270.**

- Focus on intergovernmental relationships that are more voluntary and self-organizing in nature, such as voluntary service agreements among local government units to coordinate or jointly provide services.
- Of particular interest are collaborative institutions in which the agencies or jurisdictions involved are able to enter or exit agreements and craft customized conditions without special review by a single superior coordinating agency.
- Decisions of one government or agency impose costs on others.
- In this context, interlocal agreements and partnerships provide self-organizing governance mechanisms to reduce service costs and increase benefits through collaboration
- While voluntary agreements among local governments may need statutory support from higher level governments they are not designed or mandated by a single central authority. Instead these mechanisms rely on the voluntary choices of local units to participate
- Intergovernmental collaboration can produce both collective and selective benefit for individual government units.
  - Collaborative agreements generate collective benefit by producing efficiencies and economies of scale in the provision and production of services and internalizing spillover problems.
  - They also generate selective benefits if they advance the individual interests of local government officials.
- Barriers to Interlocal Collaboration
  - Information Costs-information on the preferences of all participants over possible outcomes and on their resources should be common knowledge
  - Agency Costs-bargaining agents must accurately represent the interests of their constituents.
  - Negotiation/Division Costs-the resource costs associated with the process of negotiating an agreement must be small and the parties must be able to agree to a division of the bargaining surplus.
  - Enforcement Costs—there can be at most low costs associated with monitoring and enforcing the agreement.
- Describes recently completed and ongoing research projects at The Program in Local Governance at Florida State University's Devoe Moore Center, including some using SIENA network analysis software (Simulation Investigation for Empirical Network Analysis)
- Highlights the ability to analytically test collaboration efforts but provides no examples

**Feiock, Richard C. 2007. Rational Choice and Regional Governance. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 29(1): 47-63.**

- Article presents a “second-generation” rational choice explanation for voluntary regional governance.
- It identifies the interests that motivate interlocal collaboration and argues that voluntary agreements emerge from a dynamic political contracting process in which benefits exceed the transaction costs of bargaining an agreement.
- A rational choice explanation for regional governance focuses attention not only on service costs and benefits of interlocal cooperation, but also on transaction costs of cooperation.

- Transaction costs are reduced by formal and informal institutional arrangements that increase the availability of information, reduce obstacles to bargaining, and reinforce social capital.
- Better understanding of the context of metropolitan governance not only advances our theoretical understanding of institutional collective action, but it also has practical policy implications.
- Systematic evaluation of the contextual factors that shape transaction costs may allow policy makers and advocates of progressive consolidation to identify situations in which the costs of voluntary regional governance arrangements are high, and governmental approaches to regionalism may be more viable.

**Helsloot, Ira. 2008. Coordination is a Prerequisite for Good Collaboration, Isn't it? *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management* 16(4) 173-176.**

- Focuses on the use of command and control techniques used in crisis management as a means for evaluating ability to collaborate
- Discussion seems to indicate that "letting go of the dogma" of the necessity of coordinated, actions of organizations involved in crisis management opens up a new series of research questions.
- Answering these questions on the exact nature of collaboration between organizations involved in possibly different phases of crisis management, the optimal crisis management systems and the best leadership styles should lead to more effective crisis management.

**Kellogg, Wendy A. 2009. Ohio's Balanced Growth Program: A Case Study of Collaboration for Planning and Policy Design. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 52(4): 549-570.**

- Paper presents a case study of collaborative planning for a new 'smart growth' landscape planning program in OH
- Program was developed by a state-level commission charged with protecting the OH portion of Lake Erie and its tributary river systems
- Describes a trend of increasing collaborative resource management in last decades, particularly with reference to watershed management and other land-water issues
- Approach used in OH by several state agencies for development of coastal management training programs as well
- Decline in population in great lakes region; sprawl without growth
- Landscape oriented programs encourage retention of populations in core areas
- The Ohio Lake Erie Commission (OLEC) made up of directors of 6 state executive branch agencies; advise governor; several billion in development, regulation and conservation funding
- Author was part of OLEC and a task-force chair
- Case study illustrates that a collaborative planning process can balance apparent conflicts between scientific appropriateness and political feasibility
- Conflicting ideologies/interests of participants were valuable input in process
- Author suggests that the mix of participants and mechanisms for their collaboration produced better results than a less inclusive process

**Lauber, T. Bruce, Daniel J. Decker and Barbara A. Knuth. 2008. Social Networks and Community-Based Natural Resource Management. *Environmental Management* 42:677-687.**

- Conducted case studies of three successful examples of collaborative, community-based natural resource conservation and development to
  - identify the functions served by interactions within the social networks of involved stakeholders
  - describe key structural properties of these social networks
  - determine how these structural properties varied when the networks were serving different functions.

- Case studies relied on semi-structured, in-depth interviews of 8 to 11 key stakeholders at each site who had played a significant role in the collaborative projects.
- Interview questions focused on the roles played by key stakeholders and the functions of interactions between them.
- Findings demonstrated the value of tailoring strategies for involving stakeholders to meet different needs during a collaborative, community-based natural resource management project
  - Widespread involvement of local stakeholders may be most appropriate when ideas for a project are being developed.
  - During efforts to exert influence to secure project approvals or funding, however, involving specific individuals with political connections or influence on possible sources of funds may be critical
  - Findings are consistent with past work that has postulated that social networks may require specific characteristics to meet different needs in community-based environmental management
- 3 communities as case study sites, each having recently completed a project in which both the conservation and development of natural resources were involved
- Specific study sites were chosen based on the recommendations of informants with federal or state agencies or nongovernmental organizations who:
  - Were concerned with natural resource conservation and development;
  - and operated at least throughout the entire Northern Forest region within a particular state (and so were familiar with a wide variety of community-based projects)
- Found no evidence of tension between community insiders and outsiders as past work has done – may be due to case selection
- One limitation of study was that it focused only on a certain type of collaborative, community-based management, chose cases in which conflict was low.

**McGuire, Michael. 2006. Collaborative Public Management: Assessing What We Know and How We Know It. *Public Administration Review* 66: 33-43.**

- Article reviews lit on collaborative public management to address the prevalence of collaboration (both recently and historically) including emerging collaborative structures, types of skills unique to collaborative management, and the effects of collaboration
- Suggests that collaborative public management is a relatively recent phenomenon (judged by surge of research literature); but why? – information, networking, complexity?
- Despite recent attention, ample evidence exists that collaborative public mgt practiced for some time; i.e. American federalism
- Discusses types of collaborative process identified by Mandell and Steelman (2003); intermittent coordination; temporary task forces; permanent or regular coordination; coalitions or network structures
- Suggests that size and type of network should be dependent upon task at hand
- Note that many writers have made the case that collaborative mgt skills are unique to the collaborative context
- Importance of recruiting of potential members to expand involvement base
- Some research suggests that the common wisdom of collaboration differs from collaboration practice making the potential benefits less than optimal or skewed to one participant over another
- Empirical research on collaborative public management has increased significantly over the past decade
- Conclude that:
  - Acceptance that collaborative management is a standard component of public management in general
  - Focus in lit on types of skills that are necessary in collaborative settings
  - Renewed focus on determining the effect of collaboration on focus outcomes
  - General understanding that there is still much to learn; questions nearly endless

**National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO). 2007. Connecting State and Local Government: Collaboration through Trust and Leadership. Lexington, KY: NASCIO: Representing Chief Information Officers of the States.**

- Focuses on the methods and mechanisms available for states and local government organization to collaborate.
- Technology as a key enabler; information as a focal point
- While the advantages of collaboration can be applied universally, the approach and methodology of collaboration will vary depending on the initiative.
- A sound governance model for state-local collaboration is one that encompasses shared accountability, establishes leadership, encourages mutual trust and promotes collective dedication to achieving the same strategic goals.
- Establishing trust on all sides, turning that trust into action, and expanding it beyond a project's beginning into a mature, sustainable collaboration, can be achieved through effective communication
- As a collaborative effort moves from development into implementation and eventually to maintenance, various responsibilities of the organizations and the ways in which they are accountable are likely to shift and change over time.
- When initial efforts evolve into long-term, self-sustaining business practices, these successful collaborations can lead to lasting partnerships between agencies.
- Roles of state governments in collaboration; Funding models:
  - State as Leading Entity - state becomes the major stakeholder in the initiative by putting forth the most money toward the collaborative effort
  - State as Partner Entity - when states are financial partners in a collaborative effort, but not necessarily the leading entity, they can help bring credibility and stability to the project, but not function as the sole financial driver
  - State as Facilitator - state may not financially participate at all; lawmakers may enact legislation, or provide tax incentives, but not put forth additional funds specifically for the effort
- Any sort of collaboration, and in particular state-local collaborative efforts, require careful planning, deliberate execution and routine maintenance in order to nurture and grow the relationships that are required for a surviving— and thriving—collaborative effort.

**Parr, J., Riehm, J., & McFarland, C. (2006) Guide to Successful Local Government Collaboration in America's Regions. Washington, D.C.: National League of Cities.**

- This guide takes a closer look at the continuum of models for intergovernmental cooperation
- Easier options for governments:
  - Informal Cooperation — This approach typically involves two local — usually neighboring — government jurisdictions that offer reciprocal actions to each other
  - Interlocal Service Contracts — These are widely used to handle servicing responsibilities, particularly between and among metropolitan communities.
  - Joint Powers Agreements — These agreements between two or more local governments provide shared planning, financing, and service delivery to residents of all involved jurisdictions, with all jurisdictions receiving the same services from the same provider
  - Extraterritorial Powers — This approach allows cities to exercise their regulatory authority in surrounding unincorporated areas
  - Councils of Governments — These organizations are formed by counties and cities to serve local governments and residents in a region through government cooperation
  - Federally Encouraged Single-Purpose Regional Bodies — These originally were created in the mid-1980s to administer some federal-aid programs around poverty, aging, health systems planning, and criminal justice planning. Today, single-purpose regional bodies are primarily formed for transportation planning and funding

- State Planning and Development Districts — These were established by states during the late 1960s and 1970s to bring order to the numerous federal regional programs affecting local communities.
  - Contracting — Local governments struggling to provide services with less revenue increasingly are turning to contracting with other governments, and/or with the private and nonprofit sectors.
  - Regional Purchasing Agreements — These agreements help local governments achieve cost savings while fostering more cross-jurisdiction collaboration.
- Harder options for governments:
  - Local Special Districts — This approach is a popular option for providing single services or multiple related services to a number of jurisdictions. Special districts often remove from local government the policy control, technical specialization, and fiscal responsibility for providing services.
  - Transfer of Functions — This method is used to permanently change who provides specific services, with local governments releasing authority to other jurisdictions. Transfers typically are enabled by state statutes and created through intergovernmental negotiation.
  - Annexation — Annexation has long been used to expand jurisdictions and service boundaries in the United States.
  - Special Districts and Authorities — These are designed to address single issues such as mass transit, pollution control, hospitals, airports, or water supply on an area-wide basis, typically with a major urban area involved.
  - Metro Multipurpose Districts — These districts establish a regional authority to perform many diverse functions, not just one set of related services as in earlier examples.
  - Counties seeking stronger executive leadership and broader representation in their legislative bodies have sometimes opted for this approach, which restructures county government with an executive and legislative branch, but leaves municipalities and other local governments within the county unchanged.
  - Regional Asset Districts — These are special tax districts used to fund regional resources, such as arts and cultural institutions, entertainment venues like sports stadiums, and even parks and libraries
  - Merger/Consolidation — This option involves a variety of approaches that result in the creation of a new region-wide government, reallocation of government powers and functions, and changes in the political and institutional status quo.
- This guide offers descriptions and case studies of 17 approaches to intergovernmental cooperation, ranging from solutions that tend to be more politically feasible and less controversial to those that are more structural and difficult to implement.
- Five political challenges of regional action that are important for local officials to consider:
  - The Challenge of Regional Identity – highly important for collaborative success, but notoriously weak
  - The Challenge of Political Strategy – no consensus on speed, scope, or method
  - The Challenge of a Big Tent – mobilizing a broad base of support across multiple interests
  - The Challenge of Consensus – focusing on issues of consensus rather than conflict
  - The Challenge of State and Federal Policy – encouragement of regional cooperation while institutions are undermined by the same mechanisms
- Provides a step by step list for stakeholder engagement

**Sander, T. (2009) Opportunity in Crisis: Consolidation, Collaboration & Cooperation in Local Government.**

- Our system of government, from the pilgrim landing to global economic competition, has created a public service delivery system that has grown so large that funding and maintaining it places a frustrating and heavy burden on the “governed.”
- In response, citizens are looking at the government they own — with its multiple layers and divisions — and asking why there isn’t more cooperation and collaboration.
- A recent public opinion survey of residents in Northeast Ohio conducted jointly by Cleveland State University and Wright State University found that 82 percent of residents favor greater government collaborations and 67 percent favor government consolidations as a way to mitigate the high cost of local government services. (<http://www.futurefundneo.org/page1000040.cfm>)
- Suggests IT infrastructure collaboration and shared service efforts for various local governments
- A shift toward collaboration and a shared services model can create transformational change in local organizations now, but it requires strong leadership, informed decision-making, focus on execution and clear communication.
- The success or failure of collaboration will be determined by whether or not public employees are willing to take up the challenge of change and break down the historical barriers that have supported organizational individuality in favor of a greater common good. Ego and turf have simply become too expensive to protect and maintain.

**Thomson, Ann Marie and James L. Perry. 2006. Collaboration Processes: Inside the Black Box. *Public Administration Review* Special Issue December 2006: 20-32.**

- The authors argue that public managers should look inside the “black box” of collaboration processes.
- Inside, they will find a complex construct of five variable dimensions:
  - Governance
  - Administration
  - Organizational autonomy
  - Mutuality
  - Norms.
- Public managers must know these five dimensions and manage them intentionally in order to collaborate effectively
- Public managers often find themselves pulled between two competing views of collaboration
  - Classic liberalism, with its emphasis on private interest
  - Civic republicanism, with its emphasis on a commitment to something larger than the individual
- Wood and Gray (1991) frame the collaboration discussion in terms of an antecedent – process – outcome; a “black box”; argue that the interactive process is least understood
- Authors employ a definition of collaboration developed by Thomson (2001a) as a starting point for our analysis:
  - Collaboration is a process in which autonomous actors interact through formal and informal negotiation, jointly creating rules and structures governing their relationships and ways to act or decide on the issues that brought them together; it is a process involving shared norms and mutually beneficial interactions.
- Five Key Dimensions of Collaboration (see also Huxham and Vangen 2005)
  - Governing (structural); partners must jointly decide on rules to govern behavior and relationships; reaching agreements that are compatible with all interests does not mean groupthink
  - Administration (structural); to achieve the purpose that brought the organizations to the table in the first place, some kind of administrative structure must exist that moves from governance to action; key administrative functions found in top-down management lit appear in collaboration lit but take on new meaning in light of more symmetrical, horizontal relationships

- Autonomy (agency); defining dimension of collaboration that captures both the potential dynamism and the frustration that is implicit in collaborative endeavors is the reality that partners share a dual identity; creates intrinsic conflict between self-interest and collective interest
- Mutuality (social capital); Without mutual benefits, information sharing will not lead to collaboration; complementarity occurs when one party has unique resources (skills, expertise, or money) that another party needs or could benefit from (and vice versa)
- Norms of trust and reciprocity (social capital);
  - Trust - defined as a common belief among a group of individuals that another group (1) will make “good-faith efforts to behave in accordance with any commitments both explicit and implicit,” (2) will “be honest in whatever negotiations preceded such commitments,” and (3) will “not take excessive advantage of another even when the opportunity is available” (Cummings and Bromiley 1996, 303)
  - Reciprocity - can be conceptualized in two different ways: one that is short term and contingent, and one that is long term and rooted in a sociological understanding of obligation;
- When parties come together to collaborate, they make choices that govern a variety of collective action problems implicit in joint decision making — how to collectively develop sets of working rules to determine who will be eligible to make decisions, which actions will be allowed or constrained, what information needs to be provided, and how costs and benefits will be distributed (Ostrom 1990)
- When collaborative partners are unwilling to monitor their own adherence to the agreed-upon rules, the ability to build credible commitment is lost, and joint decision making is unlikely
- Most scholars of collaboration agree, however, that the key to getting things done in a collaborative setting rests in finding the right combination of administrative capacity (through coordination and elements of hierarchy) and social capacity to build relationships
- Thomson and Perry conclude that given the complexity of collaboration, public managers may find themselves overwhelmed by the dynamism that collaborations can create or the inertia that often transpires as partners seek to achieve collective goals
- One lesson can be taken away from this review: Don’t collaborate unless you are willing to thoughtfully consider and educate yourself about the nature of the process involved
- The most costly resources of collaboration are not money but time and energy:
  - Huxham (1996) distinguishes between two sorts of time that anyone who has collaborated will recognize: actual time and lapsed time

**Weible, Christopher M. and Paul A. Sabatier. 2009. Coalitions, Science, and Belief Change: Comparing Adversarial and Collaborative Policy Subsystems. *The Policy Studies Journal* 37(2): 195-212.**

- Goal of this article is to explore if there have been changes in policy participants’ beliefs and use of beliefs in two policy subsystem types: adversarial and collaborative
- This article tests two hypotheses about the expected changes in beliefs and the use of beliefs in comparing adversarial to collaborative policy subsystems.
  - Hypothesis 1: In a collaborative policy subsystem, actors from opposing advocacy coalitions will converge in policy core and secondary beliefs.
  - Hypothesis 2: Actors will more likely use empirical policy core beliefs and will less likely use normative policy core beliefs to formulate policy preferences in collaborative policy subsystems compared to adversarial policy subsystems.
- Arguments for collaborative (over adversarial) approaches to govern. rest partly on 2 axioms:
  - Collaborative approaches mitigate conflict to intermediate levels
  - Collaborative approaches help integrate science & values thru various joint fact-finding strategies
- Uses the advocacy coalition framework (unsurprising, has written w/ Sabatier) to compare adversarial and collaborative policy subsystems concerning
  - convergence in beliefs re: both water quality problems & agreement w/ policy proposals

- the relative use of empirical versus normative beliefs in supporting policy proposals
- Individuals in the ACF are assumed to be generally self-interested, boundedly rational, and likely to use preexisting beliefs to filter and simplify the world; affected by constraints and opportunities in a given policy subsystem
- Using questionnaire data in 1984 (3 yrs before agreement, very contentious period) and 2001 (more than a decade post agreement) of policy participants involved in Lake Tahoe water quality policy, this article investigates whether a shift from an adversarial to a collaborative policy subsystem is associated with
  - convergence in beliefs regarding water quality problems and policy proposals
  - an increase in the use of science-based empirical beliefs and a decrease in the use of normative beliefs in supporting policy proposals
- In the OLS regression equations, we control for level of education, female, owning private property and/or commercial property, and for the seventeen respondents to 1984 and 2001 questionnaires
- Article analyzes nine variables across three categories of beliefs in 1984 and in 2001:
  - Normative policy core beliefs (pro-development beliefs)
  - Empirical policy core beliefs (water quality degradation and four sources of nutrient input)
  - Secondary beliefs (three policy proposals)
- No other variable in the models has the explanatory power of pro-development beliefs in explaining policy proposals
- Findings send a mixed message to policymakers and researchers about science and collaboration.
- The evidence provides moderate support for the first hypothesis that coalitions would show more belief convergence than divergence in 2001 after the emergence of a collaborative policy subsystem
- Analysis suggests that collaborative policy subsystems are associated with convergence in some beliefs between rival coalitions, but it provides that there is no support for the notion that policy participants are no more likely to rely on science-based, empirical beliefs in collaborative than in adversarial policy subsystems
- Limitations to arguments and generalizability:
  - Use of repeated cross-sectional data; changes in beliefs, for example, might not result from the emergence of a collaborative subsystem but rather from turnover in policy participants or to other unknown factors

**Literature to be included either at the periphery of the discussion or that has not been added to the annotated bibliography.**

- Agranoff, Robert and Michael McGuire. 1998. A Jurisdiction-Based Model of Intergovernmental Management in U.S. Cities. *Publius* 28(4): pp. 1-20.
- Agranoff, Robert and Michael McGuire. 1998. The Intergovernmental Context of Local Economic Development. *State & Local Government Review* 30(3): pp. 150-164.
- Agranoff, Robert and Michael McGuire. 2001. American Federalism and the Search for Models of Management. *Public Administration Review* 61(6): pp. 671-681.
- Agranoff, Robert. & Michael McGuire. 2003. Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. Accessed 1/27/2010.
- Agranoff, Robert. 2007. Managing Within Networks : Adding Value to Public Organizations. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Berman, Evan M. 1996. Local Government and Community-Based Strategies: Evidence from a National Survey of a Social Problem. *American Review of Public Administration* 26(1): pp. 71-91.
- Bickers, Kenneth N. 2009. The Politics of Inter-local Cooperation: Is Collaboration Efficiency-Enhancing or Stratification-Preserving? Paper presented at the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, June 4, 2009.
- Bingham, Lisa Blomgren and Rosemary O'Leary, eds. 2008. Big ideas in Collaborative Public Management. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 2008.
- Bryan, Todd A. 2004. Tragedy Averted: The Promise of Collaboration. *Society and Natural Resources* 17: 881-896.
- Bryson, John M ., Barbara C . Crosby, and Melissa Middleton Stone. 2006. The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature. *Public Administration Review* December 2006, Special Issue: pp. 44-55.
- Doll, Lynda, Geri Dino, Charles Deutsch, Alan Holmes, Dora Mills, and Kimberly Horn. 2001. Linking Research and Practice: Two Academic–Public Health Collaborations That Are Working. *Health Promotion Practice* 2(4): pp. 296-300.
- Heikkila, Tanya and Andrea K. Gerlak. 2005. The Formation of Large-scale Collaborative Resource Management Institutions: Clarifying the Roles of Stakeholders, Science, and Institutions. *The Policy Studies Journal* 33(4): pp. 583-611.
- Hornbeek, John A. and Kerry Macomber, Melissa Phillips, and Sayantani Satpathi. 2009. Local Government Collaboration in Ohio: Are We Walking the Walk or Just Talking the Talk?, Center for Public Administration and Public Policy, Ohio Commission on Local Government Reform and Collaboration through The Ohio State University, December 4.
- Huxham, Chris and Vangen, Siv. 2000. Ambiguity, Complexity and Dynamics in the Membership of Collaboration. *Human Relations* 53(6): 771-806.
- Innes, Judith E. and David E. Booher. 1999. Consensus Building and Complex Adaptive Systems: A Framework for Evaluating Collaborative Planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 65(4): 412-23.

- Innes, Judith E. and David E. Booher. 2003. The Impact of Collaborative Planning on Governance Capacity. *IURD Working Paper Series*. The Institute of Urban and Regional Development.
- Kamensky, John M. and Thomas J. Burlin, eds. 2004. Collaboration: Using Networks and Partnerships. *Rowman & Littlefield Publishers: Lanham, Maryland*.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1994. The Collaborative Advantage: The Art of Alliances. *Harvard Business Review* July-August 1994: 94405-94406.
- Kim, H.Y., Lee, J. and Kim, J. (2008) Linking Local E-Government Development Stages to Collaboration Strategy. *International Journal of Electronic Government Research*, 4(3): 36-56.
- Koontz, Tomas M. 2005. We Finished the Plan, So Now What? Impacts of Collaborative Stakeholder Participation in Land Use Policy. *The Policy Studies Journal* 33(3) 459-481.
- Krueger, Skip and Michael McGuire. 2005. A Transaction Cost Explanation for Interlocal Collaboration. *Prepared for the Eighth National Public Management Research Conference*. 1-45.
- Longoria, Richard A. 2005. Is Inter-Organizational Collaboration Always a Good Thing? *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 32(3): 123-138
- Lubell, Mark. 2004. Collaborative Environmental Institutions: All Talk and No Action? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 23(3), pp. 549-573.
- Mandell, Myrna P. 1999. Community Collaborations: Working Through Network Structures. *Policy Studies Review*. 16(1): 42-64.
- Margerum, Richard D. 2005. Collaborative Growth Management in Metropolitan Denver: "Fig Leaf or Valiant Effort?" *Land Use Policy* 22:373-386.
- Margerum, Richard D. 2007. Overcoming Locally Based Collaboration Constraints. *Society and Natural Resources* 20: 135-152.
- McKinney, Matthew, and Patrick Field. 2008. Evaluating Community-Based Collaboration on Federal Lands and Resources. *Society and Natural Resources* 21:419-429.
- Mizrahi, Terry. 1999. Strategies for Effective Collaborations in the Human Services. *Social Policy* Summer 1999: 5-20.
- Moore, Elizabeth A. and Thomas M. Koontz. 2003. A Typology of Collaborative Watershed Groups: Citizen-Based, Agency-Based, and Mixed Partnerships. *Society and Natural Resources* 16: 451-560.
- National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO). 2006. Keys to Collaboration: Building Effective Public-Private Partnerships. *The National Association of State Chief Information Officers and the Corporate Leadership Council*. May 2006.
- NORTEL (2009) State, provincial and local government: Advantages of collaboration - Leveraging unified communications. NC: NORTEL.
- Paulson, Deborah D. 1998. Collaborative Management of Public Rangeland in Wyoming: Lessons in Co-Management. *Professional Geographer* 50(3): 301-315.
- Rosenthal, Larry A. 2009. The Role of Local Government: Land-Use Controls and Aging-Friendliness. *Journal of the American Society on Aging* 33(2) 18-25.

- Schuett, Michael A., Steve W. Selin and Deborah S. Carr. 2001. Making it Work: Keys to Successful Collaboration in Natural Resource Management. *Environmental Management* 27(4): 587-603.
- Selin, Steve and Deborah Chavez. 1995. Developing a Collaborative Model for Environmental Planning and Management. *Environmental Management* 19(2): 189-195.
- Sirianni, Carmen. 2007. Neighborhood Planning as Collaborative Democratic Design: The Case of Seattle. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 73(4): 373-387.
- Skelcher, Chris; Mike Smith and Naveep Mathur. 2004. The Public Governance of Collaborative Spaces: Discourse, Design, And Democracy. *Prepared for ESRC Seminar*.
- Stedman, Richard, et al. 2009. Cleaning Up Water? Or Building Rural Community? Community Watershed Organizations in Pennsylvania. *Rural Sociology* 74(2): 178-200.
- Stern, Ruth and Judith Green. 2008. A Seat at the Table? A Study of Community Participation in Two Healthy City Projects. *Critical Public Health* 18(3): 391-403.
- Walker, Peter A. and Patrick T. Hurley. 2004. Collaboration Derailed: The Politics of "Community- Based" Resource Management in Nevada County. *Society and Natural Resources* 17: 735-751.
- Wilson, Kumanan, Jennifer McCrea-Logie and Harvey Lazar. 2004. Understanding the Impact of Intergovernmental Relations on Public Health: Lessons from Reform Initiatives in the Blood System and Health Surveillance. *Canadian Public Policy*. 30(2) 177-194.