The institutionalization of Portland's neighborhood system in the 1970s brought an unprecedented number of organizations and individual citizens directly in contact with the workings of local government. While citizens were not appointed to govern neighborhood associations—the officers were elected at annual general meetings--they did represent their respective neighborhoods in public policy deliberations. The neighborhood system was a direct, face-to-face, democratic innovation and supplemented the appointed and representative forms of citizen participation that had been evolving through the citizen advisory committee structure of the city.

Neighborhood-based organizations dated to the 1930s in Portland but the tidal wave of neighborhood-based organizations in the mid-to-late 1960s came about for a variety of reasons. One of the central causes was the creation of Model Cities programs at the federal level, which called for "maximum participation of citizens" in distribution of funds designed to help cities deal with inner-city problems. The Portland Development Commission was asked to administer the physical portion of the federal Model Cities Program, and in that regard to establish or support existing organizations in the target areas. In Portland those target areas were northeast and inner Southeast Portland. In 1968, in Southeast Portland, the Southeast Uplift program was established and, in the same year, a citizens Planning Board was formed to over see Model Cities programs in northeast Portland.

Other neighborhoods began to organize during this period to address housing and transportation issues. For example, opposition to the proposed Mt. Hood Freeway in southeast Portland and the proposed I-505 freeway in northwest inspired citizens to organize neighborhood associations. One of the critical events that inspired the City to

take a proactive strategy to support neighborhood-based activism was the reaction of citizen activists in the Lair Hill Neighborhood, a residential area just south of downtown, to a proposed urban renewal designation. This led City Council, in particular City Commissioner Lloyd Anderson, to seek a more equitable way for citizens in neighborhoods such as Lair Hill and the Model Cities neighborhoods to be involved in planning processes and urban renewal.

The major step in that direction came in 1971, when the Portland Planning Commission recommended to the City Council the creation of district planning organizations (DPOs) that might help coordinate citizen participation. To shape this proposal the Council in 1972 created a Neighborhood Development Taskforce. It had 16 members who mostly came out of the fledgling neighborhood movement, although it was led by a prominent businessman, Ogden Beeman. This group submitted a plan to City Council at the end of 1972 that recommended a two-tier system by which Neighborhood Planning Organizations (NPOs) would handle matters affecting only one neighborhood and District planning Organizations would handle cases involving more than one.

The NPO's primary domains, as it was understood at the time, would be social services and land use. From the beginning, the authority of NPOs was unclear. In the original plan it was described this way:

> While all plans and proposals subsequently approved by the planning organizations may not obtain City Council or agency approval, neither will City Council, Agency plans or proposals be funded and/or approved that do not have the approval of the neighborhood or District involved. (Office of Neighborhood Associations 1994.p. 6)

The Planning Commission slightly reworked the formula by adding "unless overall city policy, articulated by the City Council and approved by the majority of the neighborhoods is involved (Office of Neighborhood Associations 1994, p. 7)."

The Taskforce's recommendations were accepted by the City Council in 1973, at which time, Mayor Neil Goldschmidt added to the scheme a new proposal, the funding of a central Office of Neighborhood Associations (ONA) to operate out of the City Hall and coordinate neighborhood organization activity. During 1973 a citizen advisory committee hammered out an ordinance that would define the Office of Neighborhood Associations, the DPOs and NPOs, and their relationship to the City. The advisory committee held over 30 meetings and public hearings during the year. One of the critical issues that arose was citizen hostility to the district planning tier. Activists viewed it as an intermediary level that would erode the power of the more truly grassroots neighborhood associations. The activist perspective prevailed, so that in 1974 the formation of the Office of Neighborhood Associations was designed to be a direct facilitator between the neighborhood associations and City Hall.

The determination of the structure of the neighborhood system was a critical juncture in the civic history of Portland. If the model of district planning organizations had won out, it is more likely that a form of appointed or representative democracy would have prevailed. If neighborhood associations wanted the recognition from the city that came from funding and authority, there were minimal requirements--such as open meetings, agreed upon boundaries, and annual election of officers. Nonetheless, they operated independently of government control. These directly democratic meetings were run by whomever showed up. Eventually, District Coalition Offices with governing

boards made up of representatives from groups of contiguous neighborhood associations were formed to provide a decentralized method for delivering assistance and services to the associations and for encouraging dialogue, and brokering of differences, among neighborhoods.

The ordinance adopted by City Council in 1974 spelled out the rules and responsibilities of citizens and local government like no other document to that time. Neighborhood associations were given right of review for issues regarding "livability" in their neighborhoods and the right to review City budgets related to improvements in their neighborhoods. The ordinance also opened the way for the City and its citizens to engage in neighborhood-based planning. It spelled out the powers of neighborhood associations in general terms:

> Any neighborhood association shall be eligible to recommend an action, a policy, or a comprehensive plan to the city and to any city agency on any matter affecting livability of the neighborhood, including, but not limited to land use, zoning, housing, community facilities, human resources, social and recreational programs, traffic and transportation, environmental quality, open space and parks. p.5)

In just 2 years, neighborhood associations had gone from unofficial status (at least outside Model Cities areas) to semi-official status with a stake in land use and social services issues, to having a legitimate stake in almost any activity in the association's geographic area of town. The number of neighborhood-based organizations grew rapidly during the 1970s so that by the end of the 1970s there were over 75 neighborhood associations, and a small army of activists was now outfitted with legitimacy and

authority. During this time, through the new direct democratic venue of neighborhoods, and through establishing more citizen advisory committees, the City of Portland created an open door policy that changed the expectation of citizens' relationship to their local government.

Neighborhood associations in Portland may have been resigned to bake sales and adversarial protests if it had not been for state and federal changes in operating rules between citizens and local government. Some of the earliest active neighborhood associations were created or at least enhanced or empowered in inner Northeast Portland, where the "maximum participation feasible" rule applied for receiving federal urban revitalization monies. In southeast Portland, never officially declared a federal Model Cities area, but so designated by local government through the creation of Portland Action Committees Together and Southeast Uplift to work on urban social needs and physical blight, agencies working with new neighborhood associations likewise had more of a voice in policy and planning deliberation. As important, or perhaps more important in the long run, was the development of statewide land use planning goals established in 1974 that among other things, called for the creation of local community-based organizations to represent the interests of residents in comprehensive planning processes. The powers of associations to assist in allocation of federal funds, and to work as a partner with government in creating neighborhood or district plans to meet state requirements gave neighborhood associations a share of governing power.

While neighborhood associations were not new in themselves in the civic reconstruction period, as Abbott (1985) noted, "the positive character of their agendas was a significant departure. Rather than reacting against unwanted changes,

neighborhood groups in the late sixties planned and advocated improvements in public services and coordinated changes in land-use regulations and public facilities."(p. 191)The neighborhood activists changed the fundamental rules of planning in Portland, in both process and content. Engineers or planners could no longer work at isolated drafting tables and plan the highways or public work projects. Additionally, the neighborhood activists changed the urban renewal priorities of the city, from abandonment and leveling to rehabilitation.

The local citizen movement to take more control of civic decisions was propelled by new federal and state laws that gave them more legal stature, including rules developed for Model City programs and environmental impact review laws. By the end of the 1970s federal laws, many of which had trickled down to state and local levels, required citizen participation in a wide range of federal programs.

The state government also took an interest in citizen empowerment. The implementation of a statewide land use system in 1973, placed citizen participation as its first goal. The goal read, "To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process." (Land Conservation and Development Commission, 1976) The program instructed every city and town and some special regional districts were to develop a comprehensive plan, development of which were to be an open public process, not a closed door, professionally or elite-driven one. The Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC), established by legislative act to oversee development of the local comprehensive plans defined the general goal of citizen involvement broadly. It was to be widespread, two-way and provide opportunity for citizens to influence the process.

Local agencies were suppose to provide technical information in understandable form, provide adequate feedback from elected officials and agency staff, and to fund or support citizen participation in land use planning decisions. LCDC also required cities and towns to establish local citizen advisory committees. This last requirement proved to be another very important factor in the development of Portland's neighborhood system, as it created an incentive to use the energy of spontaneously growing grassroots efforts at the neighborhood level, and it provided an unquestionably legitimate right for neighborhood associations to be involved in critical land use decisions.

The public hearings held around the state to help shape Oregon's land use law were also an unprecedented outreach effort that provided an instant free adult education program on land use, zoning, and planning for Oregon's citizens. Arnold Cogan, one of the road runners who led the outreach effort recalls mailings of 100,000 pieces and a journey during 1974 to 35 communities with more than 100 people at each meeting, all to help establish the land use operating rules. Fourteen committees back at the Capitol then hashed over the findings and their findings went back out to over 100,000 citizens. Around the state, citizens were drawn into the act of creating comprehensive plans for their communities throughout the 1970s. While the comprehensive plan was the stated end product of the process, probably the more important accomplishment was to create a governing ambience of process and grassroots involvement, and a precedent for the role of government as a provider of civic education. In addition to the education on land use and planning provided by government, nonprofit organizations trained citizens in how to be good and effective citizens. For example, the Center for Urban Education and Governor Tom McCall's office sponsored forums in Portland for citizens to learn how to

effectively participate in Oregon's new statewide planning laws.

Also, in 1973, the state established a comprehensive Open Meetings Law that set standards for citizen advisory committees, neighborhood associations, and other public meetings. A Public Records Act, adopted during the same legislative session, provided for public access to records and information of governing bodies and agencies. Citizens, indeed, had more official status and powers then they ever had before.

Neighborhood resistance to the development of freeways was one of the driving forces that led to Portland's neighborhood system. A map drawn in 1956, which was an update of the Portland Improvement Plan, crafted by Robert Moses, projected a Portland with a "great heart pumping fast-flowing traffic in all directions (This is how Portland's traffic, 1956)." The plan included the Mt. Hood Freeway, but also the Johnson Creek Expressway, Multnomah Expressway, Sunset-St. Johns Expressway, Burnside Expressway, Laurelhurst Freeway, and Freemont Expressway, none of which were ever built.

The I-505 freeway controversy was one of the issues that forged the activism of northwest Portland and in many ways was a critical underpinning for neighborhood activism and the creation of Portland's neighborhood system. In 1971 the Oregon Environmental Council, two neighborhood associations, and businesses and individuals sued to stop acquisitions for the planned freeway. This moved the State to try a different approach. Richard Ivy, working with the consulting firm of CH2M-Hill, was hired by the state to secure neighborhood approval for the plan. He created an innovative method for involving citizens in examining routes for the freeway and its overall design. At public meetings citizens were provided "do-it-yourself" packets to design the freeway. Ivy

hired Mary Pederson to act as citizen participation coordinator for the project. Later Ivy (Bonner, 1995) recalled,

> We hired Mary Pedersen, who had been the staff director of the Northwest District Association (NWDA), and she did a wonderful job for us in mobilizing the citizens and representing the district. We brought her right inside the program and paid her half time [she was only being paid half-time by NWDA]. But she could not be co-opted. I mean, it never occurred to me or anyone that because we were paying Mary that she would in any way be on our side if she and [NWDA] thought differently.

In February 1974 the City Council approved a compromise route for I-505 that retained the residential edge of Northwest Portland. It was far from the original design that would have brought the highway near the pricey Willamette Heights neighborhood.

The hiring of Mary Pederson to coordinate citizen participation for the I-505 freeway project also precipitated a move toward the institutionalization of Portland's grassroots neighborhood movement. In 1969 the Portland Development Commission created the Northwest District Association (NWDA) to represent the interests of northwest Portland as PDC laid plans to acquire and clear several blocks of land there at the request of Good Samaritan Hospital and the Consolidated Freightways company. When PDC held its first meeting to discuss the plans in May, 1969, 450 people showed up, and a chaotic meeting ensued. Eventually, NWDA separated from PDC and became one of the first strong new-wave neighborhood associations, still under the direction of Mary Pederson. The NWDA talked the City Council into allocating $75,000 for the neighborhood to develop a comprehensive neighborhood plan, a process that became a

model for other neighborhoods. Later, when Mayor Neil Goldschmidt sought someone to head the new Office of Neighborhood Associations (ONA), he turned to Mary Pederson. She left NWDA in 1974 to become ONA's first director.

In Southeast Portland the Mt. Hood Freeway is often regarded as one of the most critical events that shaped neighborhood politics and Portland's progressive planning policies. Since the early 1960s policy makers in Portland and state highway planning agencies had taken for granted that there would be a freeway through southeast Portland. It was included in the 1966 Comprehensive Plan and met the approval of influential Portlanders on the Planning Commission, City council, Multnomah County Commission, Chamber of Commerce, and the editorial board of the *Oregonian*. Even, Commissioner Neil Goldschmidt, who later, as mayor took decisive action that resulted in the death of the freeway, at first felt it was inevitable.

The proposed freeway ran into resistance by southeast Portland residents in 1969 as the state begin to purchase property in the right of way. Two citizens, Al and Kayda Clark, a couple in their mid-thirties, helped form the Southeast Legal Defense Fund and took the matter to court, claiming that proper procedures had not been used to select the project. The suit took 4 years to wind its way through the court system, when the U.S. District Court ruled in favor of the citizens.

Resistance to the project led the authorities to temper the project. The first change in the City of Portland's approach to the Mt. Hood Freeway came from Commissioner Lloyd Anderson who wanted a stronger environmental impact assessment. Through his insistence the City hired architectural firm Skidmore, Ownings and Merrill (SOM) to develop a more thorough impact analysis. As part of its work, SOM held

public meetings for citizens to help design a freeway that would have the least impact on livability. The SOM consultants tried to transform the identity of the project from freeway to transportation corridor, providing citizens with a way of examining it in the context of broader transportation planning concerns. However, SOM's impact statement also made it clear that the freeway "would not relieve congestion and would be obsolete by the time it was completed (Young, 1999)."

In 1974 Judge James M. Burns ruled that the proposed Mt. Hood Freeway highway could not be built without a new hearing because the state had made up its mind on the route before it held its public holding in May 1969. The Multnomah County Commission also adopted a resolution in opposition to the freeway. The Burn's court decision and county action delayed the construction timeline, and firmly introduced the possibility that the freeway could be stopped.

With a construction moratorium in place, the State Highway administration, under the leadership of George Baldwin, attempted to pressure the city into making a decision about how it would use the allocated federal funding, or else lose it. The Governor's Task Force on Transportation, established in 1973, begin maneuvers to take advantage of the Federal Air Highway Act of 1973, which allowed local governmental jurisdictions to transfer monies already committed for construction of highway facilities to mass transit projects. The task force's negotiation allowed the Portland region to keep most of the $500 million allocated for the Mt. Hood Freeway--a pivotal move to in the fight against the freeway. The negotiation opened the door to Portland's 20-year investment in light rail options and other alternative transportation options.

It wasn't until October 1975, however that the last of the proponents were

silenced, when an initiative petition organized by the construction unions, the Portland Chamber of Commerce and the City of Gresham (a suburban community that might benefit the most from the freeway) was ruled not valid based on a suit by the Oregon Environmental Council, Northwest Environmental Defense Center and neighborhood groups. While the Mt. Hood Freeway might have been built without the timely leadership of Neil Goldschmidt, Lloyd Anderson, and Multnomah County Commissioners, it was individual citizens and then organized citizens through neighborhood groups and citizen interest groups who led the charge.

Having lost the Mt. Hood Freeway the State was determined not to loose its proposed north-south highway loop on the far east end of the city. In fact, one of the conditions for the State surrendering the Mt. Hood Freeway was that the Multnomah County Commissioners would not oppose the I-205 freeway project. In addition to being part of the political compromise already achieved between the State and local officials, the route for I-205 ran through poorer neighborhoods where activism was low or nonexistent. The most rampant opposition came from Maywood Park, a middle class neighborhood, that in 1974, along with the Oregon Environmental Council, Sierra Club, and the newly formed interest group, Sensible Transportation Options for People (STOP), filed a suit to stop the freeway. When the suit failed Maywood Park's residents were so disenchanted with its government's behavior that it seceded from the city of Portland and became a separately incorporated city.

In some neighborhoods housing was the key issue that drove the creation of grass-roots neighborhood organizations. This was true for the Irvington neighborhood in inner northeast Portland, the Corbett Terwilliger-Lair Hill and Goosehollow neighborhoods in

southwest and downtown, Buckman in southeast, and the Northwest neighborhood.

The Lair Hill neighborhood and Corbett-Terwilliger neighborhoods in southwest Portland was a stopover neighborhood first settled by Jewish and Italian families and then in the 1960s by hippies and artists. This area had been considered a target for urban renewal as early as 1951. The 1966 Community Renewal Program listed it as eligible for rehabilitation, but not as a first priority urban renewal area. In 1970 PDC Chairman Ira Keller described the area as, “just awful—like something you’d find in the Tennessee mountains. It’s worse than Albina (Urban renewal project, p.5).”

A small neighborhood trapped between the I-5 freeway and several major arterials, Lair Hill viewed by the Portland City Council and Portland Development Commission as a “clearance type urban renewal” area with “few buildings which merit preservation or enhancement. (abbot, p. 183).” The future of the neighborhood in the 1960s and early 1970s was tied to the housing needs of students from nearby Oregon Health Sciences University and Portland State College. A 1970 grant application from Portland to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development called for clearance of 143 buildings to be replaced by new apartment housing for faculty and students of these institutions. PDC imagined a student village with shuttle busses running to the Medical and Dental Schools and Portland State (City Club, 1971). In a dramatic error of judgment with cascading consequences, the City and PDC did not feel compelled to have much contact with residents about the future of the neighborhood. The two bodies contended that a “Project Area Committee (composed of residents) was not required for a clearance project and expressed the view that any sort of resident participation in planning an area that was to be a clearance project would be useless and self defeating

(City Club, 1971, p. 59)."

From some political points of view Lair Hill and Terwilliger neighborhoods, along with Goose Hollow to the north and west, were merely populated with those troublesome youth and hippies. In 1968 Lair Hill Park had been targeted by City Commissioner Ivancie in his war on drugs and unconventional activities. In fact some residents were convinced that designating the area as an urban renewal district was a part of that battle. After all, before discussions about urban renewal the Bureau of Buildings had targeted buildings in the neighborhood for code violations, leading to the abandonment of many.

But, new directions came from the U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) mandated the creation of representative resident and business groups in urban renewal areas that used federal funds, a step that forced PDC and the City to recognize and work more closely with residents and businesses. As a result an industrial real estate broker who presumably did not like the City's approach called a meeting in the Lair Hill that resulted in the formation of the Hill Park Association. Then, with help from local architects William Church and William Kleinsasser, the Association requested that the City of Portland help it create a unified plan for their neighborhood. The City initially rejected this proposal, offering instead more public hearings. Fate intervened, as funding for urban renewal in the area was lost when Richard Nixon was elected president in 1972. Lair Hill combined forces with the Corbett and Teriwilliger neighborhoods to the south and eventually were provided planning assistance from the City to develop their "unified plan." In 1977 the City Council designated Lair Hill as one of the first historic conservation districts in Portland--a far cry from its designation as a derelict area

populated by hippies and other desirables.

The battle over the soul of Lair Hill and Corbett-Terwilliger neighborhoods was a major catalysis for the formation of Portland's neighborhood citizen participation system. As a consequence of the heated and relentless actions of residents in these neighborhoods, to have a voice in urban renewal policies, the City Council, in particular Commissioner Lloyd Anderson, forged proposals in the early 1970s that led to the formation of the City of Portland's Office of Neighborhood Association.

One of the most telling ways that the City of Portland opened the policy door in the 1980s and let citizens in was through the development of Budget Advisory Committees (BACs). At least 25 percent of the appointments to citizen advisory committees during the 1980s were on BACs. When Mayor Neil Goldschmidt initiated the process in 1974 there were only five BACs. It wasn't until 1980 that the City Council formally adopted goals and guidelines for them. In 1983, another resolution further refined the roles and functions of the BACs by requiring the budget division of the City to analyze and incorporate BAC reports into the budgeting process, prior to their submission to the City Council. As with other citizen advisory committees, the goal of establishing citizen participation was central to the BAC process. Committee size was set at between 8 and 15, and appointments were to be made that "respected diversity of viewpoints, minority representation, geographical balance and special bureau-related knowledge (Office of Neighborhood Associations, 1989)."

The process of involving citizens through the BACs was supplemented by the Neighborhood Needs Report system also created during the 1980s. The system allowed neighborhood associations to submit reports to ONA which contained the prioritized

needs for public works projects established by the neighborhoods. The City bureaus were expected to return the needs requests with either approval of the projects or explanations about why they could not currently be undertaken or if they might be undertaken in the future.

The BAC process was labor intensive and represented the epitome of the City's investment in citizen democracy during this period. Not all bureaus responded warmly to this process, and eventually the BAC process was modified, allowing bureaus to have more control over how citizen advisory processes were established. But during the 1980s the BAC innovation underscored the City's commitment to representative participation by more citizens.

During the 1990s, the City of Portland decided to re-evaluated aspects of its citizen involvement programs. In October 1994, it created the Task Force on Neighborhood Involvement to re-examine Portland's 20-year-old neighborhood associations system. The City took painstaking care to make this task force of 25 members representative of stakeholders and neighborhoods. The staff considered representation interests such as average citizens, business persons, homeowners, renters, schools, human services, nonprofit specialists, churches, environmental activists, arts, youth, home builders/developers, women, and people of color.

The Task Force, unlike commission-level appointments or elite forms of citizen governance, was to be a cross section of citizens. This goal was disputed during its formation, because there were now established (or "professional") activists, and others who were considered (or considered themselves) outsiders. The citizens on the Task Force were seasoned neighborhood activists, who on average had been involved in the

neighborhood system for over six years, and some of the Task Force members had chalked up as many as 12 and 15 years of experience. The Task Force also contained representatives from the nonprofit and philanthropic community, and from the Hispanic, Black, and Asian communities. While this array might not have represented all interests in the community, it did so much more than any civic body in the traditionalist era of the 1950s. The diversity of the Task Force fostered dynamic and sometimes contentious dialogue, as members and general public participants argued over basic, direct democratic principles. A chief concern of the Task Force was determining the degree of autonomy the neighborhood system should have from government bureaucracy. As originally designed, the neighborhood associations had been independent of the city government, a situation that had created civic innovations and a sense of ownership, but also at times conflict of interests, since the associations and district offices received most of their funding from the City. The Neighborhood District Coalition offices distributed throughout the city were overseen by citizen boards, whose members were appointed by the neighborhood associations from their respective areas of town. The board members considered themselves to be charged with guiding the actions of paid staff members, even though the staff's paychecks came from the City. In the end, the Task Force was unable to come up with anything better than to change the name from Office of Neighborhoods Associations to Office of Neighborhood Involvement and to include neighborhood business associations under its umbrella (Neighborhood Involvement Task Force, 1995).

The neighborhood system has both detectors and advocates. When Randy Leonard was elected as a City Commissioner in 2002 he drew an outpouring of criticism from long-time neighborhood activists, when he attempted to retool ONI as a service

bureau. Some have assumed that the neighborhood system has had its day, and others (Witt 2000) have argued that changes in Portland's neighborhood involvement system in the 1990s undermined its effectiveness as a democratic institution. One of the key elements on Portland's neighborhood system which received high marks in *The Rebirth of Urban Democracy* (Berry, Portney, Thomson 1993) was the balance between administrative support, including financial aid for staff at neighborhood district offices, and the independent authority of neighborhood associations and district offices to act free of political influence. Witt argued that this tenuous balance created conflict that finally erupted in at least two incidents that resulted in the City of Portland rearranging its administrative structure so that the district office staff worked directly under the city's Office of Neighborhood Involvement, thus diminishing the autonomy of the offices. In addition to this change, Witt pointed out two other critical changes that adversely affected Portland's neighborhood involvement system as an independent direct democratic process: (1) the dissolution of the Bureau Advisory Committee (BAC) program, that had allowed neighborhood activists to sit on advisory boards which oversee bureaus, and (2) the decision to include neighborhood business associations and other interest groups as officially recognized neighborhood organizations deserving of support from the Office of Neighborhood Involvement.

Throughout the 1990s citizens remained active in their neighborhoods, protesting developments that would affect the quality of life in their neighborhoods through public meetings, hearings, neighborhood planning processes, demonstrations, lobbying, voluntary action to secure open space and community facilities, and court actions. Citizens acted in several ways, sometimes as individuals and sometimes through

neighborhood associations, citizen interest groups, and ad hoc coalitions. The civic dialogue about neighborhood issues was organized by government, as in the case of the City of Portland developing a plan for southwest Portland or the creation of urban renewal districts in southeast and northeast Portland. Sometimes the process was amicable, sometimes not. The planning process in southwest Portland was brought to a grinding halt by activists upset with proposed density increase, while in Gateway (northeast Portland) citizens worked in harmony with regional planning agencies.