

5-1-2003

Making Growth Work for California's Communities

Kenneth R. Schreiber
AICP

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/mti_publications



Part of the [Transportation Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kenneth R. Schreiber. "Making Growth Work for California's Communities" *Mineta Transportation Institute Publications* (2003).

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mineta Transportation Institute Publications by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.



Making Growth Work for California's Communities



MTI

**Mineta
Transportation
Institute**

**Created by
Congress in
1991**



MINETA TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE

The Norman Y. Mineta International Institute for Surface Transportation Policy Studies (MTI) was created by Congress through the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and established in the California State University system at the San José State University College of Business. MTI continues as a University Transportation Center (UTC), reauthorized in 1998 by the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21).

MTI is unique among UTC's in two areas. It is the only center with an outside, internationally respected Board of Trustees, and it is the only center located in a College of Business. The Board provides policy direction, assists with needs assessment, and connects the Institute and its programs with the international transportation community. The Institute's focus on policy and management resulted from a Board assessment of the industry's unmet needs and led directly to the choice of the San José State University College of Business as the Institute's home. MTI applies the focus on international surface transportation policy and management issues in three primary areas:

Research

The Institute aims to provide policy-oriented research for all levels of government and the private sector, to foster the development of optimum surface transportation systems. Research areas include: security of transportation systems; planning and policy development; interrelationships among transportation, land use, the environment, and the economy; financing of transportation improvements; and collaborative labor-management relations. Certified Research Associates conduct the research. Certification requires an advanced degree, generally a Ph.D., a record of academic publications, and professional references. Research projects culminate in publication available both in hardcopy and on the Institute's website.

Education

The educational goal of the Institute is to provide graduate-level education to students seeking a career in the development and operation of surface transportation programs. MTI, through the College of Business at San José State University, offers an AACSB accredited California State University Master of Science in Transportation Management and a Graduate Certificate in Transportation Management that will prepare the nation's transportation managers for the 21st century. The masters degree is the highest conferred by the California State University system. With the active assistance of the California Department of Transportation, MTI delivers its classes over a state-of-the-art broadcast videoconferencing network throughout the State of California and via webcasting beyond, allowing working transportation professionals to pursue an advanced degree regardless of their location. To meet the needs of employers seeking a diverse workforce, MTI's education program promotes enrollment to under-represented groups.

Information and Technology Transfer

MTI's third responsibility is to develop and maintain electronic information systems to store, retrieve, and disseminate information relating to surface transportation policy studies. The Institute's website, *TransWeb*, enables transportation professionals, students and individuals worldwide to access information relating to surface transportation research and policy. *TransWeb* is found at <http://transweb.sjsu.edu> and delivers regional, state, national, and international transportation information. The Institute also maintains a library of periodicals and other unique publications for transportation research in cooperation with the San José State University Library system. MTI is funded by Congress through the United States Department of Transportation Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), the California Legislature through the Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and by private grants and donations.

DISCLAIMER

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and accuracy of the information presented herein. This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation, University Transportation Centers Program and the California Department of Transportation, in the interest of information exchange. This report does not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the U.S. Government, State of California, or the Mineta Transportation Institute, who assume no liability for the contents or use thereof. This report does not constitute a standard specification, design standard, or regulation.

MTI REPORT 02-01

**Making Growth Work For
California's Communities**

May 2003

Kenneth Schreiber, Principal Investigator
Gary Binger
Dennis Church

a publication of the
Mineta Transportation Institute
College of Business—BT550
San José State University
San Jose, CA 95192-0219

Created by Congress in 1991

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. FHWA/CA/TO2002-19	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Making Growth Work for California's Communities		5. Report Date May 2003	
		6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Authors Kenneth Schreiber, Gary Binger, Dennis Church.		8. Performing Organization Report No. MTI 02-01	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Mineta Transportation Institute College of Business—BT550 San José State University San Jose, CA 95192-0219		10. Work Unit No.	
		11. Contract or Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address California Department of Transportation Sacramento, CA 95819 U.S. Department of Transportation Research and Special Programs Administration 400 7th Street, SW Washington, DC 20590-0001		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes			
16. Abstract <p>If the State of California government is to become a stronger advocate for transportation and land use policies that address growth patterns and related issues associated with community planning and development, it will be helpful for state policymakers, concerned professionals, and others involved in shaping California's land use policies to have the clearest and most up-to-date understanding of existing efforts by local governments to improve and update planning methods; the status of, and attitude toward, innovation and change in the planning and community development profession; the extent to which local governments are incorporating new ideas and concepts into local plans and then implementing them into practice; and the sources and nature of support and opposition to these changes at the local community level.</p> <p>The research in <i>Making Growth Work for California's Communities</i> is unique in its degree of integration of sustainable development, smart growth, and livable communities concepts, and in its assessment of the land use and transportation strategies being incorporated into both local plans and implementation activities. It is intended to help state officials, concerned professionals, and other stakeholders select and shape effective and feasible state policies and programs that will support and promote better management of California's future growth.</p>			
17. Key Words Public policy; public opinion; regional planning; sustainable development; transit-oriented development		18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 168	22. Price \$15.00

**Copyright © 2003 by
Mineta Transportation Institute**

All rights reserved

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 2002113697

To order this publication, please contact the following:

Mineta Transportation Institute
College of Business–BT550
San José State University
San Jose, CA 95192-0219
Tel (408) 924-7560
Fax (408) 924-7565
E-mail: mti@mti.sjsu.edu
<http://transweb.sjsu.edu>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to offer their sincere thanks to the representatives of the 200 California planning agencies that responded to the Planning Director Survey. The 30 individuals who participated in the follow-up telephone interviews are identified in Appendix E and deserve a special thank you for the time and insight they provided. Phillip Trounstine, Director the San José State University Survey and Policy Research Institute, and Lecturer Hing Wong, of the SJSU Department of Urban and Regional Planning, provided valuable guidance to the study team. Professor Richard Lee of the City and Regional Planning Department at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, shared his experience with surveying California's planning agencies, as well as his mailing list. Thanks also to the MTI staff, including Research Director Trixie Johnson, Research and Publications Assistant Sonya Cardenas, Graphic Designers Shun Nelson, Emily Kruger, and Tseggai Debretson, and Editorial Associate Irene Rush.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

INTRODUCTION 5

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY 7

LITERATURE AND WEB RESEARCH 9

 INTRODUCTION 9

 SMART GROWTH CHARACTERISTICS 9

 RESEARCH FINDINGS: LOCAL POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES 10

 Land Use Element: Policies and Implementation Measures 10

 Circulation Element: Policies and Implementation Measures 12

 Housing Element: Policies and Implementation Measures 13

 Social Equity and Workforce Development: Policies and Implementation Measures 14

 Conservation/Open Space Element: Policies and Implementation Measures 15

 PLANNING STRATEGIES FOR THE SURVEY OF PLANNING DIRECTORS 16

 Develop Efficient and Compact Communities 16

 Promote Transportation and Housing Choices 16

 Enhance Public/Private Processes and Interjurisdictional Cooperation 17

 OTHER SUPPORTIVE RESEARCH 17

 State Office of Planning and Research Survey 17

 Public Policy Institute of California Opinion Research 18

 IMPORTANCE OF REGIONAL DIFFERENCES 19

SURVEY OF PLANNING DIRECTORS 23

 SMART GROWTH STRATEGIES INCLUDED IN THE PLANNING DIRECTOR SURVEY 23

 SURVEY DESCRIPTION 24

 FINDINGS 24

 SUMMARY OF RESULTS 25

 ANALYSIS OF RESPONDENTS 27

 ANALYSIS OF RESULTS 30

PLANNING DIRECTOR INTERVIEWS	33
INTRODUCTION	33
QUESTIONS POSED AND SUMMARIZED RESPONSES	33
KEY POINTS RAISED	39
CONCLUSIONS	43
RECOMMENDATIONS	47
APPENDIX A: SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND SOURCES NOTES	49
OVERVIEW	49
IDENTIFICATION OF PLANNING DIRECTORS	49
ADMINISTRATION OF THE SURVEY	49
SOURCES OF DATA FOR RESPONDENT ANALYSIS	50
APPENDIX B: LOCAL SMART GROWTH ACTIVITIES IN CALIFORNIA	51
CITY AND COUNTY PLANNING RESPONSIBILITIES	51
DEFINITIONS	51
Sustainable Communities	51
Livable Communities	52
Smart Growth	52
SMART GROWTH CHARACTERISTICS	53
RECENT PUBLIC AND PRIVATE STUDY RESULTS	53
League of California Cities	53
The Association of Bay Area Governments	55
State Office of Planning and Research Survey	57
RESEARCH FINDINGS: LOCAL POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES	60
RECOMMENDED LOCAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK	66
APPENDIX C: PLANNING DIRECTOR SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE WITH TABULATED RESULTS	69
APPENDIX D: RESPONDENT ANALYSIS SPREADSHEETS	75

APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS WITH LOCAL PLANNING OFFICIALS
..... 93

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS..... 159

BIBLIOGRAPHY 161

WEBSITES 163

ABOUT THE AUTHORS 165

PRE-PUBLICATION PEER REVIEW 167

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	California Counties Compared	20
Table 2	Types of Local Controversy for Smart Growth Strategies	26
Table 3	Comparison of All Jurisdictions and Jurisdictions Responding to Planning Director Survey by Five Data Categories	29
Table 4	Comparison of Question 6—Average Ratings for California Jurisdictions Ranked by Five Data Categories	30
Table 5	Comparison of All Jurisdictions and Jurisdictions Responding to Planning Director Survey by Five Data Categories	76
Table 6	Comparison of Question 6 Average Rating for California Jurisdictions Ranked by Five Data Categories	77
Table 7	Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Projected Percentage of Growth from 2000 to 2020 and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6.	78
Table 8	Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Per Capita Income (1998) and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6	81
Table 9	Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Percentage of Multiple-Family Housing and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6.	84
Table 10	Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Agricultural Sales (1997) and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6.	86
Table 11	Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Percentage of Vote for Bush in November 2000 Election and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6.	89

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study provides an overview of how California's local governments are reacting to and planning for current and anticipated growth and development. It identifies trends related to that growth and recommends policies and programs the State of California should consider.

The research is unique in its degree of integration of the concepts of sustainable development, smart growth, and livable communities, and in its up-to-date assessment of the land use and transportation strategies being incorporated into local plans and implementation activities.

Its primary purpose is to help state officials, concerned professionals, and other involved stakeholders select and shape effective and feasible state policies and programs that will support and promote better management of California's future growth. It may also be useful to a wide variety of professionals and advocates concerned with the policies used to guide California's growth and development.

Research for this study identified and investigated policies and approaches associated with the concepts of livable communities, smart growth, and sustainable communities. For the study, the term "smart growth" was selected as the primary term used to refer to these new planning approaches. Definitions of these terms are provided beginning on page 51 of this report, but it was not the purpose of this study to explore the distinctions between these terms. Indeed, there is no authoritative source for such definitions, and while the terms are sometimes used differently, these differences are not significant for the purposes of this report.

Research consisted of a literature review, a survey mailed to California's 534 city and county planning directors, and follow-up phone interviews of 30 survey respondents. The 200 responses to the mailed survey represent jurisdictions having almost 58 percent of the state's population.

The literature review identified a variety of land use and transportation strategies. The survey of city and county planning directors focused on 10 commonly cited strategies clustered within three policy areas:

Develop Efficient and Compact Communities

- A. Plan for a significant amount of development to occur on vacant and underutilized sites within developed areas.
- B. Establish land use standards and practices that increase land use intensity within downtown(s) and near transit stops.
- C. Plan for more mixed-use developments.

- D. Plan for more open space preservation, including natural areas, conservation lands, parks, and, if available, agricultural areas.

Promote Transportation and Housing Choices

- E. Plan for more transportation choices, including transit-supportive and bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods, shopping areas, and employment centers.
- F. Plan for the retention and development of housing that meets projected demand and accommodates a range of incomes and ages.
- G. Plan for the development of housing affordable to workers employed locally.

Enhance Public/Private Processes and Interjurisdictional Cooperation

- H. Coordinate local land use and circulation plans with neighboring communities.
- I. Use public, private, and/or nonprofit partnerships, alliances, and other collaborative approaches in the preparation of conservation and development policies and regulations.
- J. Establish procedures that provide greater certainty and predictability in the review of developments conforming to the jurisdiction's adopted planning policies, programs, and strategies.

From 107 to 143 jurisdictions currently are either implementing or studying each of the 10 strategies. Additional jurisdictions report that although all the strategies are applicable, they have not yet been considered. Few jurisdictions report having considered and rejected any of the identified strategies (no more than four for any one strategy).

The following major conclusions were drawn from the background research, survey data, and planning director interviews:

- Implementation of the 10 strategies is not restricted to particular types of communities but is broadly distributed throughout California's cities and counties.
- Cities and counties throughout California anticipate that land use will intensify. Of the 190 jurisdictions responding to the question, "In general, would you say that your jurisdiction is moving in the direction of using land more intensively?" 153 jurisdictions, representing all population sizes, geographical locations, and social and economic circumstances, answered "Yes."
- There is a large and growing trend in California to restrict urban expansion. Of the 128 jurisdictions that found the issue applicable, 85 reported that their jurisdiction is moving in the direction of restricting outward growth.

-
- Policies and programs to promote more transportation choices, including transit-supportive and bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods, shopping areas, and employment centers, have been adopted or are under study in 129 of the 140 jurisdictions that report them as applicable.
 - Policies and programs addressing land use, transportation, and other elements of growth will need to be sensitive to regional differences. The challenges of addressing growth are likely to be especially difficult for the high-growth, low-income Inland Empire and San Joaquin Valley regions.
 - The highest levels of controversy related to the 10 growth-related strategies identified and evaluated by this research involve intensification of uses—particularly housing uses—within existing residential neighborhoods.
 - The research suggests that controversies could intensify significantly in coming years. Both the survey and the in-depth interviews show that many jurisdictions are still studying or only beginning to implement new planning approaches. At the same time, the population and economic growth projected for California, combined with restrictions on outward growth, will force planners to attempt to situate large quantities of new development within existing communities.
 - Jurisdictions that are the most successful in implementing new planning approaches often employ several strategies, including extensive neighborhood and community involvement in the planning process; attention to design detail; visualization techniques; and improvement of community facilities and services, both within and around new projects. These strategies require funding and skills not available to all jurisdictions.
 - California communities that hope to accommodate projected growth within existing boundaries without encountering potentially debilitating opposition from residents must substantially enhance existing planning resources and skills, involve neighborhoods and communities in shaping their own futures, provide guidance to ensure that growth is accommodated in a manner that benefits the community, and secure adequate and stable funding sources.

Recommendations focus on what state leaders should consider if the state government is to become a stronger advocate for smart, livable, and sustainable transportation and land use policies. Specific recommendations are made in the following areas:

- Measures to enhance the planning capacities of local governments.
- Measures to target state funds (and federal pass-through funds) to communities that are implementing smart growth projects.

- Measures to enhance the capacity of local governments that approve smart growth projects to secure the local taxes and fees needed to adequately provide for related needs, including existing deficiencies in neighborhoods expected to accommodate the new projects.
- Improvements in the adequacy, security, and predictability of state funding for local government.
- Measures that structure state general plan requirements, housing requirements, and funding assistance to reward localities that are addressing and accommodating the housing needs resulting from job growth in their jurisdictions.
- Preparation of guidelines to assist localities in streamlining California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) procedures while maintaining existing CEQA benefits, coordinating local land use plans with neighboring communities, and increasing certainty in development review procedures.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This study is intended to help state officials, concerned professionals, and other involved stakeholders select and shape effective and feasible state policies and programs that will support and promote better management of the state's future growth. It may also be useful to a wide variety of professionals and advocates concerned with the policies used to guide California's growth and development.

If the state government is to become a stronger advocate for transportation and land use policies that address growth patterns and related issues, state policymakers and key administrative agency leaders should have the clearest, most up-to-date understanding possible of the following issues:

- Existing efforts by local government to improve and update planning methods.
- The status of and attitudes toward innovation and change in the planning and community development profession.
- The extent to which local governments are incorporating new ideas and concepts into local plans and implementing them in practice.
- The sources and nature of support and opposition to these changes at the local community level.

Previous research conducted by the team that carried out this project has concluded that the term "smart growth" is an appropriate way to reference the planning efforts associated with sustainable, smart, and livable development concepts. Thus, "smart growth" is the primary term used here to refer to new planning approaches. However, the work effort also integrated implementation policies and approaches associated with the concepts of livable communities and sustainable communities and development. Definitions of these terms can be found on page 51.

This report addresses the following questions and issues:

- What land use and transportation techniques are appropriately associated with smart growth?
- To what extent are local (that is, city and county) planning agencies incorporating smart growth concepts in their planning strategies?
- What are the major obstacles to incorporating smart growth planning concepts into local plans?
- To what extent are local planning agencies seeing smart growth concepts being implemented?

- What are the major obstacles to implementing smart growth planning concepts?
- Who are the advocates and opponents of smart growth planning?
- What are the perceived motivations of advocates and opponents?
- What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

This report includes an executive summary, a description of the scope and methodology of the study, results of the literature and Web site research, results and analysis of a survey of planning directors, results and analysis of interviews with selected planning officials, a summary of major conclusions, and recommendations for consideration by the State of California.

The research is unique in its degree of integration of sustainable development, smart growth, and livable communities concepts and in its up-to-date assessment of the land use and transportation strategies being incorporated into local plans and implementation activities.

CHAPTER 2: SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The research and analysis undertaken to answer the questions presented in Chapter 1 involved three primary elements:

1. Through a literature review, a master list of specific land use and transportation actions generally associated with sustainable, smart, and livable growth management was created. The primary research method was the use of the Web to review professional publications, advocacy group Web sites, and available independent studies. Some written materials were collected and incorporated into the analysis; the most important of these involved work done by the State Office of Planning and Research and surveys conducted by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC). More information on research sources and methods is available beginning on page 9.
2. A survey of planning directors was developed and administered. It focused on the master list of specific land use and transportation actions developed in the literature review. The methods used to develop, administer, compile, and analyze the data collected in the survey are presented in Chapter 4 and discussed in more detail in Appendix A.
3. Follow-up telephone interviews were conducted with 30 survey respondents. Interviewees were selected to distribute interviews geographically, by size of jurisdiction, by rates of anticipated growth, and by other factors. More details on the methods used are provided beginning on page 33.

CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE AND WEB RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

The goal of our literature and Web research was to create a master list of specific local land use and transportation actions generally associated with sustainable, smart, and livable growth management. The main objective was to identify specific techniques used by local planning agencies to promote smart growth.

The results of the literature and Web research summarized in this chapter are presented in full in Appendix B.

The primary research approach used information drawn from the Web in April 2002. Information also was drawn from local government planning documents in academic and governmental libraries. The most helpful online source of information was the LUPIN Web site (<http://ceres.ca.gov/planning>). Key planning documents included adopted or proposed general and specific plans on file in the College of Environmental Design Library at the University of California, Berkeley, and in the Association of Bay Area Governments–Metropolitan Transportation Commission Library at the MetroCenter in Oakland, California.

The State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) provided selected unpublished results from a research process they completed during the course of this project, and key elements of that are summarized below and more fully in Appendix B. The work of the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) was also reviewed. The relevant information drawn from that work is presented beginning on page 18.

SMART GROWTH CHARACTERISTICS

Three core themes, or organizing concepts, characterize smart growth. The first is *conserving resources*—accommodating growth in greenfield edges of communities through contiguous, compact development that lowers costs for new infrastructure and reduces consumption of open space, restoring and recycling built-up areas already served by community infrastructure, and taking steps to conserve valued natural resources. The second is *widening choices* of development forms and functions to satisfy the needs of an increasingly diverse society and economy—expanding available options of home styles, types of neighbors and neighborhoods, work locations, travel modes, recreation and cultural opportunities. The third theme is achieving these goals through *inclusive, public/private, multijurisdictional processes* that ensure that the interests of all the stakeholders in community development are heard and leverage collaborative relationships to achieve smart growth.

These ideas are expressed in various phrases and formulations, but usually incorporate the following elements or principles:

- Promoting compact, mixed-use development
- Conserving open space and natural features and qualities
- Efficiently maintaining and expanding infrastructure systems
- Encouraging infill, redevelopment, and adaptive reuse in existing built-up areas
- Improving mobility through multimodal transportation.

Smart growth principles propose to *bend* the current course of development—to make communities *more* compact, for example, to conserve *more* open space, and to encourage *more* infill and redevelopment.

RESEARCH FINDINGS: LOCAL POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

The following menu of policies and implementation measures identifies actions that have been either adopted or considered at the local level in California. Other than Social Equity and Workforce Development (page 14), these measures have been organized around state-mandated local general plan element topics.

Land Use Element: Policies and Implementation Measures

1. Ensure that infrastructure efficiently serves future growth.
 - Identify existing urbanized areas in need of infrastructure upgrades. Target local infrastructure resources to support development where infrastructure is already in place, enabling existing infrastructure to support increased intensity of use. Repair or replace aging infrastructure in infill and redevelopment areas.
 - Designate service boundaries for extending infrastructure and discourage extension of public facilities beyond these boundaries.
 - Work with sponsors of regional projects and activities, such as sports, entertainment, and employment, to locate these activities in downtowns and areas well served by transit.
 - Locate schools, libraries, hospitals, and civic buildings near existing and planned transit stations, and within walking or biking distance of the communities they serve.
 - Establish joint-use public facilities, such as the sharing of recreational centers between schools and cities, and placing libraries in local community service centers.
2. Direct future growth to vacant and underutilized land within existing urbanized areas.

-
- Complete an inventory of vacant and underutilized land.
 - Prepare specific plans for underutilized areas, for example, surplus or abandoned institutional, commercial (strip malls), and industrial land (contaminated sites). Redevelop these areas with activities that eliminate large surface parking lots, mix different types of uses, and include shared parking areas as well as pedestrian and transit-access amenities.
 - Identify sites with special redevelopment needs, such as abandoned or contaminated sites, and prioritize their redevelopment or clean-up.
 - Provide loan guarantees, letters of credit, and fee or tax waivers to developers of mixed-use and infill projects.
 - Create private-public partnerships in community revitalization efforts to improve the quality of life for new and existing residents and businesses in disadvantaged/existing communities.
 - Remove barriers to adaptive reuse, such as building codes that inhibit the redevelopment of older buildings.
3. Make the development process more efficient by providing certainty as to where new development will or will not occur.
- Conduct front-end environmental clearance, and minimize project-by-project reviews in areas designated for reuse.
 - Assign and fund staff contacts to guide projects through the development review process as efficiently as possible.
 - Minimize discretionary permit requirements, such as use permits, applicable to proposed infill and other smart development.
4. Create efficient land use patterns that will reduce projected congestion levels, improve mobility, and reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- Exempt or minimize development fees for infill and redevelopment projects.
 - Identify transit and transportation corridors and create specific plans for their development at greater intensities.
 - Locate the services people use every day, such as child care, cleaners, and convenience shopping, at transit centers and in major activity centers.
 - Revitalize or establish a pedestrian-oriented town center or subcenters. Create a specific plan for the center's development.
 - Encourage mixed uses by permitting residential uses in all zones and neighborhood-serving commercial uses in residential zones.

- Reduce parcel size for new single-family developments.
 - In newly developing areas, permit mixed uses and housing for a wide range of incomes.
5. Design neighborhoods and projects to improve livability.
 - Zone for mixed-use, compact development with a connected street network, pedestrian-scale design, and transit-oriented development. Encourage pedestrian-scale, neighborhood-serving commercial uses in residential areas.
 - Develop, adopt, and implement design guidelines for the street frontage of buildings. Avoid blank walls; encourage windows, entrances, landscaping, and pedestrian amenities such as sitting areas. Provide opportunities for traffic calming. Design streets and structures at a human scale, allowing walkability.
 6. Coordinate local land use, circulation, and major development plans with neighboring communities.
 - Provide for input on proposed general plan changes from those localities that could be affected by such changes.
 - Establish interjurisdictional review boards to review major development proposals within the sphere of influence of a neighboring community.

Circulation Element: Policies and Implementation Measures

1. Promote efficient use of resources for mobility demands, especially opportunities for nonmotorized transportation and access to destinations by alternatives to auto travel.
 - Establish guidelines that call for transit-supportive and bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods, shopping areas, and employment centers.
 - Require new developments to include pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
 - Adopt transit station area specific plans or redevelopment plans for all areas within walking distance, which include a mix of uses and the highest residential and commercial densities found in the community.
 - Interconnect pedestrian and bicycle networks with transit networks; connect bike and pedestrian paths directly with transit stations or stops.
 - Establish lower parking requirements, and short- and long-term bicycle parking facilities in activity centers and areas near transit stops.
2. Provide a variety of coordinated measures aimed at congestion relief.
 - Establish a transportation demand management program that encourages alternatives to single-occupant vehicles.

-
- Work with Caltrans and local transit agencies to develop transit priority measures, such as signal priority and dedicated bus lanes, that allow transit vehicles to bypass congested areas.
 - Form partnerships with transit agencies to develop financing or other strategies for development around stations or in the design of major transit corridors.
 - Relax traffic level-of-service standards within major activity centers.
 - Incorporate standards that enhance walkability (sidewalks, on-street parking, traffic calming, landscaping, good building facade design) into street design manuals.
 - Establish minimum density requirements for all new development within a certain distance (for example, one-third of a mile) of public transit stations.
 - Advocate employer-sponsored transit passes as an alternative to on-site parking for employees.
 - Pursue a city car-share program.
 - Promote telecommuting by establishing telecommuting programs for city and county workers or adopting alternative work schedules.

Housing Element: Policies and Implementation Measures

1. Provide a quantity of diverse housing types that meets projected demand.
 - Identify the potential for new housing production within existing urbanized areas. Complete an inventory of vacant lands in the jurisdiction and study potential for higher densities on currently developed sites.
 - Conduct a comprehensive assessment of current and projected housing for all economic segments of the community, to measure unmet housing needs.
 - Permit in-law (accessory) units.
 - Relax restrictions on multifamily housing.
 - Establish locally initiated density bonuses that allow developers of housing units to add extra units (stories) if the developments include such amenities as improvements to nearby transit, parks, public spaces, or pedestrian or bicycle facilities.
 - Amend the general plan and zoning on undeveloped or underutilized commercial and industrial lands to allow residential or mixed use. Permit residential development in conjunction with commercial projects.
 - Encourage the construction of affordable and infill housing by processing permits more quickly and providing project subsidies.

2. Preserve and restore the existing housing stock and limit the conversion of residential buildings to other uses.
 - Encourage housing development that accommodates a range of incomes and ages, including some mixed-income neighborhoods.
 - Participate in location-efficient mortgage programs to provide low-interest mortgage loans for residents who purchase homes in neighborhoods targeted for revitalization and/or near transit.
 - Adopt inclusionary zoning, which requires developers of new housing to provide a certain percentage (usually 10-20 percent) of units affordable to very low-, low-, and moderate-income residents. The developer can provide this housing in new residential developments or in a different location. In-lieu fees for affordable housing can substitute for units where land has been identified for it.
 - Work with nonprofit and for-profit developers to create permanently affordable housing. Preserve existing affordable housing to address gentrification of urban neighborhoods, and provide opportunities for increased community and economic development.
 - Subsidize affordable housing projects by reducing development fees or pursuing proactive programs designed to assist in construction of affordable units.
3. Locate more housing near job centers.
 - Institute jobs-housing linkage programs, which require all new job-generating projects to pay a fee toward the development of affordable housing. (This may be inappropriate for housing-rich areas where it might penalize needed new job production.)
 - Establish a housing impact fee on new commercial and industrial projects, to be used for the provision of affordable housing units.
 - Pursue tax-increment financing and other incentives to promote transit-oriented developments, producing housing at commute nodes.

Social Equity and Workforce Development: Policies and Implementation Measures

Although Social Equity and Workforce Development is not a state-mandated element of local general plans in California, issues related to social equity are part of a smart growth program and can be addressed effectively locally.

1. As part of an overall economic development program, locate and link businesses that are compatible with the skills and education of the local workforce.
 - Encourage new employers and contractors to search for skilled workers locally.

-
- Match economic development efforts to attract employers to the skills of the area's employees.
 - Adopt policies encouraging local workers to occupy new housing units.
2. Support workforce development programs that encourage schools, colleges, and other training programs to educate and train residents for targeted employment opportunities.
 3. Avoid displacing residents, community institutions, and neighborhood-serving local businesses.

Conservation/Open Space Element: Policies and Implementation Measures

1. Prepare conservation and development policies and regulations in collaboration with all stakeholders, including neighboring jurisdictions. Address community concerns through alliances and partnerships.
 - Develop resources for “green” building design practices and materials.
 - Assess development fees to preserve or provide open space.
 - Incorporate new development in or adjacent to existing developed areas, and provide greenspace for recreation and other amenities.
 - Develop measures of environmental justice to ensure that low-income communities and communities of color do not bear a disproportionate burden of environmental hazards.
 - Establish a transfer-of-development-rights program that allows for preservation of open space on the urban fringe and intensifies land use within existing developed areas.
2. Prepare plans and measures for preserving open space, natural resources, and the managed production of resources, outdoor recreation, and agricultural land.
 - Protect significant open space resources by establishing an open space land trust.
 - Adopt urban growth boundaries coupled with infill development commitments.
 - Encourage recycling, resource reduction, and energy conservation programs to reduce waste of scarce natural resources.
 - Identify significant open space and scenic, cultural, and historic resources so they can be protected.
 - Establish standards for park and recreational space in new and redevelopment areas.
 - Establish conservation easements to allow local communities to finance open space needed for parks, watershed protection, and recreational activities.

- Identify prime agricultural land that should be set aside from development, and pursue Williamson Act agreements with those landowners.
 - Do not publicly fund infrastructure that would support low-density new development in prime agricultural areas not planned for future growth.
3. Design for preservation and improvement of open space, parks, and community centers in urbanized areas, improving the quality of urban green space.
 - Identify existing parks and neighborhoods that lack parks. Identify potential greenspace and park space in existing urbanized areas that lack public greenspace. Identify recreational activities and neighborhoods that lack these.
 4. Educate citizens about the public benefits of infill and redevelopment, and the tradeoffs involved between smart growth and sprawl.
 - Explain how traditional suburban development patterns can lead to sprawl and its associated challenges of increased auto trips, congestion, and energy consumption, and how mixed uses, compactness, and walkability can promote more travel choices and livability.

PLANNING STRATEGIES FOR THE SURVEY OF PLANNING DIRECTORS

Based on the findings from this research, the following operational framework was used as a starting point in surveying local governments with respect to smart growth activity, interests, and needs:

Develop Efficient and Compact Communities

- K. Plan for a significant amount of development to occur on vacant and underutilized sites within developed areas.
- L. Establish land use standards and practices that increase land use intensity within downtown(s) and near transit stops.
- M. Plan for more mixed-use developments.
- N. Plan for more open space preservation, including natural areas, conservation lands, parks, and, if available, agricultural areas.

Promote Transportation and Housing Choices

- O. Plan for more transportation choices, including transit-supportive and bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods, shopping areas, and employment centers.

-
- P. Plan for the retention and development of housing that meets projected demand and accommodates a range of incomes and ages.
 - Q. Plan for the development of housing affordable to workers employed locally.

Enhance Public/Private Processes and Interjurisdictional Cooperation

- R. Coordinate local land use and circulation plans with neighboring communities.
- S. Use public, private, and/or nonprofit partnerships, alliances, and other collaborative approaches in the preparation of conservation and development policies and regulations.
- T. Establish procedures that provide greater certainty and predictability in the review of developments conforming to the jurisdiction's adopted planning policies, programs, and strategies.

OTHER SUPPORTIVE RESEARCH

Research and surveys conducted by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research and the Public Policy Institute of California are summarized below to provide additional evidence supporting the conclusions and recommendations of this report.

State Office of Planning and Research Survey

Exploration of other research in the area of growth management in California identified another opinion research process involving public officials that was relevant to the issues addressed by this project. The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) sponsored a series of roundtable meetings—17 were held in 2001—that involved hundreds of locally elected and appointed officials, as well as leaders representing real estate, business, environmental, and ethnic interests and organizations. At these sessions, participants were asked to recommend specific actions that could be taken by the state to effectively accommodate projected growth. After synthesizing the results of these roundtable meetings, OPR prepared and distributed a survey to all participants to measure their response to suggestions brought up at the roundtable meetings.

Certain subjects addressed in the survey relate to smart growth strategies. These ideas, and responses to them, are as follows:

	Strongly support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Left blank
1. Give priority for state grant funding to communities that can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.	34	23	8	6	7	1
2. Establish a revolving loan fund for local jurisdictions to develop and adopt specific plans that developers can rely on for approval of a project application.	13	30	16	12	2	5
3. Develop a comprehensive state plan for growth and development in California.	33	20	11	5	7	3
4. Prepare a new publication that identifies existing streamlining measures within the California Environmental Quality Act and planning law.	25	38	12	3	1	0
5. Allow transit-oriented development (TOD) to be funded through tax-increment financing by exempting TODs from meeting the physical and economic criteria of blight in order to qualify as redevelopment areas.	17	35	14	11	2	1

Public Policy Institute of California Opinion Research

The context in which the views of planning officials were solicited for this project (see the survey described in Chapter 4) includes the opinions of the general public.

The Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) regularly surveys Californians on growth, land use, and environmental issues. A survey on these issues was conducted in late October 2001; details are available on the PPIC Web site at <http://www.ppic.org>.

The survey identifies a clear split in public attitudes about growth, with a slight majority tilting in favor of greater controls. Key findings include the following:

- 55 percent would vote to approve “a local initiative that would slow down the pace of development” in their community even if it meant having less economic growth. 29 percent regard population growth and development in their region as a “big problem,” 37 percent as “somewhat of a problem,” and 33 percent as “not a problem,” with 1 percent not knowing if it is or is not a problem.

- 49 percent agree that “it is better to allow growth in undeveloped areas if people want to live there,” and 46 percent want to “steer growth to already developed areas.”
- 53 percent of Californians believe that “the state should maintain current land use and environmental restrictions, even if it increases the cost of new housing” and 43 percent believe that the state should ease land use and environmental restrictions in an effort to increase the housing supply.
- 55 percent favor using tax dollars to “buy undeveloped land to keep it free from commercial and residential development,” but 56 percent oppose higher local taxes to pay for buying undeveloped land.
- 59 percent agree that local governments in their region should “get together and agree on land use and growth issues,” and 35 percent agree that “local government should decide on its own.” 50 percent agree that the state should give planning guidelines to local governments as part of addressing regional development; 47 percent do not want state planning guidelines.
- 50 percent conclude that state government is not doing enough to manage land use and growth issues, with 35 percent concluding that the state is doing “just enough” and 8 percent “more than enough.” 12 percent have “a lot” of confidence in “the state government’s ability to plan for land use and growth,” with 48 percent having “only some” confidence, 28 percent “very little” confidence, and 10 percent no confidence; 2 percent do not know.

This survey helps to explain the controversy confronting local planning officials. While there is a slight tilt in favor of doing more to manage growth, there is no public agreement about the best course for planning.

IMPORTANCE OF REGIONAL DIFFERENCES

California’s year 2000 population of almost 34 million people live in diverse regions with very different characteristics. The strategies employed by local smart growth efforts, or by the state in supporting them, will differ substantially to account for these differing characteristics.

A State of Diversity—Demographic Trends in California’s Regions, authored by Hans Johnson for the Public Policy Institute of California (May 2002; available on the PPIC Web site, www.ppic.org), analyzes California from the perspective of the nine regions identified in Table 1. Table 1 identifies the year 2000 population and rank, the projected 2000-to-2020 population growth and rank, and the 1998 per capita income for each of California’s 58 counties. Data are divided into the county groupings used by the PPIC report *A State of Diversity*. Using per capita income as an indication of local resources available to address land use, transportation, and growth issues, the data suggest substantial regional differences.

Table 1: California Counties Compared

REGION County	2000 Population	2000 Population Rank	2000-2020 Population Growth	Projected Population Growth Rank	1998 Per Capita Income (\$)	Income Rank
BAY AREA						
Alameda	1,466,900	7	344,900	9	32,130	9
Contra Costa	963,000	9	189,900	15	36,006	5
Marin	250,100	24	23,700	39	52,869	1
Napa	125,800	35	32,600	35	32,649	6
San Francisco	787,500	11	-31,700	58	44,518	2
San Mateo	717,900	13	116,600	23	43,338	3
Santa Clara	1,709,500	5	453,500	7	40,828	4
Solano	400,300	20	159,200	18	23,724	24
Sonoma	464,800	16	163,600	17	30,911	11
CENTRAL COAST						
Monterey	408,700	18	182,000	16	28,185	14
San Benito	54,500	43	32,300	36	21,088	36
San Luis Obispo	249,900	25	141,000	22	24,807	22
Santa Barbara	406,100	19	146,600	20	28,698	13
Santa Cruz	259,300	22	111,300	24	31,302	10
SACRAMENTO METRO						
El Dorado	158,300	30	94,600	28	27,046	16
Placer	251,800	23	155,100	19	32,319	8
Sacramento	1,242,000	8	465,600	6	26,257	18
Yolo	170,900	28	65,500	30	25,791	19
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY						
Fresno	816,400	10	318,200	10	20,333	41
Kern	678,500	14	410,100	8	19,643	47
Kings	134,500	32	64,200	31	15,492	58
Madera	127,700	33	101,500	27	17,403	52
Merced	214,400	26	108,300	25	17,732	50
San Joaquin	573,600	15	314,000	11	20,813	38
Stanislaus	454,600	17	257,500	12	21,136	35
Tulare	375,100	21	195,800	14	18,893	48
SOUTH COAST						
Los Angeles	9,716,000	1	1,868,800	1	26,773	17
Orange	2,893,100	2	648,600	5	32,541	7
Ventura	765,300	12	241,900	13	28,711	12

Table 1: California Counties Compared (Cont.)

REGION County	2000 Population	2000 Population Rank	2000-2020 Population Growth	Projected Population Growth Rank	1998 Per Capita Income (\$)	Income Rank
SAN DIEGO						
Imperial	149,000	31	145,200	21	17,353	53
San Diego	2,856,300	3	1,007,200	4	27,657	15
INLAND EMPIRE						
Riverside	1,577,700	6	1,239,900	2	22,451	29
San Bernardino	1,742,300	4	1,058,600	3	20,258	43
SIERRAS						
Alpine	1,200	58	500	56	22,688	28
Amador	35,400	47	5,900	50	20,721	39
Calaveras	41,000	45	21,200	41	20,172	44
Inyo	18,200	52	2,500	52	23,468	25
Mariposa	17,300	53	7,000	49	21,231	34
Mono	13,100	54	3,900	51	25,020	21
Tuolumne	55,200	42	22,000	40	20,082	45
FAR NORTH						
Butte	205,400	27	103,500	26	20,838	37
Colusa	19,100	51	20,100	43	20,287	42
Del Norte	28,200	48	10,800	47	16,385	57
Glenn	26,900	49	19,600	44	16,882	54
Humboldt	127,700	33	14,400	45	22,066	30
Lake	59,100	40	33,900	34	21,696	33
Lassen	35,600	46	13,900	46	16,667	55
Mendocino	87,400	37	29,300	37	22,728	27
Modoc	9,500	56	2,000	55	20,005	46
Nevada	93,000	36	40,200	32	25,051	20
Plumas	21,000	50	2,500	52	23,783	23
Shasta	165,000	29	66,000	29	21,986	31
Sierra	3,600	57	200	57	23,175	26
Siskiyou	44,700	44	9,200	48	20,474	40
Sutter	80,200	38	35,400	33	21,965	32
Tehama	56,700	41	28,400	38	17,600	51
Trinity	13,100	54	2,300	54	18,704	49
Yuba	60,800	39	21,100	42	16,405	56

The PPIC report identifies several factors that are especially relevant to addressing future growth issues.

- Population densities range from 9 people per square mile (ppsq) in the seven-county Sierra region and 26 ppsq in the eighteen Far North counties, to 980 ppsq in the Bay Area and 1,959 ppsq in the three South Coast counties. With the exception of the Far North and Sierra regions, every region in California is more racially diverse than the nation as a whole. In three regions—the South Coast, the San Joaquin Valley, and the Inland Empire—no single group constitutes a majority of the population.
- California’s regions have continued to diverge economically. The San Joaquin Valley and the Inland Empire—the poorest regions and two of the fastest-growing regions—had inflation-adjusted declining per capita income in the 1990s. In 1999, the San Joaquin Valley’s per capita income was more than 30 percent below the state average, the Inland Empire’s per capita income was about 25 percent below the state average, and the Bay Area’s per capita income was almost 40 percent higher than the state average.

CHAPTER 4: SURVEY OF PLANNING DIRECTORS

SMART GROWTH STRATEGIES INCLUDED IN THE PLANNING DIRECTOR SURVEY

Initial research identified a variety of planning strategies that are commonly associated with smart growth. The strategies can be grouped into three major categories of local planning activities: developing efficient and compact communities, promoting transportation and housing choices, and enhancing public/private processes and interjurisdictional cooperation. The survey (see Appendix C) asked for responses to the following 10 strategies:

Strategy A. Planning for a significant amount of development to occur on vacant and underutilized sites within developed areas.

Strategy B. Establishing land use standards and practices that increase land use intensity within downtown(s) and near transit stops.

Strategy C. Planning for more mixed-use developments.

Strategy D. Planning for more open space preservation, including natural areas, conservation lands, parks, and, if available, agricultural areas.

Strategy E. Planning for more transportation choices, including transit-supportive and bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods, shopping areas, and employment centers.

Strategy F. Planning for the retention and development of housing that meets projected demand and accommodates a range of incomes and ages.

Strategy G. Planning for the development of housing affordable to workers employed locally.

Strategy H. Coordinating local land use and circulation plans with neighboring communities.

Strategy I. Using public, private, and/or nonprofit partnerships, alliances, and other collaborative approaches in the preparation of conservation and development policies and regulations.

Strategy J. Establishing procedures that provide greater certainty and predictability in the review of developments conforming to the jurisdiction's adopted planning policies, programs, and strategies.

SURVEY DESCRIPTION

The Mineta Transportation Institute conducted a mail survey of 534 city and county planning directors in California in mid-February 2002. Follow-up e-mails were sent to agencies that did not respond by the end of February. Extensive phone contact was made with jurisdictions where the mailed survey and/or the e-mail had been returned as undeliverable, and those agencies were sent the survey again by fax or e-mail.

A copy of the survey instrument (including the tabulated results) is presented as Appendix C to this report. The survey was drafted, reviewed, and revised in consultation with the Survey and Policy Research Institute at San José State University. The strategies included in the survey were developed as part of the literature and Web research effort described on page 9.

From mid-March through early April 2002, phone, fax, and e-mail follow-up were carried out for jurisdictions that had not responded. The most effort was expended on the largest jurisdictions; some effort was focused on jurisdictions having more than 20,000 in population; and few jurisdictions smaller than 20,000 received further effort. After April 15, no additional written survey responses were accepted for inclusion in the analysis. Appendix A contains a more detailed description of the sources of information and methods related to the survey and to the analysis below.

FINDINGS

As California is growing, increasing the need for forward thinking in land use planning, overwhelming majorities of cities and counties throughout the state say they are using land more intensively than in the past and incorporating multimodal transportation features in their land use plans. Most cities and counties are altering past policies to some degree, and substantial numbers are adopting new language to describe those policies, with an increasing emphasis on the concept of a “livable community.” The jurisdictions most likely to be moving away from past development policies are those with the greatest projected rates of growth and those with lower per capita incomes.

Planning officials also report that some of the same strategies their jurisdictions are using to plan for significant growth on vacant and underutilized land, for example, are generating the most local controversy. The least controversial (or most widely accepted) policy among California cities and counties appears to be planning for more transportation choices, including transit-supportive and bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods, shopping areas, and employment centers.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The tabulated survey results are presented as Appendix C. Of the state's 534 jurisdictions, 200 responses were received. This represented 37.5 percent of the total jurisdictions and 57.9 percent of the total population of the state (the unincorporated populations of counties were covered by county planning departments). Some respondents completed only some of the questions in the survey, so the totaled responses to individual questions frequently add up to less than 200.

The comments below are summarized from Appendix C.

Question #1: Study or action on 10 identified strategies?

From 107 to 143 of the survey respondents are currently either studying or implementing each of the 10 strategies. Few jurisdictions report that they have considered and rejected any of the identified strategies (no more than four for any one strategy). The strategies on the low end of this range were also those with the most jurisdictions reporting them as "not applicable." Between 51 and 86 jurisdictions report each of the strategies as either "applicable but not yet considered" or "under study."

Question #2: Level of controversy?

Levels of controversy are significantly different for the 10 strategies presented on page 23. The most controversial strategies (A, F, and G) involve infill and additional housing, with a similar number of respondents reporting them very controversial (score 4 or 5) as reporting them mildly controversial or not controversial (score 1 or 2). In the middle are measures involving more intensive use of downtown or transit station areas, mixed use, or open space protection (strategies B, C, and D); between two and four times as many respondents reported them mildly or not controversial as reported them very controversial. The least controversial strategies (E, H, I, and J) involve expanding transportation choices and such process strategies as neighboring jurisdiction coordination, partnerships, and developer certainty; between four and ten times as many respondents reported them mildly or not controversial as reported them very controversial.

Question #3: Narrative on nature of controversy.

Of 200 jurisdictions, 115 reported that at least one of the 10 smart growth strategies was causing significant controversy. Those 115 jurisdictions cited a total of 320 comments on controversies associated with specific strategies.

The local agency comments were aggregated into categories with similar concerns. They are identified in the left column of Table 2. These concerns were expressed relative to the 10 strategies as identified by letter across the top of the table.

Table 2: Types of Local Controversy for Smart Growth Strategies

Local Issue Causing Concern	Smart Growth Strategies										Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	
Property owner/developer objections	0	1	1	11	5	2	1	0	2	9	32
Voter/resident objections to growth/development/density	30	26	21	6	6	19	7	3	4	3	125
Voter/resident objections to low/moderate/affordable housing	1	1	2	0	1	31	36	1	0	0	73
Voter/resident concerns about increased traffic	14	4	2	1	2	2	1	4	0	0	30
Disputes with other governmental agencies	2	0	0	2	0	6	4	11	0	0	25
Disputes over environmentally sensitive/agricultural land/water supply	7	0	2	7	0	1	1	1	0	0	19
Miscellaneous	0	1	0	2	0	3	3	2	3	3	16
Total	54	33	28	29	14	64	52	22	9	15	320

Question #4: Level of modification following controversy?

Respondents were asked to rank the degree to which they modified adopted and/or implemented strategies as a result of controversy. They ranked the degree of modification made relative to the original proposal or concept on a scale of 1 (none) to 5 (major). Results indicated that the more controversial strategies were modified the most.

For the most controversial strategies identified in response to Question 2 (A, F, and G), an average of 19 percent of responding jurisdictions reported very significant modification (score 4 or 5). For the middle level of controversy (strategies B, C, and D), an average of 17 percent reported very significant modification. For the least controversial (strategies E, H, I, and J), an average of 8 percent reported very significant modification.

Question #5: Moving in particular directions?

Jurisdictions are moving in the direction of using land more intensively by a ratio of 153 to 35, with just two jurisdictions declaring this strategy not applicable.

Respondents report that their jurisdictions are moving toward restricting outward growth by a ratio of 85 to 43, with 55 reporting this strategy not applicable.

Respondents reporting that they are moving in the direction of incorporating multimodal transportation features in land use plans outnumbered those who are not using this strategy by 134 to 31, with 20 reporting this strategy not applicable.

Question #6: Moving in a significantly different direction in approach to planning?

Of 181 jurisdictions responding, 11 reported they intend to follow past policies, 97 projected moderate change (score 2 or 3), and 73 projected more significant change (score 4 or 5).

Question #7: Terminology used to describe planning philosophy?

Weighted results (3 points for first choice, 2 points for second choice, and 1 point for third choice) show that the term “livable community” is far ahead of other terms used by elected and appointed officials (211 points). The next most frequently cited term is “smart growth” (132 points), followed by “reliance on the private market” (106 points).

Of 170 respondents indicating a number one rank for a term listed in the questionnaire, 104 selected a “new” term, 41 selected a “traditional” term, and 25 selected “reliance on the private market.”

“New” terms in order of preference (for number one rank) were: livable community (46); smart growth (24); transit-oriented development (8); new urbanism (7); sustainable development (7); regional planning (5); compact growth (5); and green city (2); (total 104).

“Traditional” terms in order of preference (for number one rank) were: controlled growth (21) and growth management (20) (total 41).

ANALYSIS OF RESPONDENTS

Before analyzing and interpreting the results of the survey, two questions about the 200 respondents were considered:

1. In what ways and to what extent were the 200 respondents similar to or different from the 534 jurisdictions to whom the survey was distributed?
2. To what extent might any differences identified be related to differences in growth management practices?

The survey methodology described above and in Appendix A resulted in overrepresentation of larger jurisdictions. As a result of the greater attention to follow-up for larger jurisdictions and the

generally larger planning staffs and budgets of those jurisdictions, the respondents represented 37.5 percent of the cities and counties but 57.9 percent of the total population of California.

Because larger jurisdictions generally have larger planning staffs and more elaborate growth management programs, the affirmative responses to questions about being engaged in particular planning practices may be somewhat greater than would be the case for all the cities and counties in California. Also, agencies more engaged in change might be more likely to respond to a survey about change than agencies that are less involved with change. The former agencies have more to say and are more motivated where issues related to change are involved. This, too, could have resulted in more affirmative responses about engagement in planning practices than would be the case for agencies not responding to the survey.

On a more analytical level, Appendix D contains several tables showing data related to the two questions posed above. Using data available by county, the 534 jurisdictions were divided in quarters (approximate—to the nearest county) for each of five characteristics:

1. Percent of projected growth in population (2000 to 2020), from highest to lowest
2. Per capita income, from highest to lowest
3. Agricultural sales, from highest to lowest
4. Presidential vote (2000), from highest to lowest for George Bush
5. Percent of multiple family housing, from highest to lowest.

These five parameters were selected because professionals and policy makers often expect smart growth practices to be more prevalent in areas experiencing rapid growth, in more affluent areas, and in more densely developed areas; likewise, these practices are often expected to be less prevalent in more rural and politically conservative areas.

We then compared the percent of our 200 respondents in each approximate quarter to the exact percent of the 534 jurisdictions contained in each approximate quarter (remembering that the data was available by county and the jurisdictions were divided into quarters to the nearest county). While the county basis of our data is less than ideal, this procedure allowed us to compare in what ways and to what extent the 200 respondents were similar to or different from the 534 jurisdictions along these five parameters.

The results are summarized in Table 3 (top two quarters compared to bottom two quarters) and presented in more detail in Appendix D.

Table 3: Comparison of All Jurisdictions and Jurisdictions Responding to Planning Director Survey by Five Data Categories

DATA CATEGORY	Jurisdictions in the top half (% of 534)	Responding jurisdictions in the top half (% of 200)	Jurisdictions in the bottom half (% of 534)	Responding jurisdictions in the bottom half (% of 200)
% 2000-2020 Growth (projected)	47.9	46.5	52.1	53.5
1998 Per Capita Income	54.3	62.5	45.7	37.5
2000 % Multiple-Family Housing	48.5	54.5	51.5	45.5
1997 Agricultural Sales	50.9	55.5	49.1	44.5
November 2000 vote for Bush	50.6	51.5	49.4	48.5

The 200 respondents differ from the top half of the 534 total as follows:

- % Projected Growth—respondents: 1.4% less projected growth
- Per Capita Income—respondents: 8.2% more per capita income
- Agricultural Sales—respondents: 4.6% more agricultural sales
- Presidential Vote—respondents: 0.9% more for President Bush
- % Multiple-Family—respondents: 6.0% more multiple-family housing

The respondent group includes more than its proportional share of higher income, higher multiple-family housing, and higher agricultural sales jurisdictions, and is close to representative for projected growth rate and political orientation.

The second question addressed was to what extent the differences identified between our 200 respondents and the total 534 jurisdictions might relate to differences in growth management practices. We did not attempt to evaluate this question in terms of the various particular practices, but considered it in terms of the overall proclivity to change as measured by responses to Question 6, which reads: “In general, on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 represents past policies and 5 represents moving in a significantly different direction, does your jurisdiction believe that in the next 20 years development policies and practices should follow past policies or move in a different direction?”

To do this, we calculated the average response to Question 6 for the top and bottom halves of the respondent jurisdictions arrayed by the five parameters described above; results are shown in Table 4. (For more detail, see Appendix D.)

Table 4: Comparison of Question 6—Average Ratings for California Jurisdictions Ranked by Five Data Categories

DATA CATEGORY	Average rating by jurisdictions in top half of data category	Average rating by jurisdictions in bottom half of data category
% 2000-2020 Growth (projected)	3.44	3.06
1998 Per Capita Income	3.14	3.41
2000 % Multiple-Family Housing	3.24	3.23
1997 Agricultural Sales	3.25	3.23
November 2000 vote for Bush	3.26	3.21

Question 6 addresses the extent of anticipated change in planning policies. The average rating by the 200 jurisdictions that responded to the Planning Director survey was 3.23.

This data shows that responses vary significantly only for projected population growth and per capita income. Because our respondents are very much like the total 534 jurisdictions in terms of percent projected growth, we can hypothesize that only our respondents' somewhat higher per capita incomes might result in somewhat understating the overall proclivity to change.

Based on this analysis, we see little evidence that the respondents as a whole are very different from the total 534 jurisdictions in terms of their proclivity to change. Nevertheless, those more involved with change might respond to our survey more frequently, and larger jurisdictions have more planning resources and thus may be more involved with changes in growth management practices. Thus, it appears to be a plausible hypothesis that the jurisdictions not responding to our survey might be less involved with changing growth management practices. We have no empirical evidence to support or refute this hypothesis.

At the same time, the lack of significant differences in responses to Question 6 based on political orientation, agricultural sales, and multifamily housing provides evidence that the movement to change land use planning practices in California is not restricted to the more urban and more liberal areas but is widely distributed throughout the state.

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The survey results support a picture of widespread and unfolding change in how California's cities and counties are approaching community planning and development. This change is either underway, expected, or planned in the great majority of jurisdictions that responded to the survey.

Change is not restricted to particular types of communities but is broadly distributed throughout California's cities and counties. Many of the responding communities are embracing terminology

that reflects an effort to develop and articulate new development concepts and philosophies, rather than merely to accomplish incremental changes within existing concepts such as growth management or controlled growth.

Between 51 and 86 jurisdictions reported strategies as either “applicable but not yet considered” or “under study.” These numbers, especially when combined with the low numbers having considered but rejected strategies, suggest that many more jurisdictions will be joining the ranks of those for whom strategies are being carried out. This, in turn, suggests that the number of jurisdictions experiencing controversy will increase over time.

In addition, the unfolding of strategies reported as “now being implemented” can be expected to result in more controversy as implementation progresses from project planning to project approval and from first projects to many projects in any given jurisdiction.

Given the population and economic growth projected for California in the coming decades, plus the relatively widespread expectation expressed in the survey responses that the intensity of land use will increase and that outward growth will be increasingly curtailed, the only possible conclusion is that growth will be forced into existing communities. The survey demonstrates that infill projects and increasing the intensity of development, particularly housing development, is the most controversial aspect of the effort to change how communities are planned and developed.

In terms of the relationship between the measures being carried out and the level of controversy, the three most controversial measures are being carried out by an average of 78 jurisdictions, the three in the middle by an average of 68, and the four least controversial by an average of 80. This generally supports the idea that the level of controversy is not a significant factor in determining the level of implementation. (However, it is a significant factor in the degree of modification of policies and practices, as noted on page 26.)

A review of the comments included in responses to Question 3 identifies a number of major obstacles to incorporating smart growth planning concepts into local plans and implementing smart growth concepts.

- Objections to increased density and providing multifamily and affordable housing focus on traffic, concern regarding changing community character, property values, fears of crime, and discomfort with new and different populations.
- Development of vacant land can provoke fear that the character of the community will change.
- In areas with lower property values and higher unemployment, mixed-use development is often cited as not being of interest to the development community.

- There is support for more public parkland, but controversy over how to pay for acquisition and operation. This can lead to jurisdictions using slow and no-growth strategies to prevent development and preserve private land as a form of open space.
- Planning for more transportation choices generates little controversy, but implementation, including providing higher-density housing close to transit stops, can generate the same opposition as affordable housing.
- An obstacle to coordinating plans with neighboring communities appears to be prior, and often ongoing, jurisdictional problems over responsibility for growth and provision of urban services.

The comments also help to identify the advocates and opponents of smart growth.

- Opponents of affordable housing and of focusing future development on vacant and underutilized land often are nearby residents and property owners.
- Planning for more open space is sometimes opposed by agricultural interests, who fear lower property values; and developers, who fear having to contribute land.
- The development community is the major proponent of more certainty in the development review process. At times, this includes opposition to local agency design review.
- In some communities, supporters of downtown revitalization efforts can provide the basis of community support for acceptance of higher-density housing and new development.

CHAPTER 5: PLANNING DIRECTOR INTERVIEWS

INTRODUCTION

Between April 1 and May 23, 2002, telephone interviews were conducted with planning directors or senior-level planners from 30 different California localities. These interviews were designed to follow up with a selected number of professionals who completed the written questionnaires that were developed and distributed in this study. A complete summary of these interviews is included in Appendix E.

Those interviewed represented communities from Northern and Southern California, the Central Valley, and the Central Coast. Attempts to interview planners from the northernmost portions of the state were unsuccessful. Those interviewed were from localities ranging in population from 4,450 (Del Mar) to 3,807,400 (Los Angeles), major old and new suburban employment centers, and slow- and fast-growing communities. An attempt was made to assure that the planners interviewed represented communities that reflect the economic and racial diversity of the state.

Each interviewee was asked to respond to a series of common questions (in italics below). Depending on responses, other areas of inquiry were undertaken to gain a greater understanding about specific local opportunities, obstacles, and practices, and to explore the current and potential future role of the state.

QUESTIONS POSED AND SUMMARIZED RESPONSES

- 1. To what extent are local planning agencies incorporating smart growth concepts into their planning strategies?*

In accordance with state law, all local plans set forth policies for meeting future housing supply and affordability needs. Approximately half the cities contacted have adopted housing strategies that encourage higher-density development in and around downtowns as a means of accommodating a portion of these needed housing units. The three large central cities contacted (San Diego, Los Angeles, and Oakland) cite this as central to their smart growth strategies. Less than half of the communities have recently modified their general plan and zoning rules to either encourage, or mandate, mixed-income (inclusionary) housing.

The encouragement and provision of bike paths and walkways is cited as a smart growth strategy in less than half the localities, and those facilities, primarily, have a recreational focus. Folsom is pursuing street connectivity policies and development review approaches to encourage more transportation choices. Nearly all localities with transit stations have established policies or plans that call for more intensive development in close proximity to these stops.

Nearly all the suburban and rural cities, as well as both counties surveyed (Sonoma and Kern), have established significant open space protection programs, including urban growth boundaries and agricultural land preservation policies. The counties update their general plans in cooperation with the cities in the county and are focusing a great deal of attention on protecting agricultural land from future development.

Infill planning strategies that call for a significant amount of future development on vacant and underused land is, or has been, considered in more than half the localities. Carlsbad uses sophisticated level-of-service performance standards that tie into ways of using land more intensively to prevent sprawl. Bellflower is focusing its infill program on providing owners of oversized lots with opportunities to add additional units. Less than half the communities have had long-term programs aimed at raising residential densities.

Mixed use is a concept that is acceptable in nearly all the communities; however, only a few localities are exploring it, and it is not advocated consistently or strongly.

The City of San Diego is pursuing joint-use planning with the local school district. The belief is that this could lead to a better integration of school facilities into the neighborhood, and that it is a key feature of a communitywide smart growth strategy. Several California cities have contacted San Diego about how to do this.

A few localities have made a commitment to take the time to work with neighborhood groups on accommodating infill and transit-oriented development. They spend time with neighbors trying to identify specific concerns: Is it density, bulk, traffic? These localities have had significant success and believe that it has paid dividends.

2. What are the major obstacles to incorporation or implementation of smart growth planning concepts at the local level?

Neighborhood opposition to density is cited as a significant barrier to smart growth planning and implementation in nearly all localities, with traffic and change of community character mentioned as the underlying concern. The need for, or lack of, funding to provide adequate infrastructure also is an obstacle in nearly all localities. A few local planners say that the public's lack of understanding about the benefits of smart growth blocks its implementation.

The promotion of smart growth policies is a low priority in nearly all older inner suburbs contacted.

More than half of the localities believe that state restriction on local government funding sources has been a major cause of the fiscalization of land use. A few localities cite the lure of "big box" services and their sales tax revenue as a specific barrier to the implementation of smart growth

objectives. In Palm Springs, the State of California's Department of Fish and Game restrictions on development is cited as having precluded a number of smart growth projects.

Less than half the respondents say that it is important to protect and enhance auto use and to meet a reasonable traffic level-of-service throughout the community. However, more than half cite inadequate parking in conjunction with infill policies and projects as an obstacle in both commercial and residential districts. The respondent from Mountain View notes that traffic level-of-service standards, which are established by the county congestion management agency, make it difficult to plan for and approve infill development. A few planners indicated that they did not see any obstacles to smart growth.

Developers in a few communities prefer to build lower-density single-family projects, even if they could build multifamily housing on a site. This resistance is attributed to uncertainty about multifamily marketability, developer comfort with a time-proven single-family detached product, and concern about the neighborhood opposition that frequently occurs in reaction to multifamily development.

Fremont's Planning Manager, Dan Marks says: "Planning is easy. Implementation is hard!" Amy Harbin, Principal Planner with the City of Baldwin Park, says: "Our community needs services, not more density."

3. To what extent are local planning agencies seeing smart growth concepts being implemented?

Nearly all communities note a growing public and private sector interest in multifamily development near regional transit stations and within downtowns. Less than half cite significant development of new housing within and around downtowns. However, major mixed-use infill communities are being planned for in and around downtown San Diego, and in Los Angeles.

Urban growth boundaries have been established and defended in more than half the suburban localities, and more than half of those localities have funded the acquisition of sensitive open space. Sonoma County has passed a "right-to-farm" ordinance that puts future home buyers on notice that they will need to put up with certain odors and noises associated with farming activities.

Approximately half the localities have increased the overall allowable density of development in the last couple of years, while only a few have established minimum density requirements and policies allowing for mixed use in their zoning provisions.

Localities as diverse as Lodi, San Diego, Sonoma County (Santa Rosa), Mountain View, and Carlsbad have established multimodal transportation centers.

“Density has been gradually increasing in Chico since the 1980’s” says Kim Seidler, Planning Director. “We restricted the use of septic tanks, which prohibited leap-frog development,” says Cheryl Casdorf, Senior Planner, Kern County.

4. *Who are the advocates and the opponents of smart growth plans, and what are their perceived motivations?*

Communities that have had the greatest success in pursuing smart growth on a comprehensive basis have strong advocates on the city council, planning commission, and staff. Localities that strongly support and pursue smart growth have had to commit significant time to working closely with neighborhood groups to identify and try to resolve specific concerns.

Some regional planning agencies (SANDAG and ABAG/MTC) are seen as major proponents of smart growth that back their commitment with planning grants and capital facilities for smart growth activities.

Opponents of smart growth plans are residents reluctant to see change, interested in protecting community character, and fearful about possible traffic impacts. Many of these groups want to see deficiencies in their neighborhoods corrected before allowing higher density.

A few respondents perceive state policies and practices as hindering smart growth by not providing supportive policies or funds, and often sending contradictory conservation and economic development messages.

5. *What actions could the state take that would be effective in facilitating smart growth plans and be acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?*

Nearly all planning officials cite the inadequacy and uncertainty of local government funding, which serves to encourage land use planning and development decisions that are contrary to smart growth, as a shortcoming of the state. They believe that the state needs to fix local government funding problems that lead to the fiscalization of land use decision making.

“Stop ‘robbing’ revenue from the city,” says Douglas Evans, Director of Planning and Building, City of Palm Springs. Specific revenues cited were the property tax and vehicle license fee.

Suggestions for state actions include changing tax laws that discourage the approval of needed housing; tackling Proposition 13; and considering a split-roll proposal where nonresidential land uses would be taxed at a slightly higher rate, with the resulting new revenue targeted for community services, infrastructure, or affordable housing.

Nearly all support the state’s enacting a simplified incentive or bonus program that would reward localities that are doing the “right thing.” There is a unanimous feeling that infrastructure funding

support would be first priority, with planning assistance second. A few feel that current state financial reward programs are so complicated and limited in amounts that it does not pay to go after them.

It is suggested that the state provide greater local flexibility regarding the use of the real estate transfer tax, establishing taxing districts for free transit, and so forth.

Nearly all planning officials think that the housing needs process should be thoroughly reevaluated and overhauled. It should be a more performance-based system that provides financial rewards to localities that accommodate regionally identified needs. A few argue that the housing need numbers are too high. Others note that the process does not push for balancing jobs and housing and leads to land use policies that can be contrary to smart growth, such as pressing for more housing without concern for the environmental consequences or the effect on community livability.

The respondent from Sonoma County suggests that the state prepare an overall land use plan or strategy that would focus on balancing jobs and housing, housing needs, and open space preservation. Such a plan could lead to incentivizing solutions to job-housing balance problems and providing funds to establish conservation easements to protect agricultural land and sensitive resources that are under development pressure. This respondent also suggests a longer term for Williamson Act contracts.

A Southern California planner suggested, “Perhaps the state should modify the General Plan law to require that cities address smart growth and sustainable development.”

A handful of respondents suggest that state policies and programs need to be more internally consistent; an example of contradictory programs is environmental protection versus housing production.

One respondent suggests that the state undertake a comprehensive analysis to determine whether housing pays its own way, taking into consideration factors such as the effects on schools. Another suggests that the state put out guidelines that explain what smart growth is and how communities can promote it. Such a guidebook should stress the need for interjurisdictional coordination and problem solving.

Each interviewee was asked to express an opinion on a set of specific possible state actions. The suggestions and reactions are as follows:

- *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing smart growth principles?*

Overall, very positive support. Comments centered on what the principles (criteria for judging) would be, whether those communities that cannot do as much as others would be recognized, and if the amount of state funding would be significant enough to make a difference. There was some concern that older, slow-growing communities that greatly need infrastructure funds might be cut out in this process (“If it was a beauty contest” – Michael Johnson, Assistant Director of Planning Services, City of Folsom).

- *Focus state capital investments within designated growth area?*

Responses similar to those shown above.

- *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans?*

Although no one opposes this idea, less than half strongly support a loan program and believe that the strings likely to be attached to it would limit its attractiveness. Nearly all support a forgivable loan or grant program for this purpose, particularly if it is targeted to needy communities.

- *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been prepared in the last 10 years?*

Mixed reaction to this idea. Approximately half feel that current CEQA exemptions are adequate as is, do not want to avoid assessing infill projects that might be located on environmentally sensitive sites, and think that the issue is best decided at the local level. (“This would need to be carefully drafted to assure that bad projects aren’t allowed to slip through the cracks” – Linda Niles, Planning Director, City of Del Mar.) A few think that raising the exemption threshold could help to stimulate desired development and would eliminate the ability of NIMBYs to delay good projects. A few respondents suggest that CEQA should center its focus on zoning or specific plan decisions, then exempt conforming projects from another round of CEQA review.

- *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis?*

Although many think that the idea is conceptually sound, it did not get widespread support. A few respondents note that communities with many retail facilities have to absorb higher costs for maintaining supportive infrastructure. Nearly all say that their response would depend on data indicating if their community would be a winner or loser under such a change.

- *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas?*

Nearly all respondents think that this is both a creative idea and potentially valuable in stimulating desired development. The greatest concern revolves around mitigating the financial impact that this would have on county services.

- *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent?*

More than half think that this should be left as a local decision. Others, particularly those from communities that already have such a program, think that a broad-scale application of the concept makes sense. Planners from lower-income communities with a good supply of affordable housing feel that it would have a negative impact and discourage needed new housing.

- *Focus state capital investments within designated growth area?*

Responses similar to those shown above.

KEY POINTS RAISED

The following key points were determined from the interviews:

1. A few localities have made a commitment to take the time to work with neighborhood groups on accommodating infill and transit-oriented development. They spend time with neighbors trying to identify specific concerns. Those localities that have been responsive to neighborhood and community concerns believe that it has paid dividends.
2. Neighborhood opposition to density is cited as a significant barrier to smart growth planning and implementation in nearly all localities, with traffic and change of community character mentioned as the underlying concerns. The need for, or lack of, funding to provide adequate infrastructure also is an obstacle in nearly all localities.
3. More than half of the localities believe that state restriction on local government funding sources has been a major cause of the fiscalization of land use. A few localities cite the lure of “big box” services and their sales tax revenue as a specific barrier to the implementation of smart growth objectives.
4. Nearly all communities note a growing public and private sector interest in multifamily development near regional transit stations and within downtowns. Less than half cite significant development of new housing within and around downtowns; however, major mixed-use infill communities are being planned for in and around downtown San Diego, and in Los Angeles.

5. Urban growth boundaries have been established and defended in more than half the suburban localities and more than half of those localities have funded the acquisition of sensitive open space.
6. Nearly all planning officials cite the inadequacy and uncertainty of local government funding that serves to encourage land use planning and development decisions that are contrary to smart growth as a shortcoming of the state. They feel that the state should fix local government funding problems that lead to the fiscalization of land use decision making.
7. Nearly all support the state's enacting a simplified incentive or bonus program that would reward localities that are doing the "right thing." There is a unanimous feeling that infrastructure funding support would be first priority, with planning assistance second. A few feel that current state financial reward programs are so complicated and limited in amounts that it does not pay to go after them.
8. Although many planners indicated that their localities are pursuing smart growth, responses to in-depth questioning indicate that in some cases actual activities are extremely modest or even contrary to fundamental precepts of smart growth (low-density single-family and auto-oriented development).
9. Rapidly growing lower-income localities do not have the financial resources or trained staff to effectively plan for the anticipated growth.
10. Some respondents indicated that new revenue sources might be needed to support the infrastructure and services necessary to maintain and enhance the future quality of life in their communities, particularly in light of projected future growth. Two new specific revenue sources, identified by one of the respondents worthy of exploring, were securing voter approval for a split property tax roll that would allow assessing nonresidential property at a modestly higher rate, and allowing local governments to increase and use the real property transfer tax to provide needed infrastructure.
11. Some cities (most notably San Diego, Mountain View, and Chico) have worked with the neighborhood or community to accommodate this type of development while being responsive to resident concerns. Effectively implementing this approach seems to require a number of steps:
 - a. Let the community know that, as a matter of policy, the city is committed to exploring opportunities for infill and TOD without being detrimental to neighborhood and/or community livability.
 - b. City leadership (city council, planning commission, and staff) identifies areas within the community that would appear to have some feasibility and logic for infill or TOD.
 - c. Staff works with community in an open and collaborative process that identifies current deficiencies and concerns in the area—Is it traffic? Is it design, bulk, or height? Is it services such as libraries, parks, and recreation facilities?

- d. The city develops a strategy that encourages infill or TOD while being responsive to community deficiencies and concerns. This would include planning policies and regulations as well as funding commitments.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS

A variety of conclusions appear warranted by the research.

1. There is a large and growing trend in California to restrict urban expansion and intensify land use within the existing urbanized areas.
 - This trend is not concentrated in particular types of jurisdictions (for example, urban or politically liberal), but extends throughout California to include rural, lower-income, and more conservative areas.
 - This trend is identified by its advocates and practitioners under a variety of labels—livable communities, smart growth, new urbanism, sustainable development, and others. Advocates and practitioners include all sectors of society—business, labor, minority, environmentalist, and others.
2. Addressing land use, transportation, and many other elements of growth requires sensitivity to regional differences. The challenges of addressing growth are likely to be especially difficult for the high-growth, low-income Inland Empire and San Joaquin Valley regions.
3. The highest levels of controversy related to the 10 land use strategies identified and evaluated by this research involve intensification of uses, particularly housing uses, within existing residential neighborhoods. (Nonresidential intensification can also provoke high levels of controversy, particularly when it results in significant traffic impacts.) Some of this opposition appears to be based on the real impacts of such development (for example, more traffic, stretching urban service facilities thinner to serve more people), but some appears to be based on fears that often have little relationship to real impacts (for example, lower property values and more crime).
4. Interviews identified a view that the target numbers provided to localities through the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process are too high. They are seen as sometimes inconsistent with local infrastructure capacity, local fiscal resources, and community open space and environmental objectives. Moreover, there is an absence of rewards or benefits for communities that meet the RHNA targets.
5. Community and neighborhood opposition to land use intensification, particularly to higher levels of housing density and to affordable housing, is causing modification of plans and projects (sometimes minor, sometimes major).
6. The research suggests that controversies could intensify significantly in coming years. Both the survey and the in-depth interviews show that many jurisdictions are still studying or only beginning to implement new planning approaches. At the same time, growing restrictions on outward growth combined with the population and economic growth projected for California will force planners to attempt to situate large quantities of new development within existing

communities. Some jurisdictions are establishing urban growth boundaries without also considering where and how projected household growth would be accommodated.

7. Jurisdictions that are most successful in implementing new planning approaches often employ several strategies:
 - Extensive neighborhood and community involvement from the first steps in the planning process, and genuine flexibility to plan and modify policies and projects to address the concerns expressed.
 - Attention to design detail to reduce real problems and increase real benefits of projects for surrounding neighborhoods.
 - Use of visualization techniques (such as photos of similar projects, drawings, computer-generated images, and models) in the community process so neighbors can see what projects will be like after construction, rather than neighbors visualizing their worst fears and assuming those fears will be the reality.
 - Planning projects such that project-generated revenues and general municipal revenues can be used to improve community facilities and services both within and around the projects. To the extent that this strategy is used to make projects into real improvements to the neighborhoods in which they occur, neighborhood concerns are easier to address and support is easier to generate.
8. The strategies identified in Number 7 require funding and skills that not all jurisdictions have. In smaller and less affluent areas, planning staffs may lack the skills, experience, or tools needed. Many jurisdictions lack the capital and/or operating funds needed to incorporate into projects the expanded and improved community facilities and services that would make intense infill projects a net asset for their communities.
9. If California's communities are going to accommodate a large percentage of projected growth within existing boundaries without encountering potentially debilitating opposition from residents, they will need to accomplish the following tasks:
 - Substantially enhance existing planning resources and skills.
 - Involve neighborhoods and communities in planning and shaping their own futures.
 - Provide the means and mechanisms to ensure that existing communities can accommodate growth in a way that represents a real, substantial, demonstrable net benefit to those communities.
 - Secure funding sources adequate to meet the new capital and operating needs engendered by these projects and also correct existing deficiencies in transportation, open space, and community and cultural facilities and services now existing in the surrounding neighborhoods. This will require both ensuring the stability of existing funding sources and securing new funding to meet growing needs.

- Educate citizens about the public benefits of infill and redevelopment, and the tradeoffs involved between smart growth and sprawl.
- Explain how traditional suburban development patterns can lead to sprawl and its associated challenges of increased auto trips, congestion, and energy consumption, and how mixed uses, compactness, and walkability can promote more travel choices and livability.

CHAPTER 7: RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the research presented in this report, we recommend that the State of California consider the following measures:

1. Enhancing the planning capacities of local governments, including:
 - Providing grants to improve neighborhood and community participation in the planning process.
 - Establishing a skills training institute or institutes (perhaps as part of the state college or university regular or extension programs) to train planners, city managers, and other city officials, both elected and appointed, in collaborative planning skills and the use of related tools. It should promote the ability to deal with all stakeholders—community members, property owners, developers, investors, and so on.
 - Preparing a guidebook to assist local governments in effectively planning and implementing smart growth.
 - Developing and providing local governments with a package of visualization tools (such as equipment and software, slides, digital images) so local planners can create visual depictions of proposed projects.
2. Targeting state funds and federal pass-through funds to communities that are engaged in smart growth projects. Funds for transportation, parks, wastewater and stormwater facilities, other infrastructure and utilities, schools, public health and safety, economic development, brownfield cleanup, toxics prevention and abatement, and related needs could be targeted preferentially into communities and neighborhoods that agree to accept smart growth developments that meet local and regional housing and transportation demand reduction needs. This targeting could be accomplished in part through partnerships with the metropolitan planning organizations. Targeting of state funds should recognize the critical needs of regions such as the San Joaquin Valley and the Inland Empire that have many lower-income jurisdictions projected to experience large amounts of new growth.
3. Enhancing the capacity of local governments that approve smart growth projects to secure the local taxes and fees needed to adequately provide for related needs, including existing deficiencies in neighborhoods expected to accommodate new projects. Measures identified by interviewees or in the literature and Web research process include the following:
 - Enhanced use of tax increment financing, for example, in proximity to major transit corridors and stations and related to facilities needed for transit-oriented development.
 - Enhanced use of local bonds.
 - Enabling legislation to encourage greater use of public/private funding arrangements.

- Securing voter approval for a split tax roll that would allow assessing nonresidential property at a modestly higher rate.
 - Allowing local governments to increase the real property transfer tax and use it to provide needed infrastructure.
4. Improving the adequacy, security, and predictability of state funding for local government.
 5. Structuring state general plan requirements, housing requirements, and funding assistance to reward localities that are addressing and accommodating the housing needs resulting from job growth in their jurisdictions.
 6. Preparing guidelines to assist localities in streamlining CEQA procedures, while maintaining existing CEQA benefits; coordinating local land use plans with neighboring communities; and increasing the certainty in development review procedures.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND SOURCE NOTES

OVERVIEW

The Mineta Transportation Institute conducted a mail survey of the 534 city and county planning directors in California in mid-February 2002. Follow-up e-mails were sent to the agencies not responding by the end of February. Extensive phone contact was made for jurisdictions where the mailed survey and/or the e-mail had been returned as undeliverable, and surveys were resent to those agencies by fax or e-mail.

A copy of the survey instrument (including the tabulated results) is presented as Appendix C. The survey was drafted, reviewed, and revised in consultation with the Survey and Policy Research Institute at San José State University. The strategies included in the survey were developed as part of the literature and Web research effort described in Chapter 3, "Literature and Web Research".

From mid-March through early April, jurisdictions that had not responded were contacted by phone, fax, or e-mail. The most effort was expended on the largest jurisdictions; some effort was focused on jurisdictions of more than 20,000 in population; few jurisdictions smaller than 20,000 received further effort. After April 15, no additional written survey responses were accepted for inclusion in the analysis.

IDENTIFICATION OF PLANNING DIRECTORS

The most recent mailing list of city and county planning directors was obtained from the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and the California League of Cities. The lists were reviewed and compared; the League's list was missing about 100 jurisdictions (some as notable as the City of San Diego). Although the OPR list appeared to be two years old, it listed all jurisdictions. A decision was made to use the OPR list and mailing labels were created.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE SURVEY

The questionnaire and cover letter were mailed to 476 cities and 58 counties in mid-February 2002. E-mail distribution lists were prepared using the e-mail addresses on the OPR list. Near the end of February, an e-mail reminder was sent to 414 agencies that had not responded and for which an e-mail address was available. The e-mail noted the earlier mailing and asked for a response if one had not yet been sent. A few of the paper mailings and about 20 percent of the e-mails were returned as undeliverable. The research team then telephoned jurisdictions from which a paper or e-mail message was returned. The purpose of the calls was to obtain the name of the planning director and the correct mailing address, telephone, fax number, and e-mail address.

A copy of the questionnaire was then sent to jurisdictions where no one indicated having received the original mailing.

By mid-March, about 150 surveys had been returned from the original list of 534 agencies. As the completed questionnaires were received, they were tracked on a master list of California counties and cities. The master list included the estimated year 2000 population of each agency. From mid-March through early April, follow-up telephone calls were placed to the planning directors of cities with a population over 20,000 that had not yet responded. If the planning director was unavailable, an effort was made to talk to the director's secretary or administrative assistant. In many cases, another questionnaire was sent via fax or e-mail. Special attention was paid to jurisdictions with a population higher than 50,000, which often resulted in a third or fourth contact. A cut-off time was set for mid-April, to allow time to compile survey results. The final list of returned surveys included 10 counties and 190 cities, representing 37.4 percent of the surveyed jurisdictions. Using unincorporated population for the county responses, the responding communities have a combined July 2000 population of 19,981,090, 57.9 percent of the state's residents.

SOURCES OF DATA FOR RESPONDENT ANALYSIS

The responses to the questionnaire were analyzed by total jurisdictional responses within counties for five data categories. County-level analysis was used because the only city-level data available was year 2000 population. The five data categories are:

- Population percent increase from 2000 to 2020, projected by the California Department of Finance
- Per capita income according to the 1998 California Department of Finance statistics
- Percent of multiple-family housing according to United State's Census 2000 statistics
- Agricultural sales per county according to 1997 California Department of Agricultural statistics
- November 2000 presidential election results according to California Secretary of State statistics.

The five categories were selected to obtain different groupings of California's counties based on levels of projected rate of growth; wealth and, by association, local resources; urbanization; nonurban economic production; and political orientation.

APPENDIX B: LOCAL SMART GROWTH ACTIVITIES IN CALIFORNIA

The goal of this work task is to develop, through a literature review, a master list of specific local land use and transportation actions generally associated with sustainable, smart, and livable growth management. The objective is to identify specific techniques used by local planning agencies to promote smart growth.

The primary research approach uses information drawn from the Web in April 2002, as well as from local government planning documents in academic and governmental libraries.

CITY AND COUNTY PLANNING RESPONSIBILITIES

California cities and counties are primarily responsible for determining the intensity and geographic arrangement of land uses in communities. These responsibilities are carried out through making and implementing plans. Plan making involves the devising of general plans, specific plans, district or neighborhood plans, and other policy documents. Plan implementation involves carrying out those plans on a project-by-project basis with zoning decisions, permit approvals or denials, and other individual actions.

DEFINITIONS

The terms “smart growth,” “sustainable communities,” and “livable communities” are often used interchangeably, and share many broad policies and practices. While this study focuses on smart growth, it is useful to understand how it is distinguished from these other planning concepts, since they do have differences.

Sustainable Communities

Sustainability and sustainable development are defined globally as meeting the needs of the present population without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Applying this idea to communities leads to the concept of sustainable communities—“think globally, act locally.”

The sustainable communities concept generally includes a tenet of sustainable development—the idea of choosing a path that will serve economic, environmental, and social equity ends simultaneously. The idea embodies most, if not all, of the characteristics of livable communities, but also involves long-term and global goals and issues, such as slowing global warming.

Livable Communities

“Livability” generally refers to a range of things both local and immediate in nature. Livable communities are pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly; provide affordable housing; offer good access to neighborhood facilities and services; provide for easy mobility and multiple modes of transportation; promote neighborhood and community interaction through design; have lots of parks and open space; have good schools and libraries; have well-maintained streets, sidewalks, street trees, and landscaping; and have lower levels of congestion, air pollution, water pollution, noise, dust, litter, graffiti, crime, and related problems that reduce the quality of life—or livability—of an area.

While there can be conflicts between specific elements of these two concepts, most of the things that make a community more sustainable, help also to make it more livable, and most of the things that make it more livable, improve its sustainability.

Smart Growth

Smart growth involves thoughtful and deliberate decisions about where growth is channeled and how it is shaped to accomplish community goals. Smart growth steers development to areas with existing or planned infrastructure. It balances jobs, housing, and other development types, and it promotes affordable housing. Within developing areas, compact, mixed-use, pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly, and transit-oriented development is encouraged. Incentives are established to enhance investment, regulatory barriers are lowered, and state and local funding is used to improve infrastructure. Outward development is controlled, leapfrog development is prevented, and open space is protected both at the edges of and inside the area permitted for development. Specific local programs may be summed up as intended to make the community livable, sustainable, healthy, clean, or some other term.

Smart growth has little to do with the rate of growth. Sometimes smart growth is more beneficial if it happens sooner rather than later, faster rather than slower. Slow growth in itself does not avoid any growth-related problems, nor secure any of the positive benefits of smart growth.

Smart growth calls for building more hospitable, productive, and fiscally and environmentally responsible communities than have been developed through most of the past century. Smart growth approaches apply to development in newly developing greenfields; to infill and renewal of already urbanized infields in cities and suburbs; to growing rural villages; and to standalone new towns and resort communities. These strategies can guide the siting and design of both large and small projects; single-use and multi-use developments; and dense complexes as well as typical neighborhoods.

Smart growth envisions well-designed, multi-use communities that offer residents and workers a range of options for living, working, recreation, and travel. Growing in smart ways means

developing compact neighborhoods and communities that reduce infrastructure costs and conserve open space and natural resources.

SMART GROWTH CHARACTERISTICS

Three core themes, or organizing concepts, characterize smart growth. The first is conserving resources—accommodating growth in greenfield edges of communities through contiguous, compact development that lowers costs for new infrastructure and reduces consumption of open space; restoring and recycling built-up areas already served by community infrastructure; and taking steps to conserve valued natural resources. The second theme is widening choices of development forms and functions to satisfy the needs of an increasingly diverse society and economy—expanding available options of home styles, types of neighbors and neighborhoods, work locations, travel modes, recreation, and cultural opportunities. The third theme is achieving these goals through inclusive, public/private, multijurisdictional processes that ensure that the interests of all the stakeholders in community development are heard, and that leverage collaborative relationships to achieve smart growth.

These ideas are expressed in various phrases and formulations, but usually incorporate the following elements or principles:

- Promoting compact, mixed-use development
- Conserving open space and natural features and qualities
- Efficiently maintaining and expanding infrastructure systems
- Encouraging infill, redevelopment, and adaptive reuse in existing built-up areas
- Improving mobility through multimodal transportation.

Smart growth principles propose to bend the current course of development—for example, to make communities more compact, to conserve more open space, and to encourage more infill and redevelopment.

RECENT PUBLIC AND PRIVATE STUDY RESULTS

League of California Cities

In 2001, the League of California Cities established a Smart Growth Subcommittee to discuss issues and challenges facing cities in managing conservation and development. The subcommittee was composed of local elected officials and staff from around the state. Local fiscal restructuring was recognized as a key ingredient in altering some of the problems that have resulted in existing land use patterns, and was identified as the highest priority of the League. However, the group

recognized that many other aspects to problems associated with smart growth could be addressed in conjunction with fiscal reform.

To guide its efforts, the subcommittee developed the following 10 smart growth principles, which have been approved by the League's Board of Directors. They are posted on the League's Web site (www.cacities.org).

1. *Well-Planned New Growth*: Recognize and preserve open space, watersheds, environmental habitats, and agricultural lands, while accommodating new growth in compact forms in a manner that de-emphasizes automobile dependency, integrates the new growth into existing communities, creates a diversity of affordable housing near employment centers, and provides job opportunities for people of all ages and income levels.
2. *Maximize Existing Infrastructure*: Accommodate additional growth by first focusing on the use and reuse of existing urbanized lands supplied with infrastructure, with an emphasis on reinvesting in the maintenance and rehabilitation of existing infrastructure.
3. *Support Vibrant City Centers*: Give preference to the redevelopment and reuse of city centers and existing transportation corridors by supporting and encouraging (1) mixed-use development; (2) housing opportunities for all income levels; (3) safe, reliable, and efficient multimodal transportation systems; (4) retaining existing businesses; and (5) promoting new business opportunities that produce quality local jobs.
4. *Coordinated Planning for Regional Impacts*: Coordinate planning with neighboring cities, counties, and other governmental entities so that there are agreed-upon regional strategies and policies for dealing with the regional impacts of growth on transportation, housing, schools, air, water, wastewater, solid waste, natural resources, agricultural lands, and open space.
5. *Support High-Quality Education and School Facilities*: Develop and maintain high-quality public education and neighborhood-accessible school facilities as a critical determinant in making communities attractive to families, maintaining a desirable and livable community, promoting lifelong learning opportunities, enhancing economic development, and providing a work force qualified to meet the full range of job skills required in the future economy.
6. *Build Strong Communities*: Support and embrace the development of strong families and socially and ethnically diverse communities by (1) working to provide a balance of jobs and housing within the community; (2) avoiding the displacement of existing residents; (3) reducing commute times; (4) promoting community involvement; (5) enhancing public safety; and (6) providing and supporting educational, mentoring, and recreational opportunities.
7. *Emphasize Joint Use of Facilities*: Emphasize the joint use of existing compatible public facilities operated by cities, schools, counties, and state agencies, and take advantage of opportunities to form partnerships with private businesses and nonprofit agencies to maximize the community benefit of existing public and private facilities.

8. *Support Entrepreneurial/Creative Efforts*: Support local economic development efforts and endeavors to create new products, services, and businesses that will expand the wealth and job opportunities for all social and economic levels.
9. *Encourage Full Community Participation*: Foster open and inclusive community dialogue and promote alliances and partnerships to meet community needs.
10. *Establish a Secure Local Revenue Base*: Support the establishment of a secure, balanced, and discretionary local revenue base necessary to provide the full range of needed services and quality land use decisions.

Based on these principles, the subcommittee will develop additional recommendations on suggested strategies and changes needed to implement these principles. Future recommendations by the subcommittee will focus on:

- Strategies cities should implement themselves
- Actions the League should take
- Actions the legislature and state and federal governments should take
- Recommendations for improving cooperation and coordination with other local and regional governmental entities.

The Association of Bay Area Governments

The Association of Bay Area Governments, in *Making Better Communities by Linking Land Use and Transportation*, identified five land use and transportation strategies and related best practices that local communities should consider in the pursuit of smart growth (including minimizing transportation-related energy consumption). The five strategies and their related best practices are listed below.

Compact and Balanced Communities

- Establish urban growth boundaries around existing communities. Such action requires coordination with nearby jurisdictions and special districts. Whether future housing can be accommodated within the boundaries should be carefully considered.
- Encourage the development of housing targeted to the incomes and needs of workers within the community. Achieving a better match between incomes and housing prices can reduce commute distances.
- Identify transit corridors and activity centers and separate auto-dependent uses from them. Identifying transit corridors before development improves the chances that land uses can be served by transit when it becomes available.

- Require specific plans in order to ensure coordinated planning for the development of activity centers. Cost recovery for this type of proactive planning is permitted under state law.

Greater Mix and Intensity of Land Uses

- Increase the density of housing and employment, especially in activity centers. Moderate increases coupled with excellent design are most effective.
- Increase the mix of uses within communities. This should include situating housing within walking distance of employment areas, allowing a broader range of uses within zoning districts, and encouraging more on-site services such as day care, dry cleaning, and cafes within employment centers and office parks.
- Encourage infill and intensification. This should include second units in single-family zones, the sale of air rights over public lands, and the redevelopment of vacant and underutilized lands.
- Direct civic uses to, and create public spaces in, community activity centers. Such civic uses can be a catalyst for private development.
- Discourage auto-oriented uses in pedestrian- and transit-oriented areas.

Integrated Transportation Network

- Plan and implement a dense, interconnected network of streets and pathways. Connect key core sites, have short regularly spaced blocks and frequent intersections, limit the use of cul-de-sacs, and provide direct bus access to potential riders and key sites. Include midblock pathways where blocks are long, and clear direct pedestrian paths through parking areas.
- Keep vehicle speeds low, and improve safety through traffic-calming techniques, narrow vehicle ways, reduced turning radii and intersection width, and wider inside lanes for bicyclists.
- Establish transit routes that are located to serve and link activity centers with transit priority, direct routing, and few turns.

Pedestrian-Friendly Development Standards

- Orient buildings and entrances to the pedestrian network by encouraging visually interesting building facades, frequent building entrances, and front porches, and by reducing setbacks for commercial and residential buildings.
- Situate parking areas to the rear or, if screened, to the side of buildings.
- Limit driveways crossing pedestrian paths.
- Provide street trees along roadways and through parking lots to help mark pedestrian paths.

- Use on-street parking to help separate pedestrians from moving vehicles.
- Provide adequate lighting and opportunities for visual surveillance.

Incentives to Reduce Driving

- Include pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the design of new and reconstructed streets.
- Limit the amount of parking allowed and encourage shared parking.
- Reduce parking subsidies through cash-out programs, and increase parking fees.
- Allow bicycles on buses and rail transit.
- Require bicycle-friendly facilities at employment centers.
- Establish shuttles to connect employment and shopping areas with fixed-rail transit stations.

State Office of Planning and Research Survey

The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is studying how California could address the projection that the state's population will expand by 12 million more residents by 2020. Part of this study included a series of roundtable meetings—17 were held in 2001—that involved hundreds of local elected and appointed officials, as well as leaders representing real estate, business, environmental, and ethnic organizations. Participants were asked to recommend specific actions that the state could take to accommodate projected growth effectively. After synthesizing the results of these roundtable meetings, OPR prepared and distributed a survey to all participants to measure their responses to 50 different suggestions brought up at the roundtable meetings, and sent the survey to all of those who attended the sessions. A complete copy of the survey is attached to this report.

Results were requested on the following 11 selected questions or ideas:

Category #1: Planning and Planning Assistance:

Idea 2: Give priority for state grant funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Left Blank
34	23	8	6	7	1

Idea 6: Amend state statutes to require local jurisdictions to update their comprehensive general plans every 10 years.

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Left Blank
21	21	12	13	11	1

Idea 9: Establish a revolving loan fund for local jurisdictions to develop and adopt specific plans that developers may rely on for approval of a project application.

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Left Blank
13	30	16	12	2	5

Idea 10: Develop a comprehensive state plan for growth and development in California.

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Left Blank
33	20	11	5	7	3

Category #2: The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA):

Idea 3: Prepare a new publication that identifies existing streamlining measures within CEQA and planning law.

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Left Blank
25	38	12	3	1	0

Category #3: Infrastructure and Finance:

Idea 6: Create a state “Works Progress Administration” to build homes, construct facilities, and provide neighborhood clean-up assistance.

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Left Blank
11	21	23	17	6	1

Idea 9: Provide greater funding for intelligent transportation systems.

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Left Blank
17	34	23	2	1	2

Category #4: Housing and Neighborhood Development:

Idea 1: Allow transit-oriented development (TOD) to be funded through tax-increment financing, by exempting TODs from meeting the physical and economic criteria of blight in order to qualify as redevelopment areas.

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Left Blank
17	35	14	11	2	1

Idea 2: Provide opportunities for greater utilization of Location Efficient Mortgages (LEMs) in California by having the California Housing Finance Agency (CHFA) offer LEMs or provide down payment assistance to home buyers who use LEMs.

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Left Blank
11	33	27	3	1	4

Idea 4: Redirect a portion of California's federal discretionary transportation funds for matching grants for transit-related amenities to local governments that approve housing within a 1/4-mile radius of transit.

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Left Blank
16	34	19	6	3	1

Idea 5: Require school siting to be linked with local land use planning by amending the School Facilities Program to give priority funding to existing schools for modernization and to applicants whose school project sites are identified in their local general plans or zoning ordinances.

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Left Blank
30	28	13	6	1	1

RESEARCH FINDINGS: LOCAL POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

Building off the information presented above, a combined Web-based and governmental library survey was undertaken to identify specific local smart growth policies and implementation measures that are currently in place or are being considered by individual California cities and counties. The sources of this information include the LUPIN Web site, as well as adopted or proposed general and specific plans on file in the College of Environmental Design Library–University of California at Berkeley, and in the Association of Bay Area Governments–Metropolitan Transportation Commission Library at the MetroCenter in Oakland, California.

The following menu of policies and implementation measures identifies the array of actions that have either been adopted or considered at the local level in California. These actions have (with one exception) been organized around state-mandated local general plan element topics:

Land Use Element: Policies and Implementation Measures

Ensure that infrastructure efficiently serves future growth.

- Identify existing urbanized areas in need of infrastructure upgrades. Target local infrastructure resources to support development where infrastructure is already in place, enabling existing infrastructure to support increased intensity of use. Repair or replace aging infrastructure in infill and redevelopment areas.
- Designate service boundaries for extending infrastructure and discourage extension of public facilities beyond these boundaries.

-
- Work with sponsors of regional projects and activities, such as sports, entertainment, and employment, to locate these activities in downtowns and areas well served by transit.
 - Locate schools, libraries, hospitals, and civic buildings near existing and planned transit stations, and within walking or biking distance of the communities they serve.
 - Establish joint-use public facilities, such as the sharing of recreational centers between schools and cities and placing libraries in local community service centers.

Direct future growth to vacant and underutilized land within existing urbanized areas.

- Complete an inventory of vacant and underutilized land.
- Prepare specific plans for underutilized areas, for example, surplus or abandoned institutional, commercial (strip malls), and industrial land (contaminated sites). Redevelop these areas with activities that eliminate large surface parking lots, mix different types of uses, and include shared parking areas as well as pedestrian and transit-access amenities.
- Identify sites with special redevelopment needs, such as abandoned or contaminated sites, and prioritize their redevelopment or clean-up.
- Provide loan guarantees, letters of credit, and fee or tax waivers to developers of mixed-use and infill projects.
- Create private-public partnerships in community revitalization efforts to improve the quality of life for new and existing residents and businesses in disadvantaged/existing communities.
- Remove barriers to adaptive reuse, such as building codes that inhibit the redevelopment of older buildings.

Make the development process more efficient by providing certainty as to where new development will or will not occur.

- Conduct front-end environmental clearance and minimize project-by-project reviews in areas designated for reuse.
- Assign and fund staff contacts to guide projects through the development review process as efficiently as possible.
- Minimize discretionary permit requirements, such as use permits, applicable to proposed infill and other smart development.
- Create efficient land use patterns that will reduce projected congestion levels, improve mobility, and reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- Exempt or minimize development fees for infill and redevelopment projects.

- Identify transit and transportation corridors and create specific plans for their development at greater intensities.
- Locate the services people use every day, such as child care, cleaners, and convenience shopping, at transit centers and in major activity centers.
- Revitalize or establish a pedestrian-oriented town center or subcenters. Create a specific plan for the center's development.
- Encourage mixed uses by permitting residential uses in all zones and neighborhood-serving commercial uses in residential zones.
- Reduce parcel size for new single-family developments.
- In newly developing areas, permit mixed uses and housing for a wide range of incomes.

Design neighborhoods and projects to improve livability.

- Zone for mixed-use, compact development with a connected street network, pedestrian-scale design, and transit-oriented development. Encourage pedestrian-scale, neighborhood-serving commercial uses in residential areas.
- Develop, adopt, and implement design guidelines for the street frontage of buildings. Avoid blank walls; encourage windows, entrances, landscaping, and pedestrian amenities such as sitting areas. Provide opportunities for traffic calming. Design streets and structures at a human scale, allowing walkability.

Coordinate local land use, circulation, and major development plans with neighboring communities.

- Provide for input on proposed general plan changes from those localities that could be affected by such changes.
- Establish interjurisdictional review boards to review major development proposals within the sphere of influence of a neighboring community.

Circulation Element: Policies and Implementation Measures

Promote efficient use of resources for mobility demands, especially opportunities for nonmotorized transportation and access to destinations by alternatives to auto travel.

- Establish guidelines that call for transit-supportive and bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods, shopping areas, and employment centers.
- Require new developments to include pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

-
- Adopt transit station area specific plans or redevelopment plans for all areas within walking distance, which include a mix of uses and the highest residential and commercial densities found in the community.
 - Interconnect pedestrian and bicycle networks with transit networks; connect bike and pedestrian paths directly with transit stations or stops.
 - Establish lower parking requirements, as well as short- and long-term bicycle parking facilities, in activity centers and areas near transit stops.

Provide a variety of coordinated measures aimed at congestion relief.

- Establish a transportation demand management program that encourages alternatives to single-occupant vehicles.
- Work with Caltrans and local transit agencies to develop transit priority measures, such as signal priority and dedicated bus lanes that allow transit vehicles to bypass congested areas.
- Form partnerships with transit agencies to develop financing or other strategies for development around stations or in the design of major transit corridors.
- Relax traffic level-of-service standards within major activity centers.
- Incorporate standards that enhance walkability (sidewalks, on-street parking, traffic calming, landscaping, good building facade design) into street design manuals.
- Establish minimum density requirements for all new development within a certain distance (for example, one-third of a mile) of public transit stations.
- Advocate employer-sponsored transit passes as an alternative to on-site parking for employees.
- Pursue a city car-share program.
- Promote telecommuting by establishing telecommuting programs for city and county workers or adopting alternative work schedules.

Housing Element: Policies and Implementation Measures

Provide a quantity of diverse housing types that meets projected demand.

- Identify the potential for new housing production within existing urbanized areas. Complete an inventory of vacant lands in the jurisdiction and study potential for higher densities on currently developed sites.
- Conduct a comprehensive assessment of current and projected housing needs for all economic segments of the community to measure unmet housing need.

- Permit in-law (accessory) units.
- Relax restrictions on multifamily housing.
- Establish locally initiated density bonuses that allow developers of housing units to add extra units (stories) if the developments include amenities such as improvements to nearby transit, parks, public spaces, or pedestrian or bicycle amenities.
- Amend the general plan and zoning on undeveloped or underutilized commercial and industrial lands to allow residential or mixed use. Permit residential development in conjunction with commercial projects.
- Encourage the construction of affordable and infill housing by processing permits more quickly and providing project subsidies.
- Preserve and restore the existing housing stock and limit the conversion of residential buildings to other uses.

Encourage housing development that accommodates a range of incomes and ages, including some mixed-income neighborhoods.

- Participate in location-efficient mortgage programs to provide low-interest mortgage loans for residents who purchase homes in neighborhoods targeted for revitalization and/or near transit.
- Adopt inclusionary zoning, which requires developers of new housing to provide a certain percentage (usually 10-20 percent) of units affordable to very low-, low-, and moderate-income residents. This developer can provide this housing in new residential developments or in a different location. In-lieu fees for affordable housing can substitute for units where land has been identified for it.
- Work with nonprofit and for-profit developers to create permanently affordable housing. Preserve existing affordable housing to address gentrification of urban neighborhoods, and provide opportunities for increased community and economic development.
- Subsidize affordable housing projects by reducing development fees or pursuing proactive programs designed to assist in construction of affordable units

Locate more housing near job centers.

- Institute jobs-housing linkage programs, which require all new job-generating projects to pay a fee toward the development of affordable housing. (This may be inappropriate for housing-rich areas where it might penalize needed new job production.)
- Establish a housing impact fee on new commercial and industrial projects to be used for the provision of affordable housing units.

-
- Pursue tax-increment financing and other incentives to promote transit-oriented developments, producing housing at commute nodes.

Social Equity and Workforce Development: Policies and Implementation Measures

Although Social Equity and Workforce Development is not a state-mandated element of local general plans in California, issues related to social equity are part of a smart growth policy and can be addressed effectively locally.

As part of an overall economic development program, locate and link businesses that are compatible with the skills and education of the local workforce.

- Encourage new employers and contractors to search for skilled workers locally.
- Match economic development efforts to attract employers to the skills of the area's employees.
- Adopt policies encouraging local workers to occupy new housing units.

Support workforce development programs that encourage schools and colleges to educate or train residents for targeted employment opportunities.

Avoid displacing residents, community institutions, and neighborhood-serving local businesses.

Educate citizens about the public benefits of infill and redevelopment, and the tradeoffs involved between smart growth and sprawl.

- Explain how traditional suburban development patterns can lead to sprawl and its associated challenges of increased auto trips, congestion, and energy consumption, and how mixed uses, compactness, and walkability can promote more travel choices and livability.

Conservation/Open Space Element: Policies and Implementation Measures

Prepare conservation and development policies and regulations in collaboration with all stakeholders, including neighboring jurisdictions. Address community concerns through alliances and partnerships.

- Develop resources for “green” building design practices and materials.
- Assess development fees to preserve or provide open space.
- Incorporate new development in or adjacent to existing developed areas, and provide greenspace for recreation and other amenities.

- Develop measures of environmental justice to ensure that low-income communities and communities of color do not bear a disproportionate burden of environmental hazards.
- Establish a transfer-of-development-rights program that allows for preservation of open space on the urban fringe and intensifies land use within existing developed areas.

Prepare plans and measures for preserving open space, natural resources, and the managed production of resources, outdoor recreation, and agricultural land.

- Protect significant open space resources through the establishment of an open space land trust.
- Adopt urban growth boundaries coupled with infill development commitments.
- Encourage recycling, resource reduction, and energy conservation programs to reduce waste of scarce natural resources.
- Identify significant open space and scenic, cultural, and historic resources so they can be protected.
- Establish standards for park and recreational space in new and redevelopment areas.
- Establish conservation easements to allow local communities to finance open space needed for parks, watershed protection, and recreational activities.
- Identify prime agricultural land that should be set aside from development, and pursue Williamson Act agreements with these landowners.
- Do not publicly fund infrastructure that would support low-density new development in prime agricultural areas not planned for future growth.

Design for preservation and improvement of open space, parks, and community centers in urbanized areas, improving the quality of urban green space.

- Identify existing parks and neighborhoods lacking parks. Identify potential greenspace and park space in existing urbanized areas that lack public greenspace. Identify recreational activities and neighborhoods that lack these.

RECOMMENDED LOCAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK

Based on the findings from this research, the following operational framework is recommended as a starting point in surveying local governments with respect to smart growth activity, interests, and needs:

Develop Efficient and Compact Communities

1. Plan for a significant amount of development to occur on vacant and underutilized sites within developed areas.
2. Establish land use standards and practices that increase land use intensity within downtown(s) and near transit stops.
3. Plan for more mixed-use developments.
4. Plan for more open space preservation including natural areas, conservation lands, parks, and, if available, agricultural areas.

Promote Transportation and Housing Choices

5. Plan for more transportation choices, including transit-supportive and bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods, shopping areas, and employment centers.
6. Plan for the retention and development of housing that meets projected demand and accommodates a range of incomes and ages.
7. Plan for the development of housing affordable to workers employed locally.

Enhance Public/Private Processes and Interjurisdictional Cooperation

8. Coordinate local land use and circulation plans with neighboring communities.
9. Use public, private and/or nonprofit partnerships, alliances, and other collaborative approaches in the preparation of conservation and development policies and regulations.
10. Establish procedures that provide greater certainty and predictability in the review of developments conforming to the jurisdiction's adopted planning policies, programs and strategies.

APPENDIX C: PLANNING DIRECTOR SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE WITH TABULATED RESULTS

1. The following table identifies 10 land use strategies. Please indicate by means of check marks your jurisdiction’s level of engagement with each of them.

You may check more than one box for each strategy if doing so would best describe what your jurisdiction has done or is doing. We realize that the strategies may not be a perfect match for your situation, but please check the appropriate boxes if a statement is reasonably close to what your jurisdiction is doing or has done.

Strategy	Not applicable	Applicable, but not yet considered	Considered and rejected	Under study	Adopted policy	Adopted implementation strategy	Being carried out
A. Planning for a significant amount of future development to occur on vacant and underutilized sites within developed areas.	42	8	4	43	60	37	85
B. Establishing land use policies and practices that increase land use intensity within downtown(s) and near transit stops.	31	18	4	55	68	34	59
C. Planning for more mixed-use developments.	12	11	2	60	85	36	68
D. Planning for more open space preservation, including natural areas, conservation lands, parks and, if available, agricultural areas.	36	8	4	44	71	44	77
E. Planning for more transportation choices, including transit-supportive and bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods, shopping areas, and employment centers.	18	11	0	50	79	44	76
F. Planning for the retention and development of housing that meets projected demand and accommodates a range of incomes and ages.	5	11	1	54	94	51	82

Strategy	Not applicable	Applicable, but not yet considered	Considered and rejected	Under study	Adopted policy	Adopted implementation strategy	Being carried out
G. Development of housing affordable to workers employed locally.	12	29	1	57	79	37	66
H. Coordinating local land use and circulation plans with neighboring communities.	19	27	1	39	64	28	86
I. Using public, private, and/or nonprofit sector partnerships, alliances, and other collaborative approaches in the preparation of conservation and development policies and regulations.	32	32	0	43	47	22	64
J. Establishing procedures that provide greater certainty and predictability in the review of developments conforming to the jurisdiction's adopted planning policies, programs, and strategies.	9	23	1	50	50	35	93

2. For the strategies that have been dealt with in any way, check the number, on a 1 (none) to 5 (high) scale, that best describes the level of controversy experienced by your jurisdiction.

Strategy	Level of Controversy					Number of Responses	Average Score
	1	2	3	4	5		
A	1	2	3	4	5		
	28	38	35	31	26	158	2.93
B	1	2	3	4	5		
	34	48	42	20	12	156	2.54
C	1	2	3	4	5		
	38	63	47	16	9	173	2.39
D	1	2	3	4	5		
	54	35	31	24	12	156	2.39
E	1	2	3	4	5		
	48	73	38	7	2	168	2.06

Strategy	Level of Controversy					Number of Responses	Average Score
	1	2	3	4	5		
F	1	2	3	4	5		
	19	40	53	50	14	166	2.82
G	1	2	3	4	5		
	28	37	51	37	13	166	2.82
H	1	2	3	4	5		
	54	49	37	20	2	162	2.18
I	1	2	3	4	5		
	57	46	28	13	3	147	2.04
J	1	2	3	4	5		
	53	52	33	17	6	161	2.20

3. For those strategies that experienced significant controversy, *briefly* describe the nature of the controversy.

Strategy	Nature of Controversy
Strategy	
Strategy	

Local Issue Causing Controversy	STRATEGY										Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	
1. Property owner/developer objections	0	1	1	11	5	2	1	0	2	9	32
2. Voter/resident objections to growth/development/density	30	26	21	6	6	19	7	3	4	3	125
3. Voter/resident objections to low/moderate/affordable housing	1	1	2	0	1	31	36	1	0	0	73
4. Voter/resident concerns about increased traffic	14	4	2	1	2	2	1	4	0	0	30
5. Disputes with other governmental agencies	2	0	0	2	0	6	4	11	0	0	25
6. Disputes over environmentally sensitive/agricultural land/water supply	7	0	2	7	0	1	1	1	0	0	19
7. Miscellaneous	0	1	0	2	0	3	3	2	3	3	16
TOTAL	54	33	28	28	14	64	52	22	9	15	320

4. For those strategies your jurisdiction has adopted and/or implemented after some level of controversy (see question 2), check the number, on a 1 (none) to 5 (major) scale, that best describes the degree of modification made relative to the original proposal or concept.

Strategy	Degree of Modification					Number of Responses	Average Score
	1	2	3	4	5		
A	1	2	3	4	5		
	17	19	12	6	7	61	2.45
B	1	2	3	4	5		
	15	23	11	7	3	59	2.32
C	1	2	3	4	5		
	18	20	13	1	4	56	2.16
D	1	2	3	4	5		
	21	13	15	11	5	65	2.48
E	1	2	3	4	5		
	21	19	9	1	5	55	2.27
F	1	2	3	4	5		
	19	24	21	10	5	79	2.47
G	1	2	3	4	5		
	16	20	19	9	1	65	2.37
H	1	2	3	4	5		
	21	14	11	2	0	48	1.88
I	1	2	3	4	5		
	20	11	10	2	0	43	1.86
J	1	2	3	4	5		
	17	16	14	3	3	53	2.23

5. In general, would you say that your jurisdiction is moving in the direction of:

	Yes	No	Not Applicable	Total
A. Using land more intensively?	153	35	2	190
B. Restricting outward growth?	85	43	55	183
C. Incorporating multimodal transportation features in land use plans?	134	31	20	185

6. In general, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents past policies and 5 represents moving in a significantly different direction, does your jurisdiction believe that in the next 20 years development policies and practices should follow past policies or move in a different direction?

1	2	3	4	5	Number of Responses	Average Score
11	30	67	52	21	181	3.23

7. Please circle the terms on the list below, if any, that are most often used by elected and appointed officials, including staff, to characterize your jurisdiction’s planning philosophy. If more than one term is used, please indicate relative importance by ranking the terms, with # 1 being the most important.

	Rank #1	Rank #2	Rank #3
a. Compact Growth (relative importance #__)	5	15	8
b. Controlled Growth (relative importance #__)	21	14	8
c. Green City (relative importance #__)	2	2	6
d. Growth Management (relative importance #__)	20	19	6
e. Livable Community (relative importance #__)	46	28	17
f. New Urbanism/Neo-traditional Planning (relative importance # __)	7	5	11
g. Regional Planning (relative importance #__)	5	13	12
h. Reliance on the private market (relative importance #__)	25	10	11
i. Smart Growth (relative importance #__)	24	21	18
j. Sustainable Development (relative importance #__)	7	17	16

	Rank #1	Rank #2	Rank #3
k. Transit-Oriented Development (relative importance #__)	8	14	13
l. Other (Please identify) (relative importance #__)	8	3	5

Prepared by: Name (please print) _____

Title _____

Jurisdiction _____ Date _____

Thank you very much for your assistance. If you would like to receive a copy of the results of the survey, please indicate: Yes ___

APPENDIX D: RESPONDENT ANALYSIS SPREADSHEETS

This appendix addresses two questions about the 200 respondents to the Planning Director Survey:

1. In what ways and to what extent were the 200 respondents similar to or different from the 534 jurisdictions to whom the survey was distributed?
2. To what extent might any differences identified be related to differences in growth management practices?

Greater attention was paid to following up on larger jurisdictions, and those jurisdictions generally have larger planning staffs and budgets. As a result, the respondents represented 37.5 percent of the cities and counties but 57.9 percent of the total population of California.

Since larger jurisdictions generally have larger planning staffs and more elaborate growth management programs, the affirmative responses to questions about being engaged in particular planning practices might be somewhat greater than would be the case for all the cities and counties in California. It takes staff and resources to be engaged in these practices, and larger agencies have more staff and resources.

Also, agencies that are more engaged in change might be more likely to respond to a survey about change than agencies that are less involved with change; such agencies have more to say and are more motivated where issues related to change are involved. This too could have resulted in more affirmative responses about engagement in planning practices than would be the case for agencies not responding to the survey.

This appendix contains 10 tables showing data related to the two questions posed above. Using data available by county, the 534 jurisdictions were divided in quarters (approximate—to the nearest county) for each of five characteristics:

1. Percent of projected growth in population (2000 to 2020), from highest to lowest as projected by the State Department of Finance.
2. Per capita income for 1998, from highest to lowest, as calculated by the State Department of Finance.
3. Percent of multiple family housing, from highest to lowest, as calculated by the 2000 United States Census.
4. Agricultural sales for 1997, from highest to lowest, as calculated by the State Department of Agriculture.

5. Presidential vote in November 2000, from highest to lowest for George Bush, as compiled by the California Secretary of State.

These five parameters were selected because professionals and policy makers often expect smart growth practices to be more prevalent in areas experiencing rapid growth, in more affluent areas, and in more densely developed areas, and often expect these practices to be less prevalent in more rural and politically conservative areas.

We then compared the percent of our 200 respondents in each approximate quarter to the exact percent of the 534 jurisdictions contained in each approximate quarter (remembering that the data was available by county and the jurisdictions were divided into quarters to the nearest county). While the county basis of our data is less than ideal, this procedure allowed us to compare in what ways and to what extent the 200 respondents were similar to or different from the 534 jurisdictions along these five parameters.

The results are summarized in Table 5 (top two quarters compared to bottom two quarters).

Table 5: Comparison of All Jurisdictions and Jurisdictions Responding to Planning Director Survey by Five Data Categories

Data Category	Jurisdictions in the top half (% of 534)	Responding jurisdictions in the top half (% of 200)	Jurisdictions in the bottom half (% of 534)	Responding jurisdictions in the bottom half (% of 200)
% 2000-2020 Growth	47.9%	46.5%	52.1%	53.5%
1998 Per Capita Income	54.3%	62.5%	45.7%	37.5%
2000 % Multiple Family Housing	48.5%	54.5%	51.5%	45.5%
1997 Agricultural Sales	50.9%	55.5%	49.1%	44.5%
November 2000 vote for Bush	50.6%	51.5%	49.4%	48.5%

The 200 respondents differ from the top half of the 534 total as follows:

% Projected Growth – respondents: 1.4% less

Per Capita Income – respondents: 8.2% more

Agricultural Sales – respondents: 4.6% more

Presidential Vote – respondents: 0.9% more

% Multifamily – respondents: 6.0% more

The respondent group includes more than its proportional share of jurisdictions with higher income, more multifamily housing, and higher agricultural sales, and is close to representative for projected growth rate and political orientation.

The second question addressed was to what extent the differences identified between our 200 respondents and the total 534 jurisdictions might relate to differences in growth management practices. Rather than attempting to evaluate this question in terms of the various particular practices, we considered it in terms of the overall proclivity to change as measured by responses to Question 6, which reads: “In general, on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents past policies and 5 represents moving in a significantly different direction, does your jurisdiction believe that in the next 20 years development policies and practices should follow past policies or move in a different direction?”

To do this, we calculated the average response to Question 6 for the top and bottom halves of the respondent jurisdictions arrayed by the five parameters described above. These results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Comparison of Question 6 Average Rating for California Jurisdictions Ranked by Five Data Categories

Data Category	Average rating by jurisdictions in top half of data category	Average rating by jurisdictions in bottom half of data category
% 2000-2020 Growth	3.44	3.06
1998 Per Capita Income	3.14	3.41
2000 % Multiple Family Housing	3.24	3.23
1997 Agricultural Sales	3.25	3.23
November 2000 vote for Bush	3.26	3.21

The average rating by the 200 jurisdictions that responded to the Planning Director survey was 3.23.

As can be seen from this data, responses vary significantly only for projected population growth and per capita income. However, since our respondents are much like the total 534 jurisdictions in terms of percent projected growth, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that only our respondents' somewhat higher per capita incomes might result in somewhat understating the overall proclivity to change.

This analysis gives little evidence that the respondents as a whole are very different from the total 534 jurisdictions in terms of their proclivity to change. Nevertheless, common sense suggests that those more involved with change might respond to our survey more frequently, and larger jurisdictions have more planning resources and thus may be more involved with changes in growth management practices. Thus, it appears to be a plausible hypothesis that the jurisdictions not responding to our survey might be less involved with changing growth management practices. We have no empirical evidence to either support or refute this hypothesis.

However, the surprising lack of significant differences in responses to Question 6 based on political orientation, agricultural sales, and multifamily housing indicates that the movement to change land use planning practices in California is not restricted to the more urban and more liberal areas but is distributed widely throughout the state.

Tables 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 address the five data categories identified above. For each table, the following information is included:

- California counties ranked by the data category
- The number of jurisdictions in each county
- The number of jurisdictions responding to the Planning Director Survey
- The number of jurisdictions responding to Question 6
- The total score for Question 6 responses (for example, a county with two responding jurisdictions, one rating Question 6 at 3 and the other at 4, would have a total score of 7).

Table 7: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Projected Percentage of Growth from 2000 to 2020 and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6

County	Total 2000 Population	Change % 2000-2020	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
Colusa	41,400	105.2%	1	3	1	1	3
Imperial	149,000	97.4%	2	8	1	1	4
Madera	127,700	79.5%	3	3	2	2	7
Riverside	1,577,700	78.6%	4	25	11	10	36

Table 7: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Projected Percentage of Growth from 2000 to 2020 and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6 (Continued)

County	Total 2000 Population	Change % 2000-2020	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
Glenn	26,900	72.9%	5	3	0	0	0
Placer	251,800	61.6%	6	7	2	1	5
San Bernardino	1,742,300	60.8%	7	25	12	11	31
Kern	678,500	60.4%	8	13	2	2	7
El Dorado	158,300	59.8%	9	3	1	1	3
San Benito	54,500	59.3%	10	3	1	1	5
Lake	59,100	57.4%	11	3	1	1	3
Stanislaus	454,600	56.6%	12	10	7	6	20
San Luis Obispo	249,900	56.4%	13	9	4	3	11
San Joaquin	573,600	54.7%	14	8	4	4	12
Tulare	375,100	52.2%	15	9	1	1	4
First Quartile				132	50	45	151
Calaveras	41,000	51.7%	16	2	0	0	0
Merced	214,400	50.5%	17	7	1	1	5
Butte	205,400	50.4%	18	6	3	2	8
Tehama	56,700	50.1%	19	4	2	2	6
Kings	134,500	47.7%	20	5	2	2	7
Monterey	408,700	44.5%	21	13	3	3	10
Sutter	80,200	44.1%	22	3	1	1	4
Nevada	93,000	43.2%	23	4	0	0	0
Santa Cruz	259,300	42.9%	24	5	1	1	3
Alpine	1,200	41.7%	25	1	0	0	0
Mariposa	17,200	40.5%	26	1	1	1	3
Shasta	165,000	40.0%	27	4	2	2	8
Tuolumne	55,200	39.9%	28	2	0	0	0
Solano	400,300	39.8%	29	8	3	2	6
Lassen	35,600	39.0%	30	2	0	0	0

Table 7: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Projected Percentage of Growth from 2000 to 2020 and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6 (Continued)

County	Total 2000 Population	Change % 2000-2020	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
Fresno	816,400	39.0%	31	16	3	3	11
Yolo	170,900	38.3%	32	6	2	2	8
Del Norte	28,200	38.3%	33	2	0	0	0
Sacramento	1,242,000	37.5%	34	6	2	2	8
Santa Barbara	406,100	36.1%	35	8	3	3	12
San Diego	2,856,300	35.3%	36	19	14	14	46
Second Quartile				124	43	41	145
TOP HALF				256	93	86	296
Sonoma	464,800	35.2%	37	10	5	4	14
Yuba	60,800	34.7%	38	3	0	0	0
Mendocino	87,400	33.5%	39	5	0	0	0
Ventura	765,300	31.6%	40	11	6	6	15
Mono	14,200	29.8%	41	2	2	2	8
Santa Clara	1,709,500	26.5%	42	16	8	8	24
Napa	157,900	25.9%	43	6	2	2	4
Alameda	1,466,900	23.5%	44	15	9	8	27
Orange	2,893,100	22.4%	45	34	15	15	46
Modoc	9,500	21.1%	46	2	0	0	0
Siskiyou	44,700	20.6%	47	10	1	1	1
Contra Costa	963,000	19.7%	48	20	8	7	21
Third Quartile				134	56	53	160
Los Angeles	9,716,000	19.2%	49	89	30	28	81
Trinity	13,100	17.6%	50	1	0	0	0
Amador	35,400	16.7%	51	6	2	1	2
San Mateo	717,900	16.2%	52	21	13	11	40
Inyo	18,200	13.7%	53	2	1	1	4
Plumas	21,000	11.9%	54	2	0	0	0
Humboldt	127,700	11.3%	55	8	0	0	0
Marin	250,100	9.5%	56	12	4	4	13

Table 7: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Projected Percentage of Growth from 2000 to 2020 and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6 (Continued)

County	Total 2000 Population	Change % 2000-2020	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
Sierra	3,600	5.6%	57	2	0	0	0
San Francisco	781,900	-4.0%	58	1	1	1	3
Fourth Quartile				144	51	46	143
BOTTOM HALF				278	107	99	303
TOTAL				534	200	185	599

Source: The amount of projected growth from 2000 to 2020 is from State Department of Finance statistics.

Table 8: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Per Capita Income (1998) and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6.

County	Per capita income	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
Marin	\$52,869	1	12	4	4	13
San Francisco	\$44,518	2	1	1	1	3
San Mateo	\$43,338	3	21	13	11	40
Santa Clara	\$40,828	4	16	8	8	24
Contra Costa	\$36,006	5	20	8	7	21
Napa	\$32,649	6	6	2	2	4
Orange	\$32,541	7	34	15	15	46
Placer	\$32,319	8	7	2	1	5
Alameda	\$32,130	9	15	9	8	27
First Quartile			132	62	57	183
Santa Cruz	\$31,302	10	5	1	1	3
Sonoma	\$30,911	11	10	5	4	14
Ventura	\$28,711	12	11	6	6	15
Santa Barbara	\$28,698	13	8	3	3	12
Monterey	\$28,185	14	13	3	3	10
San Diego	\$27,657	15	19	14	14	46
El Dorado	\$27,046	16	3	1	1	3

Table 8: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Per Capita Income (1998) and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6. (Continued)

County	Per capita income	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
Los Angeles	\$26,773	17	89	30	28	81
Second Quartile			158	63	60	184
TOP HALF			290	125	117	367
Sacramento	\$26,257	18	6	2	2	8
Yolo	\$25,791	19	6	2	2	8
Nevada	\$25,051	20	4	0	0	0
Mono	\$25,020	21	2	2	2	8
San Luis Obispo	\$24,807	22	9	4	3	11
Plumas	\$23,783	23	2	0	0	0
Solano	\$23,724	24	8	3	2	6
Inyo	\$23,468	25	2	1	1	4
Sierra	\$23,175	26	2	0	0	0
Mendocino	\$22,728	27	5	0	0	0
Alpine	\$22,688	28	1	0	0	0
Riverside	\$22,451	29	25	11	10	36
Humboldt	\$22,066	30	8	0	0	0
Shasta	\$21,986	31	4	2	2	8
Sutter	\$21,965	32	3	1	1	4
Lake	\$21,696	33	3	1	1	3
Mariposa	\$21,231	34	1	1	1	3
Stanislaus	\$21,136	35	10	7	6	20
San Benito	\$21,088	36	3	1	1	5
Butte	\$20,838	37	6	3	2	8
Third Quartile			110	41	36	132
San Joaquin	\$20,813	38	8	4	4	12
Amador	\$20,721	39	6	2	1	2
Siskiyou	\$20,474	40	10	1	1	1
Fresno	\$20,333	41	16	3	3	11
Colusa	\$20,287	42	3	1	1	3

Table 8: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Per Capita Income (1998) and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6. (Continued)

County	Per capita income	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
San Bernardino	\$20,258	43	25	12	11	31
Calaveras	\$20,172	44	2	0	0	0
Tuolumne	\$20,082	45	2	0	0	0
Modoc	\$20,005	46	2	0	0	0
Kern	\$19,643	47	13	2	2	7
Tulare	\$18,893	48	9	1	1	4
Trinity	\$18,704	49	1	0	0	0
Merced	\$17,732	50	7	1	1	5
Tehama	\$17,600	51	4	2	2	6
Madera	\$17,403	52	3	2	2	7
Imperial	\$17,353	53	8	1	1	4
Glenn	\$16,882	54	3	0	0	0
Lassen	\$16,667	55	2	0	0	0
Yuba	\$16,405	56	3	0	0	0
Del Norte	\$16,385	57	2	0	0	0
Kings	\$15,492	58	5	2	2	7
Fourth Quartile			134	34	32	100
BOTTOM HALF			244	75	68	232
TOTAL			534	200	185	599
Source: Per capita income is from 1998 State Department of Finance statistics.						

Table 9: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Percentage of Multiple-Family Housing and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6

County	# Multi-family units	% Multi-family	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
San Francisco	234,196	68.80%	1	1	1	1	3
Mono	5,544	47.00%	2	2	2	2	8
Los Angeles	1,415,474	43.30%	3	89	30	28	81
Alameda	210,057	39.20%	4	15	9	8	27
San Diego	377,666	36.30%	5	19	14	14	46
First Quartile				126	56	53	165
Orange	339,214	35.10%	6	34	15	15	46
San Mateo	89,029	33.80%	7	21	13	11	40
Santa Clara	192,473	32.70%	8	16	8	8	24
Yolo	19,360	31.50%	9	6	2	2	8
Alpine	473	31.00%	10	1	0	0	0
Santa Barbara	43,756	30.10%	11	8	3	3	12
Marin	30,900	29.40%	12	12	4	4	13
Sacramento	131,507	28.10%	13	6	2	2	8
Fresno	75,082	27.50%	14	16	3	3	11
Monterey	35,729	27.00%	15	13	3	3	10
Second Quartile				133	53	51	172
TOP HALF				259	109	104	337
Contra Costa	87,115	24.60%	16	20	8	7	21
San Joaquin	42,630	22.40%	17	8	4	4	12
Imperial	9,696	22.30%	18	8	1	1	4
Solano	30,023	22.00%	19	8	3	2	6
Ventura	53,958	21.40%	20	11	6	6	15
Santa Cruz	20,800	21.40%	21	5	1	1	3
Butte	18,508	21.10%	22	6	3	2	8
Sutter	6,157	21.00%	23	3	1	1	4
San Bernardino	123,576	20.20%	24	25	12	11	31
Kings	7,406	20.00%	25	5	2	2	7
Kern	44,996	19.20%	26	13	2	2	7

Table 9: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Percentage of Multiple-Family Housing and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6 (Continued)

County	# Multi-family units	% Multi-family	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
Napa	9,282	18.90%	27	6	2	2	4
Yuba	4,360	18.80%	28	3	0	0	0
Sonoma	34,361	18.70%	29	10	5	4	14
Third Quartile				131	50	45	136
Riverside	108,879	18.70%	30	25	11	10	36
San Luis Obispo	18,968	18.70%	31	9	4	3	11
Humboldt	10,449	18.30%	32	8	0	0	0
Merced	12,713	18.20%	33	7	1	1	5
Stanislaus	27,197	17.90%	34	10	7	6	20
Shasta	11,191	15.60%	35	4	2	2	8
Placer	16,411	15.30%	36	7	2	1	5
Tulare	17,824	14.60%	37	9	1	1	4
Glenn	1,382	13.50%	38	3	0	0	0
Mendocino	4,957	13.30%	39	5	0	0	0
El Dorado	9,513	13.00%	40	3	1	1	3
Madera	5,146	13.00%	41	3	2	2	7
Colusa	917	12.80%	42	3	1	1	3
Del Norte	1,344	12.50%	43	2	0	0	0
San Benito	2,037	12.20%	44	3	1	1	5
Tehama	2,901	12.10%	45	4	2	2	6
Siskiyou	2,516	11.40%	46	10	1	1	1
Lassen	1,225	10.40%	47	2	0	0	0
Inyo	909	10.00%	48	2	1	1	4
Tuolumne	2,489	8.70%	49	2	0	0	0
Nevada	3,907	8.60%	50	4	0	0	0
Plumas	1,104	7.90%	51	2	0	0	0
Amador	1,146	7.60%	52	6	2	1	2
Sierra	165	7.20%	53	2	0	0	0

Table 9: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Percentage of Multiple-Family Housing and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6 (Continued)

County	# Multi-family units	% Multi-family	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
Mariposa	596	6.50%	54	1	1	1	3
Lake	1,972	6.10%	55	3	1	1	3
Modoc	311	5.90%	56	2	0	0	0
Trinity	411	5.10%	57	1	0	0	0
Calaveras	1,078	4.60%	58	2	0	0	0
Fourth Quartile				144	41	36	126
BOTTOM HALF				275	91	81	262
TOTAL				534	200	185	599

Source: The percentage of multiple-family housing is from the 2000 United States Census.

Table 10: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Agricultural Sales (1997) and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6.

County	Production value	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
Fresno	3,418,622	1	16	3	3	11
Tulare	3,066,533	2	9	1	1	4
Monterey	2,923,255	3	13	3	3	10
Kern	2,208,541	4	13	2	2	7
Merced	1,538,538	5	7	1	1	5
San Joaquin	1,348,709	6	8	4	4	12
San Diego	1,253,834	7	19	14	14	46
Stanislaus	1,197,302	8	10	7	6	20
Riverside	1,048,562	9	25	11	10	36
Ventura	1,047,054	10	11	6	6	15
First Quartile			131	52	50	166
Imperial	919,610	11	8	1	1	4
Kings	885,062	12	5	2	2	7
Madera	748,199	13	3	2	2	7
Santa Barbara	739,504	14	8	3	3	12

Table 10: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Agricultural Sales (1997) and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6. (Continued)

County	Production value	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
San Bernardino	619,999	15	25	12	11	31
Sonoma	585,039	16	10	5	4	14
San Luis Obispo	487,654	17	9	4	3	11
Orange	366,422	18	34	15	15	46
Colusa	345,987	19	3	1	1	3
Napa	343,948	20	6	2	2	4
Sutter	343,496	21	3	1	1	4
Santa Cruz	337,913	22	5	1	1	3
Yolo	302,736	23	6	2	2	8
Santa Clara	300,900	24	16	8	8	24
Second Quartile			141	59	56	178
TOP HALF			272	111	106	344
Butte	291,345	25	6	3	2	8
Sacramento	285,572	26	6	2	2	8
Glenn	280,899	27	3	0	0	0
Los Angeles	268,158	28	89	30	28	81
San Benito	208,899	29	3	1	1	5
San Mateo	194,131	30	21	13	11	40
Third Quartile			128	49	44	142
Solano	185,109	31	8	3	2	6
Yuba	148,341	32	3	0	0	0
Mendocino	128,572	33	5	0	0	0
Siskiyou	118,981	34	10	1	1	1
Tehama	110,704	35	4	2	2	6
Humboldt	96,733	36	8	0	0	0
Contra Costa	92,598	37	20	8	7	21
Placer	60,509	38	7	2	1	5
Modoc	56,731	39	2	0	0	0
Lake	53,603	40	3	1	1	3

Table 10: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by Agricultural Sales (1997) and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6. (Continued)

County	Production value	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
Lassen	52,665	41	2	0	0	0
Shasta	50,023	42	4	2	2	8
Marin	48,189	43	12	4	4	13
Alameda	31,913	44	15	9	8	27
Del Norte	30,792	45	2	0	0	0
El Dorado	24,166	46	3	1	1	3
Amador	22,692	47	6	2	1	2
Mono	21,101	48	2	2	2	8
Mariposa	18,622	49	1	1	1	3
Calaveras	17,615	50	2	0	0	0
Plumas	17,590	51	2	0	0	0
Tuolumne	16,864	52	2	0	0	0
Inyo	14,482	53	2	1	1	4
Nevada	7,144	54	4	0	0	0
Sierra	6,260	55	2	0	0	0
Trinity	2,139	56	1	0	0	0
San Francisco	2,013	57	1	1	1	3
Alpine	0	58	1	0	0	0
Fourth Quartile			134	40	35	113
BOTTOM HALF			262	89	79	255
TOTAL			534	200	185	599

Source: Agricultural sales figures are from the California Department of Agriculture.

Table 11: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by % of Vote for Bush in November 2000 Election and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6

County	Vote for Bush	% Vote for Bush	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
Modoc	2,969	70.9%	1	2	0	0	0
Lassen	7,079	66.4%	2	2	0	0	0
Glenn	5,794	65.7%	3	3	0	0	0
Shasta	43,278	64.2%	4	4	2	2	8
Sutter	17,350	64.2%	5	3	1	1	4
Tehama	13,270	62.9%	6	4	2	2	6
Colusa	3,542	62.9%	7	3	1	1	3
Sierra	1,172	62.8%	8	2	0	0	0
Siskiyou	12,198	61.0%	9	10	1	1	1
Yuba	9,837	60.3%	10	3	0	0	0
Plumas	6,343	60.2%	11	2	0	0	0
Madera	20,281	60.1%	12	3	2	2	7
Kern	110,624	60.1%	13	13	2	2	7
Tulare	54,068	59.8%	14	9	1	1	4
Inyo	4,712	59.6%	15	2	1	1	4
Placer	69,825	59.0%	16	7	2	1	5
El Dorado	42,044	57.9%	17	3	1	1	3
Mariposa	4,727	57.6%	18	1	1	1	3
Trinity	3,339	57.0%	19	1	0	0	0
Kings	16,365	56.9%	20	5	2	2	7
Amador	8,766	56.1%	21	6	2	1	2
Calaveras	10,598	55.8%	22	2	0	0	0
Orange	541,143	55.3%	23	34	15	15	46
Tuolumne	13,171	55.1%	24	2	0	0	0
Nevada	25,972	54.2%	25	4	0	0	0
Butte	45,583	54.1%	26	6	3	2	8
First Quartile				136	39	36	118
Del Norte	4,526	54.0%	27	2	0	0	0
Fresno	117,341	52.8%	28	16	3	3	11

Table 11: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by % of Vote for Bush in November 2000 Election and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6 (Continued)

County	Vote for Bush	% Vote for Bush	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
Stanislaus	67,187	51.9%	29	10	7	6	20
San Luis Obispo	56,858	51.8%	30	9	4	3	11
Mono	2,295	51.3%	31	2	2	2	8
Merced	26,101	51.1%	32	7	1	1	5
Riverside	231,935	51.0%	33	25	11	10	36
San Diego	474,954	48.6%	34	19	14	14	46
San Joaquin	81,485	48.4%	35	8	4	4	12
San Bernardino	221,730	47.7%	36	25	12	11	31
Ventura	133,994	47.7%	37	11	6	6	15
Second Quartile				134	64	60	195
TOP HALF				270	103	96	313
Alpine	280	46.9%	38	1	0	0	0
Santa Barbara	71,491	45.8%	39	8	3	3	12
Sacramento	195,617	44.6%	40	6	2	2	8
Imperial	12,523	42.5%	41	8	1	1	4
San Benito	7,015	41.3%	42	3	1	1	5
Humboldt	23,218	41.2%	43	8	0	0	0
Lake	8,699	40.3%	44	3	1	1	3
Napa	20,633	39.5%	45	6	2	2	4
Solano	51,603	38.6%	46	8	3	2	6
Yolo	23,056	37.2%	47	6	2	2	8
Monterey	43,759	36.9%	48	13	3	3	10
Contra Costa	141,373	36.8%	49	20	8	7	21
Mendocino	12,271	35.1%	50	5	0	0	0
Santa Clara	188,742	33.8%	51	16	8	8	24
Sonoma	63,168	32.0%	52	10	5	4	14
Third Quartile				121	39	36	119
Los Angeles	871,910	31.5%	53	89	30	28	81

Table 11: Analysis of California's Counties Ranked by % of Vote for Bush in November 2000 Election and Response to Planning Director Survey Question 6 (Continued)

County	Vote for Bush	% Vote for Bush	Rank	# of Jurisdictions	Responding jurisdictions	Jurisdictions responding to Q 6	Total # for Q 6
San Mateo	80,146	30.7%	54	21	13	11	40
Marin	34,872	28.2%	55	12	4	4	13
Santa Cruz	29,627	27.1%	56	5	1	1	3
Alameda	119,134	23.8%	57	15	9	8	27
San Francisco	51,435	15.9%	58	1	1	1	3
Fourth Quartile				143	58	53	167
BOTTOM HALF				264	97	89	286
TOTAL				534	200	185	599
Source: California Secretary of State							

APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS WITH LOCAL PLANNING OFFICIALS

Between April 1 and May 23, 2002, telephone interviews were conducted with local planning directors or senior-level local planners from 30 different California localities. These interviews were designed to follow up with a selected number of individuals who completed the written questionnaires that were developed and distributed in this study.

Those interviewed represented communities from Northern and Southern California, the Central Valley, and the Central Coast. Attempts to interview planners from the northernmost portions of the state were unsuccessful. Those interviewed included representatives of two counties, three major central cities, and five rural cities. They are involved in jurisdictions ranging in population from 4,450 (Del Mar) to 3,807,400 (Los Angeles), major old and new suburban employment centers, and slow- and fast-growing communities. An attempt was made to assure that the planners interviewed represented communities that reflect the economic and racial diversity of the state.

Each interviewee was asked to respond to a series of common questions, which are noted in italics in the following interview summaries. Depending on responses to these questions, other areas of inquiry were undertaken to gain a greater understanding about specific local opportunities, obstacles, and practices, as well as about current and potential future roles of the state.

The objective of these interviews was to gain insight on the nature of smart growth activities at the local level, by focusing on the following issues:

1. Objectives
 - What are they trying to do?
 - What do they want to change?
2. Barriers
 - What barriers are they running into?
 - Which barriers are the most significant?
3. Role of the State
 - What state regulatory reforms would be helpful?
 - What state fiscal incentives would be helpful?

City of Pittsburg

Randy Jerome

Director of Planning and Building

Question 1. Your written survey indicated that you have experienced challenges in encouraging infill, increasing land use intensity near transit and in the downtown, preserving open space, and retaining and developing needed housing. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Allowing for or encouraging infill development, or increasing the intensity of development within the downtown, has not been a major problem from a policy perspective. There has, however, been limited private sector interest in developing the downtown. On the other hand, there has been some interest in infill development outside the downtown, and it has run into significant resident opposition, particularly when it is proposed within or near existing single-family residences. In addition, proposals calling for multifamily housing and mid-rise (10-story) offices near the new Pittsburg-Bay Point BART Station have run into major political problems. The city council, with support and pressure from residents in the area, is directing that the city's policies encourage retail services rather than office uses or multifamily housing on vacant land within a fairly significant area around the station. A major argument behind this decision is the need for more sales tax revenue to benefit residents and the city in general.

In recent months the city's long-standing policy of protecting ridgeline and hillside areas from development has been overturned on land near the new BART station. A locally based major single-family developer successfully convinced a majority of the city council that the need to encourage development on land near the BART station, thereby facilitating rapid transit use and providing for upscale housing, was more important than preserving hillsides and ridgelines.

The opposition to needed housing increases in proportion to its proposed density. In general, the city believes that it already provides a large stock of affordable and moderately priced housing. Their goal now is to encourage upscale housing.

It needs to be emphasized that resident opposition, particularly at the neighborhood level, is the major barrier to moving toward more compact development. Fears about increased traffic generation from new development, and its effect on neighborhood character and safety, is a major obstacle.

There is very limited support for encouraging alternative transportation strategies, i.e., anything other than the automobile. While a small group of citizens advocate bicycle and pedestrian pathways, their efforts have not yet proven to be fruitful.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

There is little public-sector support for smart growth concepts at this point. Although there has been some private-sector interest in developing multifamily and mid-rise office development near the BART station, it has not been implemented because of public opposition.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

City council and resident opposition, particularly at the neighborhood level.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

The city council is not supportive of higher-density development. The development community has been supportive within areas near the BART station. There are no advocates for significant smart growth planning strategies at the current time.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

The city council is committed to making Pittsburg less of a blue-collar community than it currently is. They are strongly supportive of low-density single-family that will attract new higher-income residents.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

If the goal is to create a more compact pattern of development, the state will need to step in with something like the Lanterman Act, which usurped the ability to say “No” to residential care facilities, and directed that localities approve them “by right.” The state’s message is inconsistent; some of the conservation agencies are calling for restrictions to development, while others are promoting it.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner’s response, are noted below.

- 1. Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Thought the concept has merit, but was not sure that it would make a significant difference.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

O.K.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Would be very helpful.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Good idea.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Yes.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Yes.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Not supportive (see prior answers).

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Does not think that this policy would make a difference in either approving or denying housing proposals in Pittsburgh.

City of Del Mar
Linda Niles
Planning Director

Question 1. Your written survey indicated that you have experienced challenges in increasing land use intensity in the downtown, planning for mixed use, coordinating plans with neighboring communities, or planning for needed housing. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

The city's downtown currently has limited parking. It is doubtful that there would be public support for additional development, including mixed-use, unless there was a strategy to assure that the current parking shortages and the needs for parking to serve this new development would be met.

The City of San Diego abuts Del Mar's eastern border. Recent efforts to coordinate or mitigate proposed San Diego plans and projects with Del Mar's planning policies and concerns have been characterized by frustration and litigation. There is not evidence that San Diego officials are interested in working with Del Mar on some of these issues. It should be noted, however, that Del Mar has very strict land use controls, and has been both critical of, and confrontational with, San Diego on a number of growth issues.

Del Mar's housing stock is not able to accommodate workers at the Del Mar racetrack, a major thoroughbred horse racing facility located in the city, but operated by the 22nd Agricultural District, an arm of the state. It was suggested that the state should provide housing to meet the needs of these workers.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

The community encourages the use of bicycles and walking in the design of new public and private projects. They have narrowed and created a serpentine major thoroughfare through the community. Inclusionary zoning policies have been established, and they have attempted to create a compact commercial core. Finally, they have enacted regulations and have spent taxpayer funds to protect open space throughout the city.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Covered in answer to Question 1.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

It depends on the issue. So long as the character of the community is respected, there is receptivity to smart growth concepts.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Same as answer to last question.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Answered below.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

This sounds good, but would hope that the principles are carefully crafted in conjunction with the League of Cities, etc. Suggests looking at the criteria recently developed by SANDAG.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Yes.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Yes. Would like to see funding made available to develop public education tools that would explain the concepts and benefits of smart growth at the community level.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Yes, but would need to be drafted carefully to assure that bad projects are not allowed to slip through the cracks.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Absolutely not. Would have negative impacts on Del Mar.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Not applicable.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Yes. This is currently done in Del Mar.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Palm Springs

Douglas Evans

Director of Planning and Building

Question 1. Your written survey indicated that you have experienced challenges in encouraging infill, increasing land use intensity in the downtown, preserving open space, and retaining and developing needed housing. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Although there have been challenges from local residents to certain types of development, they have not significantly impacted the city's efforts to achieve these objectives. In fact, the city's downtown has, over the years, been intensified and revitalized with the encouragement of the city.

The most significant obstacle to desired development in Palm Springs comes from the State Department of Fish and Game. Their endangered species laws, and the way they are interpreted, have created major turmoil and uncertainty in the city's ability to accommodate growth consistent with local objectives.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

The city has been pursuing smart growth plans and development.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

The lack of adequate state funding. In addition, obstacles created by the Department of Fish and Game have precluded a number of desirable projects.

Question 4. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

The state should stop "robbing" revenue from the city. These revenue sources include vehicle license fees and property taxes. As a result, the city has had to enact a utility users tax.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes.

-
2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Yes.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Previous loans from the state have had so many strings tied to them that something like this would probably not be of interest. Suggests that such planning funds should be made available as grant money.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Yes.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

No.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Not applicable.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Would oppose.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Would help. They have found that houses priced at \$300,000 or higher do pay for themselves.

City of Arroyo Grande
Rob Strong, AICP
Community Development Director

Question 1. Your written survey indicated that you have experienced challenges in encouraging infill, planning for more mixed-use developments, planning for more transportation choices, and retaining and developing needed housing. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Allowing for further growth is problematic, primarily stemming from the lack of water resources and traffic impacts. Some revitalization has occurred in the downtown. There are few undeveloped sites in the city without major environmental constraints. The constraints include agricultural land preservation, wetlands, steep slopes, and erosion.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

No response.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

See answer to Question 1.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

The citizens are unsupportive of higher-density development. There is not evidence that there is developer interest in pursuing smart growth. Primary community concerns center on agricultural conservation and open space preservation.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Yes.

-
3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Yes.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

No need for this. Can be handled locally.

5. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Not applicable.

6. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

No. Need rewards for those that provide affordable housing.

7. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Not critical.

City of Oakland

Leslie Gould

Director of Planning and Zoning

Question 1. Your written survey indicated that you have experienced challenges in encouraging infill, increasing land use intensity near transit and in the downtown, preserving open space, and retaining and developing needed housing. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

In general, neighbors want lower density and no rental housing. There is, however, huge support and demand for more affordable housing by renters. Developers want by-right certainty, while neighbors want discretionary review.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Mayor's 10K downtown housing program is an excellent example of smart growth that is effective. Within the past five years there has been a great deal of new housing development underway in the downtown with the encouragement and support of the city, particularly around Lake Merritt and in the Jack London Square area.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

See answer to Question 1 above.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

See answer to Question 1 above.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

See answer to Question 1 above.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Would like to see the state tackle Proposition 13. Thinks a split-roll proposal where nonresidential property would be taxed at a higher rate, with the resulting new revenue being targeted for community amenities, needed housing subsidies, etc., is a good approach to consider.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes, particularly if the money would go for infrastructure.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Yes.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Loans would be more trouble than they would be worth. Suggests grants.

4. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Yes.

5. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Yes.

6. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

No. Could stifle needed development in Oakland.

7. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes. City manager is concerned that housing does not pay its own way.

City of Santa Maria

Jim Stern
City Planner

Question 1. Your written survey indicated that you have experienced challenges in retaining and developing needed housing. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Santa Maria is a pro-growth community. It is not too familiar with the specific components of smart growth. Major concerns center on the need to provide affordable housing and needed social services.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Some success in advocating higher densities, although the extent of it has not been great. Schools are already overcrowded. There has been some commercial revitalization.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Public officials are not interested in mandating walkable communities. See the city as suburbia—need to accommodate the auto.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

No strong advocates for smart growth.

Question 5. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

No answer.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

O.K.

-
2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

O.K.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Not critical. City has enough money to fund planning. Would be interested if it were a grant.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

O.K. as is.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

No. Currently have high sales tax revenue.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Not applicable.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

No. The city has a certified housing element and is doing more than the other cities in Santa Barbara County.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes. They did this in an agreement with the county. Have established a “municipal annuity fund” on recent annexations where the difference between the revenue from future development and the cost to serve it is estimated—developer must pay the difference.

County of Sonoma

Greg Carr

Comprehensive Planning Manager

Question 1. Your written survey indicated that you have not experienced major challenges in promoting smart growth. Explain the extent of concerns.

Major concern has to do with the housing need numbers that come from the state. They do not take into account the constraints associated with financing infrastructure or the agricultural protection policies in the county's plan.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

The county has enacted a right-to-farm ordinance that has helped to protect agricultural land from being converted to urban use. The county also has encouraged future urbanization to be located within incorporated cities or within already urbanized areas of the county. Many of the cities in the county have had a fair amount of revitalization in their downtowns—both retail and housing activity.

ABAG's and MTC's smart growth programs have stimulated smart growth activity through local planning and capital facility grants.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

The high housing need numbers from the state. Although not an immediate problem, in the long run county revenue will not be able to keep up with service demands, and this problem could be linked with the need to encourage revenue-generating uses. Could lead to pressure for revenue sharing between cities and the county.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

The planning commission and the Board of Supervisors are major advocates. Single-family developers and some farmers who want to convert their land to single-family uses frequently oppose smart growth concepts.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Public officials are attempting to respond to their constituents. They recognize that there is inadequate infrastructure to accommodate significant new growth, particularly sewer capacity. Opponents are simply not in synch with the principles of smart growth.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

The state should prepare a land use plan for California. It should focus on balancing jobs and housing, open space, housing needs, etc. In addition, the state should thoroughly reevaluate its housing needs allocation process.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

- 1. Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

O.K. Needs to recognize that rural areas need infrastructure.

- 2. Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Yes.

- 3. Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Yes.

- 4. Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Not convinced that this would be good. Difficult to create exemption criteria that would work in all communities of the state.

- 5. Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Not sure that the county would support this. Likely to lead to loss of county revenue.

- 6. Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Yes. County board recently enacted such a measure.

- 7. Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Fremont
Dan Marks
Planning Manager

Question 1. Your written survey indicated that you have experienced challenges in planning for a significant amount of development on vacant and underused sites, increasing land use intensity near transit and in the downtown, planning for more mixed-use developments, and preserving open space. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

It has been difficult to implement smart growth principles. Housing in the downtown has been very controversial, and mixed-use continues to be controversial because it is perceived to be inconsistent with commercial activities. Finally, open space preservation efforts are in conflict with housing objectives.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Some infill and housing developments, particularly within and around major commercial nodes of activity.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Planning is easy, implementation is hard.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

Advocates include a few citizen action groups. Opponents include businesses and neighborhood groups.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Advocates are motivated by the need to create a more livable community. Opponents are motivated by private market concerns.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

The state should do a study that addresses the question of whether housing pays its own way. Such a study should take into consideration the effects on schools, etc.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

- 1. Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes.

- 2. Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Yes.

- 3. Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Yes.

- 4. Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

There are already sufficient exemptions.

- 5. Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Yes. This could be a major aid in Fremont's efforts to encourage TOD.

- 6. Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

A good idea, but very tough to pass.

- 7. Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Mountain View

Michael Percy
Principal Planner

Question 1. Your written survey indicated that you have experienced challenges in planning for a significant amount of development on vacant and underused sites, increasing land use intensity near transit and in the downtown, planning for more mixed use developments, and preserving open space. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

The downtown has undergone a major transition over the past 10 to 15 years. It has been revitalized with a lot of new retail activity and housing, as well as some new employment development.

The city has had pretty good success with transit-oriented development. However, there has been neighborhood concern about the density of TOD. This has been offset by using a neighborhood planning process, which is time-consuming (six to eight months), but focuses on drawing out and mitigating major problems. Is it density? Bulk? Traffic? The process often results in lower density than was originally proposed, but overall the density within TOD areas is three to five times current density. It is, however, difficult to accommodate more traffic and bulkier development. Points out that according to a recent Bay Area Council report, Mountain View has the third-highest density of all Bay Area cities. Most of the areas being pushed for higher densities are in or adjacent to multifamily areas. City tries to “taper” density when it is moving close to single-family neighborhoods or areas.

Although mixed-use development is popular, it is sometimes difficult to implement because many developers only do residential product and are wary or unknowledgeable about commercial development.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Mountain View has had excellent success—note the recent American Planning Association [national] award for excellence in planning. Particularly noteworthy—TOD, downtown intensification and revitalization, inclusionary zoning, and new urbanism development. City establishes both minimum and maximum densities.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Covered in answer to Question 1.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

The leadership comes mostly from the planning commission and staff. Developers are also a positive force, participating in collaborative planning efforts with neighborhood groups.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Schools sometimes oppose more housing developments due to the impact on their facilities.

In addition, the county congestion management agency only allows 5 percent credit for traffic diversion to transit analysis on TOD. While this may be accurate, it does not take into account the likely long-term diversion potential.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Would like to see the state consider some simplified bonus programs that would reward communities that are doing the right thing. Unfortunately, current state financial reward programs are so complicated and limited in amounts that it does not pay to go after them.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Would be mostly beneficial to newer communities.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas?*

Yes.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Yes.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Yes. A major concern of the development community is time. It would, however, be important to not go too far on this and lead neighbors to think that their concerns are not being addressed.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Would not be beneficial to Mountain View. They have tried to create a balance of residential and commercial uses, and have to absorb the traffic and other impacts of commercial development.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Yes.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Yes. Mountain View recently enacted such a requirement, and it would have been nice to say that it was a state mandate.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Although it would be good to capture more revenue, it would not be a “tipping” issue in approving more housing.

City of Napa
John Yost
Planning Director

Question 1. Your written survey indicated that you have not experienced major challenges in adopting and implementing smart growth. Can you identify any major barriers to smart growth?

The only major barrier is one of politics. It is important for the public and their elected representatives to recognize the value of smart growth and to nurture its implementation.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

In 1975, Napa voters passed a law that established the boundaries of the city (18 square miles). In 1998, the city undertook a comprehensive update to its plan and concluded that it was important to maintain the 18-square-mile boundary to 2020. This included a commitment to raise densities in order to accommodate future growth. Part of the commitment was the need to ensure design excellence. The city has now hired consultants to prepare design guidelines.

As a measure of its commitment to maintaining the growth boundary, the city council proposed an amendment to the city's charter calling for the 18-square-mile limit, and not allowing it to be amended without a vote of the people.

Now the city is relying on vacant land to meet its housing needs. They included this approach in their most recent housing element, which received HCD certification.

Finally, the downtown is undergoing a healthy upturn, with new retail activities.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

See answer to Question 1.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

The pressure to continue the practice of smart growth is coming from the residents, through a bottom-up process. There are no significant opponents.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

To protect the surrounding open space from urbanization, and to do the right thing.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

The state needs to fix local government funding and provide localities with adequate and certain revenue flows. Over the past 10-plus years, state per capita budget increases have gone up at a much faster rate than have the budgets of cities. Some of the state programs are internally inconsistent.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

- 1. Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes.

- 2. Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Yes.

- 3. Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Would hate going to the state for a loan, due to the many strings that would be attached.

- 4. Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

No. CEQA has not been a big problem.

- 5. Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Difficult to answer at this point.

- 6. Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Yes—an excellent idea.

- 7. Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

The city already does this; in fact, it was recently tested in the courts. Does not like the idea of the state mandating it.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Would probably help.

City of Lodi
Konradt Bartlam
Community Development Director

Question 1. Your written survey indicated that you have experienced problems in encouraging infill and developing needed housing. How extensive and intensive has that opposition been?

Historically there was a great deal of NIMBY-type opposition, and that concern was reflected in the attitudes and votes of the city council. As a result, there have been no multifamily units built in the city in many years, and developers are reluctant to try.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Downtown revitalization, a multimodal transit center (Amtrak, county bus, local bus, and Greyhound), and smaller single-family lot sizes (from approximately 7,500 square feet to 5,000 square feet).

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Developers are fearful about pursuing multifamily due to prior anti-development attitudes on the city council.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

Primary advocates are the staff and the city council.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

To do the right thing.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

The state needs to make their policies internally consistent—environmental protection versus housing.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

-
1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes, and the criteria used should recognize the diversity of community types in the state.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Yes.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Not likely to use it, but could be of value for less wealthy communities.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Yes.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Yes.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

It would be important for there to be a demonstrated need before using.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Not strongly supportive since it would remove local control on this issue. There would, however, be some benefit in taking the heat off those city councils that would be interested.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Turlock
Michael Cooke
Planning Manager

Question 1. Your written survey indicated that you have experienced problems in encouraging collaborative partnerships. How extensive and intensive has that opposition been?

Actually, smart growth has been well accepted.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

The city has pushed for smaller single-family lots, alternatives to the auto, and agricultural land protection. Street connectivity is stressed, and although single-family developers were initially resistant to the grid street system (preferring cul-de-sacs) and narrower streets, that problem has been overcome. City hall was relocated into the downtown to encourage revitalization there. In addition, the city has done a lot of infrastructure investment in the downtown (sewers, curbs, and sidewalks).

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

No problems.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

Consistent support from all city players.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

It is the right thing.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

State needs to give incentives to solving the job-housing balance problems. This would include encouraging employment in the Valley and housing in the Bay Area. State should also do more to encourage agricultural land protection—conservation easements funding is needed, particularly for land that is under development pressure.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Concerned that the state will not develop reasonable criteria here.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

O.K.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Yes. A forgivable loan would be great—that is, if a locality accomplished what it set up to do, the loan would not have to be repaid.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

O.K., but it should be put into statute to avoid uncertainty.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Not supportive of this.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Not applicable.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Maybe—it would get opposing developers off the city's back.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes—enthusiastic.

City of Bellflower

Mario Suarez
City Planner

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Most development in Bellflower is infill, including mixed use. There has not been any significant opposition to this at all.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Although not an official city policy, the city is accommodating a great deal of infill development. There are few, if any, large vacant parcels. There are, however, many deep lots with only a single dwelling, and these lots are being converted to multifamily use. In the past 10 years, the population growth was 17.8 percent.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

No obstacles.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

Advocates are staff, planning commission, and elected officials.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

It is the logical thing to do.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Revamp the housing allocations—they are far too high. The state also should provide more rewards for redevelopment.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

-
1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Yes.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Could be useful, but not if there are too many strings attached.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

No problems with CEQA currently.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Although it would seem that this could be more equitable, there are many other reasons why this might not be the right thing to do.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Not applicable.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Let local agencies decide.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Carlsbad
Dennis Turner
Principal Planner

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

No significant opposition to the city's local smart growth efforts. There has, however, been a major concern with the regional council of governments (SANDAG) imposing its land use strategies at the local level. Much of this stems from the fact that SANDAG's population and employment forecast calls for significantly more growth than is being planned for at the local level.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Although SANDAG's forecasts are challenged, their efforts in support of promoting smart growth have gotten localities to focus more on promoting better land use.

The city has four major smart growth objectives: (1) Use land more intensively in order to reduce sprawl. (2) Try to focus future growth on transit in order to decrease auto dependency. (3) Use a facilities-driven plan for accommodating growth, which includes 11 classes of infrastructure performance standards. (4) Convert some commercial land to residential use.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

The imbalance of jobs and housing, which not only relates to a balancing the overall numbers of jobs and housing, but the relationship between housing costs and the wages of Carlsbad residents.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

The city council is quite proud of and strongly supportive of the city's smart growth policies and development review program. Developers complain that the city's comprehensive level-of-service requirements are complicated to interpret and add significant costs to new development.

Question 5. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Do not take funding away from city.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

- 1. Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes, but caution is urged. Should be consistent with local growth forecast, not state or regional projections.

- 2. Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

O.K.

- 3. Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Perhaps.

- 4. Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Yes, if for smaller projects. Not supportive of outright exemptions that direct development to be approved "by-right."

- 5. Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Open to looking at this, and this has been proposed within the San Diego region. Needs to recognize that those localities with significant retail facilities have had to plan for and fund infrastructure needed for these activities.

- 6. Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Yes, if used for revitalizing and upgrading older areas near transit, not necessarily vacant land in suburbs.

- 7. Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Conceptually, yes, but concerned about the state being too prescriptive here.

- 8. Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes, but where would the money come from? Who would lose revenue?

City of Vallejo
Brian Dolan
Planning Manager

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Although there is an antidensity contingent in the community, it has not altered city policies or stopped opportunities for increased revitalization and multifamily housing that is being advocated along the waterfront. There has been support for small-lot, single-family development. The concerns that have been raised focus on traffic, parking, and changing community character.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

At Mare Island and along the waterfront. The primary advocates for smart growth are the staff, and the planning commission and city council have been supportive. Although the private sector has been supportive, in one case the developer wanted to develop single-family rather than the multifamily that was being encouraged by the city.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Barriers include resident opposition, due primarily to fears about traffic and a change in community character.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

Opponents are single-family developers who would prefer lower densities so as to make the greatest profit. The primary advocates include staff and, to a lesser extent, the city council. Long-term city council members support the long-standing, level-of-service standards, while newer council members are less supportive.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

One interesting motivation for multifamily development came as a result of a legal settlement with the city that centered on the need for more housing.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Funds for affordable housing. Do not interfere with local land use control.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

- 1. Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes.

- 2. Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

O.K.

- 3. Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Yes, if they were grants. Not interested in loans.

- 4. Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Do not feel the need for additional state exemptions, although not inherently opposed to them.

- 5. Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Open to looking at this.

- 6. Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Yes. This could be particularly useful in one area of the city right now.

- 7. Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

State action may be the only way this would happen here.

- 8. Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Fillmore

Kevin Sweeney
City Planner

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Community has been generally supportive of modest increases in density and mixed land uses. A countywide initiative (SOAR) established an urban growth boundary that disallows sprawl-type development. There has been some concern from housing advocates outside the community that the city is not doing enough to plan for and encourage needed farmworker housing; city has felt its efforts have been satisfactory.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Very good support for infill. The city has increased its allowable density to 50 units per acre and allowed mixed-use development in the downtown.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Friction with the regional council of governments (SCAG) regarding the housing needs in Fillmore.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

There has not been any major opposition.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Prefer growing up rather than out.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Funds to assist smart growth development—for public improvements and housing subsidies.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

-
1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

O.K.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Not necessary in Fillmore. Would prefer infrastructure funds.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Not necessary.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Absolutely yes.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Not applicable.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

No. Opposed to anything being mandated by the state.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Irvine
Sheri Vander Dussen
Director of Community Development

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

There has not been any opposition to smart growth.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

It is important to recognize that Irvine is a new community and there is little infill that is either encouraged or taking place. All development is following a master plan that calls for good pedestrian circulation options, and contiguous open space that has been protected through the use of transfer of development rights.

The city is now exploring mixed-use concepts. They are also interested in promoting light rail (called the “center line”) as well as transit-oriented development around future stations.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Developers are resistant to mixed use and would seem to prefer to just do residential development, since it is a tested and successful product.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

There are a few no-growth advocates in the city, but their point of view is not widely shared. Advocates include staff, planning commission, and the city council.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Want to protect the features of the original master plan.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Quit taking away local revenue. Change tax laws that discourage the approval of needed housing. Make state programs and policies clearer and less inconsistent internally.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

- 1. Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

O.K.

- 2. Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

O.K.

- 3. Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Not of interest within Irvine.

- 4. Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Not an issue in Irvine, but it could be desirable in other communities within the region.

- 5. Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Have not researched the effect.

- 6. Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

This idea would have great potential in conjunction with the establishment of light rail.

- 7. Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

No. Opposed to anything being mandated by the state. Have adopted an inclusionary trigger that is connected with the availability of funds.

- 8. Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Huntington Beach

Mary Beth Broener
Principal Planner

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

There is concern about mixed use—noise versus quiet residential activity. Significant neighborhood concern about density. As a result, the city is not pressing for more compact pattern of development.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

No proactive effort, but if a good smart growth project comes along, the city would be open to considering it.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Resistance to change.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

No support.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Not applicable.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

State should stop taking property tax dollars away. Also concerned about loss of vehicle license fees. State should provide more infrastructure funds to cities and counties. Perhaps the state should modify the General Plan law to require localities to address smart growth and sustainable development.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Not a priority. Need infrastructure funds.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

O.K.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

O.K.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Not sure. Would need to analyze.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Would likely be beneficial to city, but still not sure.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Yes. City would like to encourage development in vicinity of its bus center, and this tool could be particularly helpful.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Yes. Currently require 10 percent BMR units for projects with three or more units.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Folsom
Michael Johnson
Assistant Director—Planning Services

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Much land is already entitled; city is trying to get developers to agree to retrofit with smart growth ideas such as pedestrian amenities, transit access, and possibly mixed use.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Not too much yet; are looking at examples in other areas.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Previous entitlements and accommodating projected growth within the community.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

Support is broad-based. Some opposition to the rate and type of development.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Protect community character.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

State should come up with approaches that encourage interjurisdictional problem solving and regional agreements.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Has merit. Possible downside is that it could turn into a beauty contest and communities like Folsom could get cut out.

-
2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

O.K.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Yes. Particularly as local general fund budget impacts become more severe.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Yes. Need to eliminate ability of NIMBYs to delay projects that are consistent with overall plan. Still need to allow for local input on infill projects.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Not supportive. Could lead to cities trying to attract housing growth into inappropriate areas just to raise money. Would prefer promoting interjurisdictional tax-sharing agreements such as one recently being pursued between Roseville and Rocklin.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Yes. Light rail is coming and this tool could be very effective.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Yes. Impact fees can offset initial drag of new residential development on cost of services, but not in the long run.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Baldwin Park

Amy Harbin
Principal Planner

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Particularly negative on the concept of higher density, and to mixed use if it is connected with higher density.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Although there have been some minor increases in density, it is not really happening here. There is talk of a Metro-link service, and this could lead to some TOD-type discussion.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Community is primarily Hispanic, with small lots, small houses, and overcrowding. The need is for more services, not more density.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

No support.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Protect current character.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Funds and financial incentives.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

1. Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.

O.K.

-
2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

O.K.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

O.K., but community is built out. Really need money for capital infrastructure to revitalize current community.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Not necessary.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Pass on this.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Concerned that it could be abused at the expense of the county and its needed services.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

No. Already have significant percentage of affordable housing, why have more?

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of San Bruno
Mark Sullivan
Redevelopment Manager

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Most community concerns have centered on density and traffic. The San Francisco International Airport (SFO) has opposed new development in proximity to their activities.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Recently adopted a redevelopment plan that calls for mixed use on a site previously occupied by the Navy. Redoing a shopping center adjacent to new BART station.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Resident concerns—changing community character. Proximity to SFO and the resulting noise impacts.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

Major proponents are staff. MTC's planning and capital grants have acted as an impetus to pursue smart growth plans and projects. Opponents are residents opposed to more density and traffic, as well as SFO.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

See above.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

State should put out information explaining what smart growth is; also provide direction and ideas. State should emphasize that it is resolving more than local problems.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

-
1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes, so long as it does not preclude opportunities for rewarding communities that have not done a great deal yet.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

O.K.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Yes.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Not sure.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Willing to look at this. While it makes sense conceptually, it could have a negative effect on a locality.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Yes.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Maybe so. Do not currently have a local requirement.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Loma Linda

Lori Ludi
Senior Planner

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Density is a sensitive issue to both residents and city officials.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Community is very interested in walkability. Vacant land in a former flood-prone area has been opened up to development and may open up an opportunity for mixed-use development.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Too early to tell.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

Advocates—planning commission wants walkable community. Staff is pushing for higher-density development (25 to 30 units per acre versus current maximum of 20 units per acre).

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Not applicable.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Housing-need numbers supplied by the state are too high—cannot be accommodated, forces unacceptable densities. State is unresponsive and internal strategies are often inconsistent. Also concern that a state raid on the vehicle license fees will impact local finances.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

-
1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

O.K.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Grants are fine. Uncertain about loans and how they would have to be paid back.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Yes.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

No. City has worked hard to get good economic development; would not want to share revenue with communities that have not done a good job of planning.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Might be good.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

O.K. Most are already doing this.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Mammoth Lakes
Mike Vance
Community Development Director

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

No opposition generally. Would be some concern to raising densities—could lose community character.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Urban growth boundaries established and defended. General plan sets a clear vision.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Community character change.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

No major opposition so far.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Too early to tell.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Local funding flexibility regarding use of transfer tax, taxing districts for free transit, collection of fees for transit.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes, or for projects.

-
2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

O.K.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

No, too many strings. Do not need state help. Developers will pay for preparation of specific plan.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Yes.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

No.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Yes.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

No. Done locally. City requires commercial development to house 60 percent of employees somewhere in the city.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Chico
Kim Seidler
Planning Director

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Big opposition to increased infill density. Local airport has advocated against more density and housing near their facility.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Have had success—density has been gradually raised since the 1980s. One traditional neighborhood development is now being developed.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Not getting private-sector interest in doing multifamily.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

Opposition comes from neighborhood groups. Also, developers would prefer to just develop single-family—not wanting to change their successful model and increase risk.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Protect community character.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Assist in researching positive changes that could help achieve smart growth. Present arguments as to why locals should pursue it—what are the benefits?

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

-
1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

No. Afraid that only a limited number of communities would be rewarded.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Same as above.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Yes—definitely has possibilities

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

O.K., but occasionally there are sensitive environmental issues that need to be assessed.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Not sure.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Yes.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Has merit, but might actually discourage needed housing development.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Probably would make no difference in approving housing.

City of Hollister
Raymond Hetherington
Community Development Director

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Do not want to change single-family character that has been built to house Silicon Valley workers. Concern regarding increased density.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Not too much so far. Mostly still seeing and approving big boxes.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

No train service in community. Do have a general plan rating system for large projects that sets standards for proximity to fire stations, parks, sewer capacity, etc.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

Neighborhood groups oppose density. One positive is state money for job-housing balance.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Changing character.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Housing needs should push for balancing jobs and housing.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Perhaps.

-
2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Perhaps.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Prefer grants. Not sure that city would have money to repay loan.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Yes—raise thresholds.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Would want to look at this. Could hurt Hollister—sales tax is number one revenue source.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Not applicable.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

No. Opposed to anything being mandated by the state.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

Kern County
Cheryl Casdorff
Senior Planner

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Preservation of agricultural land opposed by impacted property owners.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

County and the City of Bakersfield are doing a joint General Plan. Have restricted the use of septic tanks, which has stopped leapfrog development in the county. County only allows urban development on the edges of city urban areas.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Not really pursuing infill or mixed use.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

Not applicable.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Not applicable.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Longer-term Williamson Act.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

1. Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.

Not sure.

-
2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Not sure.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Yes.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Not necessary.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Not sure.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Not applicable.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

No—housing in Kern is low-cost already.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of San Diego
Gary Halbert
Chief Deputy Planning Director

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Little opposition from a policy standpoint. Objections come from community groups on how it would be implemented, and particularly how to correct current deficiencies in the community in the process of encouraging infill. Most deficiency areas relate to parks, libraries, and transportation.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

Mid-city redevelopment area is going to be a mixed-use infill community near Interstate 15. They have also seen some good quality infill, and some mixed use. Finally, they have focused on developing a joint-use school site in conjunction with additional housing in one part of San Diego, called their “model school site.”

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Need to correct deficiencies within existing neighborhoods before (or in conjunction with) infill.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

See above. No major opposition.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Residents and city officials—to protect and enhance the quality of life. Developers—good market for smart growth-type development.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Infrastructure funds to support smart growth. Also need to deal with construction defect liability problem.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner’s response, are noted below.

-
1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Yes.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Loans would not be helpful. Grants would be O.K., but really need infrastructure money to correct deficiencies noted above.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Yes—could use more here.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Great, but not practical politically.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Love it.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Would hope that this could be done locally.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of San Jose
Laurel Prevetti
Deputy Director of Planning

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Opposition depends on the neighborhood and where things are in the entitlement process. Working through neighborhood concerns requires time, education, and being responsive to those concerns that can be addressed. Overall, the city council's commitment to more transit-centered development is understood. Some particular concerns about one land use classification that sets a minimum density without a maximum—makes neighbors nervous about the possible scale of future projects.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

The city has adopted an urban growth boundary and has, for the past five to ten years, been moving toward accommodating projected development along transit corridors inside the growth boundary. In addition, the city has passed park and library bonds and is now attempting to direct these and other public capital projects to support the projected new intensity of development. One of the keys to success has been to focus future development on vacant and underused commercial rather than on residential sites.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

See above. Need to be less abstract in conveying smart growth development concepts. Requires constant diligence.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

See above.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

See above.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

State needs to deal with the fiscalization of land use. Revenue-sharing makes sense; state should look at ways of encouraging that. State should expand the tax credit program—very helpful in addressing affordable housing. Also, state should encourage a city-county model of agreement on the location of urban development along the lines that have been in place in Santa Clara County for years.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

- 1. Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes. Need to recognize that the state housing benchmark is not achievable.

- 2. Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Yes.

- 3. Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Not needed.

- 4. Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Yes. They would like to be able to center the CEQA review in the adoption of zoning or specific plans, then exempt conforming projects from another round of CEQA review.

- 5. Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Willing to look at this. Not sure.

- 6. Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Seems like an excellent idea. Another idea is to set up one redevelopment plan for the entire community, then transfer the tax increments to the areas that need it the most. Would be important to protect needed county services under this approach.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Perhaps yes, would level the playing field. However, there are issues that deserve special attention: could kill off housing market, may need to be phased in to minimize private sector upset.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Gardena
Kathy Ikari
Community Development Director

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

Not a major issue, one way or the other.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

The city does not have a policy that encourages the elements of smart growth. Looking at the siting of new developments and getting the most out of them. Trying to encourage mixed uses, and are looking for grants to study this.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

Not clear about how to make mixed-use zoning work. General property owner focus is on security, not on land use issues.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

Major advocates are staff and the planning commission.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

Not a priority issue.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Would be helpful if the state provided some guidelines on how localities can promote smart growth. In addition, carrying out smart growth will require resources for planning—how about state grant funds to support it?

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner's response, are noted below.

1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Yes.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Yes.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Unnecessary.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Yes—could stop interjurisdictional fighting and lawsuits.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Not applicable.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Already accommodate a great deal of affordable housing.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Yes.

City of Los Angeles
Michael Davies
City Planner

Question 1. How extensive and intensive has the opposition to smart growth been?

No major opposition at all.

Question 2. To what extent are you seeing smart growth concepts being implemented in your jurisdiction?

The trend is improving. Development is starting to follow the principles of smart growth. Have seen significant housing development in the central business district, the area best served by transit. Have not seen a great deal of new transit-oriented development along the new rail transit lines since those areas already were quite dense.

Question 3. What do you see as the major obstacles to implementation of smart growth concepts?

The absence of effective incentives and disincentives. Infill development must provide significant incentives in order to be responsive to community concerns; this raises development costs and discourages development.

Question 4. When you deal with either planning policy development or implementation, who are the major advocates and opponents of smart growth planning concepts?

No opposition. A number of groups advocate smart growth policies and projects; they include SCAG, various “livable community” groups, the Westside Coalition, the Southern California Land Use and Transportation Coalition, and a handful of the 15 city council members.

Question 5. How would you describe the motivations of advocates and opponents?

No response.

Question 6. What actions could the state take that would be both effective in facilitating smart growth plans and acceptable to the constituencies that would have implementation responsibilities?

Answered below.

A number of possible state policies or programs were presented for reaction. These possibilities, along with the planner’s response, are noted below.

1. *Give priority for state funding to those communities who can demonstrate that they are implementing key smart growth principles.*

Yes.

2. *Focus state capital investments within designated growth areas.*

Yes, particularly if those funding strategies were linked with funds from the regional transportation planning agencies.

3. *Establish a revolving loan fund that would be available to localities for developing specific plans.*

Not critical.

4. *Allow localities to exempt infill projects in designated areas from EIR preparation, provided they are consistent with a plan that has been developed in the last 10 years.*

Unnecessary.

5. *Change the method of sales tax distribution from point-of-sale to a population basis.*

Yes—could stop interjurisdictional fighting and lawsuits.

6. *Allow transit-oriented development to be encouraged through tax-increment financing, similar to the approach used in redevelopment areas.*

Strong support for this to stimulate desired development.

7. *Establish a mandatory inclusionary housing requirement for housing projects larger than 20 units in localities with a vacancy rate below, for example, three percent.*

Currently, Los Angeles only applies this within a few specific plan areas. Could be good if this were done across the board.

8. *Allow localities to receive a larger share of the property tax generated by new housing development.*

Do not think it would make a difference in encouraging needed housing.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit
BMR	below market rate
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CHFA	California Housing Finance Agency
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
Federal pass-through funds	Federal monies given to a state or local government to support specific area programs
HCD	Housing and Community Development
Lanterman Act	An entitlement granting services and support for persons with developmental disabilities, those at risk of developing a developmental disability, and their families
LEM	Location Efficient Mortgages
LUPIN	Land Use Planning Information Network
MTC	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
NIMBY	Not in My Backyard
OPR	Office of Planning and Research
PPIC	Public Policy Institute of California
PPSQ	people per square mile
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Allocation
SANDAG	San Diego Association of Governments
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
TOD	Transit-Oriented Development

Williamson Act	Land Conservation Act of 1965, which provides for lowered property taxes for lands maintained in agricultural and certain open space uses
----------------	---

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABAG – Association of Bay Area Governments. *Regional Livability Footprint Project: Shaping the Future of the Nine-County Bay Area* (Briefing Book for Public Workshop Participants and Other Bay Area Residents). Oakland, CA: ABAG– Association of Bay Area Governments, 2001.
- _____. *Regional Livability Footprint Project: Shaping the Future of the Nine-County Bay Area* (Alternatives Report for Round Two Public Workshop Participants and Other Bay Area Residents). Oakland, CA: ABAG–Association of Bay Area Governments, 2002.
- Abel, David. *What If? New Schools, Better Neighborhoods, More Livable Communities*. (Metropolitan Forum Project report). San Francisco, CA: The James Irvine Foundation, 1999.
- Binger, Gary, et. al. *Making Better Communities by Linking Land Use and Transportation*. Oakland, CA: Association of Bay Area Governments, 1997.
- Brewster, George B. *Land Recycling and the Creation of Sustainable Communities: A Strategy for Ensuring Prosperity and Quality of Life for Californians in the 21st Century*. San Francisco, CA: California Center for Land Recycling.
- California Center for Regional Leadership. *The State of California's Regions* (A Report on the New Regionalism in California). San Francisco, CA: California Center for Regional Leadership, 2001.
- Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy. *Land Use and The California Economy: Principles for Prosperity and Quality of Life*. Los Angeles, CA: Californians and the Land, 1999.
- Henton, Doug, and Kim Walesh. *Linking the New Economy to the Livable Community* (Collaborative Economics Report). San Francisco, CA: The James Irvine Foundation, 1998.
- Levy, Stephen. *Economic and Demographic Trends in California*. Washington, D.C.: ULI–The Urban Land Institute, 2001.
- Morales, Jeff. *Statewide Transit-Oriented Development Study: Factors for Success in California* (Executive Summary). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Transportation, 2002.
- Moss, Steven. *Smart Growth Versus Sprawl in California*. A Report for the American Farmland Trust, 1999.
- Nelson, Dick, John Niles, and Aharon Hibshoosh. *A New Planning Template for Transit-Oriented Development* (Mineta Transportation Institute Report 01-12). San Jose, CA: San José State University, College of Business, 2001.

- O'Neill, David. *The Smart Growth Tool Kit*. Washington D.C.: ULI – Urban Land Institute, 2000.
- Pepper, Edith M. *Strategies for Promoting Brownfield Reuse in California: A Blueprint for Policy Reform* (California Center for Land Recycling Report). San Francisco, CA: California Center for Land Recycling, 1998.
- Sanders, Steve. *A Strategic Scan of Smart Growth Issues in California*. Miami, FL: Funder's Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities, 2001.
- Schreiber, Kenneth, et al. *Sustainable Communities* (The Mineta Transportation Institute Draft Final Report). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Transportation, 2001.
- Smart Growth Caucus. "Growth Challenges in the Golden State: Smart Growth Caucus Briefing Book." [online report]. California: California State Assembly [last modified 28 February 2001, accessed April 2002]. Available at: http://assembly.ca.gov/sgc/SGBriefings_book.htm.
- Speakers Commission on Regionalism. *The New California Dream: Regional Solutions for 21st Century Challenges* (Final Report). San Francisco, CA: California Center for Regional Leadership, 2002.
- The Urban Land Institute. *Report on ULI's Smart Growth Initiative*. Washington, D.C.: ULI–The Urban Land Institute, 1999.
- _____. *State Incentives and Regulatory Reforms to Promote Smart Growth in California* (A Community Outreach Advisory Services Workshop (San Diego, CA) Report). Washington, D.C.: ULI–The Urban Land Institute, 2001.

WEBSITES

Association of Bay Area Governments: Regional Planning. <http://www.abag.ca.gov>

Environmental Working Group: Cutting-Edge Research on Health and the Environment.
<http://www.ewg.org/>

Land Use Planning Information Network (LUPIN). <http://ceres.ca.gov/planning>

League of California Cities: Policy Development/Smart Growth Information.
<http://www.cacities.org>

Metropolitan Transportation Commission: Transportation for Livable Communities and Housing
Improvement programs. <http://www.mtc.ca.gov>

Natural Resources Defense Council. <http://www.nrdc.org/>

Public Policy Institute of California. <http://www.ppic.org>

Sierra Club: Explore, Enjoy, and Protect the Planet. <http://www.sierraclub.org/>

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Kenneth R. Schreiber, AICP

Kenneth Schreiber, Principal Investigator of this report, is a self-employed land use and transportation planning consultant. He has served as a planner, senior planner, and assistant planning director in Rockford-Winnebago County, Illinois; an assistant planning director, director of planning and community environment, and deputy city manager of Palo Alto, California; and opened his Palo Alto-based consulting services office in January 2000.

Schreiber earned a Bachelor of Science in History from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, a Master of Arts in History from Columbia University, a Master of Arts in Urban Studies from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and a Master of Arts in Public Administration from Golden Gate University.

His areas of research interest include strategic planning, land use, rural and urban transportation planning, and transportation demand management.

Gary Binger, Research Associate

Research Associate Gary Binger is a self-employed land use consultant. He has extensive experience in land use, development processing and intergovernmental coordination. In California, he has served as an assistant planner in Concord; an associate planner in Oakland; planning director for the city of Del Mar; chief of planning and community development director for the city of Walnut Creek; and deputy executive director and planning director of the Association of Bay Area Governments.

Binger earned his Bachelor of Architecture degree from Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo and his Master of Urban Planning degree from the University of Washington, Seattle. He also pursued graduate study at the University of Manchester, England, where he studied the British New Town Program.

His areas of research interest include land use, planning studies, public participation, and law and environment regulations.

Dennis Church, Research Associate

Research Associate Dennis Church is president of EcoIQ, a Cupertino-based Internet publishing, digital media, and client services company specializing in environmental management, land use planning, and transportation.

Church holds a degree in journalism from San José State University.

His areas of research interest include rural and urban transportation planning, state and regional transportation planning, land use, and energy and ecological systems.

PRE-PUBLICATION PEER REVIEW

San José State University, of the California State University system, and the MTI Board of Trustees have agreed upon a peer review process required for all research published by MTI. The purpose of the review process is to ensure that the results presented are based upon a professionally acceptable research protocol.

Research projects begin with the approval of a scope of work by the sponsoring entities, with in-process reviews by the MTI Research Director and the project sponsor. Periodic progress reports are provided to the MTI Research Director and the Research Associates Policy Oversight Committee (RAPOC). Review of the draft research product is conducted by the Research Committee of the Board of Trustees and may include invited critiques from other professionals in the subject field. The review is based on the professional propriety of the research methodology.

MTI FOUNDER

Hon. Norman Y. Mineta

MTI BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Hon. Don Young**

Chair
Transportation and Infrastructure
Committee
House of Representatives
Washington, DC

Hon. James L. Oberstar**

Ranking Member
Transportation and Infrastructure
Committee
House of Representatives
Washington, DC

Michael S. Townes*

Executive Director
Transportation District Comm. of
Hampton Roads
Hampton, VA

Hon. John Horsley^

Executive Director
American Association of State
Highway & Transportation
Officials (AASHTO)
Washington, DC

Hon. Rod Diridon#

Executive Director
Mineta Transportation Institute
San Jose, CA

Rebecca Brewster

Director/COO
American Transportation
Research Institute
Atlanta, GA

Donald H. Camph

President
California Institute for
Technology Exchange
Los Angeles, CA

Anne P. Canby

President
Surface Transportation
Policy Project
Washington, DC

Dr. David Conrath

Dean
College of Business
San José State University
San Jose, CA

Hank Dittmar

President/CEO
Great American Station Foundation
Las Vegas, NM

Bill Dorey

Vice President/COO
Granite Construction
Watsonville, CA

David Gunn

President/CEO
Amtrak
Washington, DC

Steve Heminger

Executive Director
Metropolitan Transportation
Commission
Oakland, CA

Celia Kupersmith

General Manager
Golden Gate Bridge,
Highway, and Transportation District
San Francisco, CA

Dr. Thomas Larson

Administrator (Ret.)
Federal Highway Administration
Lemont, PA

Bob Lingwood

President/CEO (Ret.)
British Columbia Ferry Corporation
Victoria, British Columbia

Brian Macleod

Senior Vice President
Gillig Corporation
Hayward, CA

William W. Millar

President
American Public
Transportation Association (APTA)
Washington, DC

William C. Nevel

Chair
National High Speed
Ground Transportation Association
Washington, DC

Hans Rat

Secretary General
Union Internationale des
Transports Publics
Bruxelles, Belgium

Lawrence Reuter

President
New York City Transit Authority
Brooklyn, NY

Vickie Shaffer

General Manager
The Tri-State Transit Authority
Huntington, WV

Paul Toliver#

Vice President
Transportation Computer
Intelligence 2
Seattle, WA

David L. Turney

Chair/President/CEO
Digital Recorders, Inc.
Research Triangle Park, NC

Edward Wytkind

Executive Director
Transportation Trades
Department, AFL-CIO
Washington, DC

** Honorary

* Chair

^ Vice Chair

Past Chair

Directors

Hon. Rod Diridon

Executive Director

Hon. Trixie Johnson

Research Director

Dr. Peter Haas

Education Director

Leslee Hamilton

Communications Director

Research Associates Policy Oversight Committee

Dr. Richard Werbel, Chair
Professor, Dept. of Marketing/
Decision Sciences
San José State University

Dr. Burton Dean, Vice Chair
Professor, Dept. of Organization &
Management (ret.)
San José State University

Dr. Jan Botha
Professor, Dept. of Civil &
Environmental Engineering
San José State University

Dayana Salazar
Associate Professor,
Acting Department Chair,
Dept. of Urban &
Regional Planning
San José State University

Dr. Dongsung Kong
Associate Professor,
Dept. of Political Science
San José State University

Diana Wu
Research Librarian
Martin Luther King, Jr. Library
San José State University



MTI

Funded by
U.S. Department of
Transportation and
California Department
of Transportation

