

# **Sustainable Communities/ San Joaquin Valley Growth Response**

Draft Final Report:  
**Sustainable Communities**

**Kenneth R. Schreiber  
Dennis Church  
Gary Binger  
Dayana Salazar  
Dr. Richard Taketa**

**May 2001**

Prepared under a Grant from the State of California  
Department of Transportation  
Division of Transportation Planning

By

**The Mineta Transportation Institute  
Established as the Norman Y. Mineta  
International Institute for  
Surface Transportation Policy Studies**

Created by Congress in 1991

## Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. FHWA/CA/OR-00/XX	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipients Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Sustainable Communities Draft Final Report		5. Report Date May 2001	
		6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Authors Kenneth R. Schreiber, Gary Binger, Dennis Church, Richard Taketa and Dayana Salazar		8. Performing Organization Report No.  Not applicable	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Norman Y. Mineta International Institute for Surface Transportation Policy Studies (Mineta Transportation Institute) San José State University – BT 550 San Jose, CA 95192-0219		10. Work Unit No.	
		11. Contract or Grant No. WA 55994784 WA 55994790, WA 07A0016.2	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address California Department of Transportation, Transportation Planning 1120 N Street P O Box 942874 Sacramento, CA 92474-0001		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Draft Final Report	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes This research project was financially sponsored by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Staff in the Office of Policy Analysis and Research, Division of Transportation Planning, provided both substance and support during the interactive process that resulted in the draft final report.			
16. Abstract The Mineta Transportation Institute at San José State University conducted this study to investigate current development and growth trends and the nature of sustainable communities, smart growth, and livable communities development concepts. The primary objective was to identify actions that the state, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), regional and local governments and the private sector could take to address growth in a sustainable, smart and livable manner. The project team's recommendations were reviewed and modified following consideration of comments by Caltrans and a group of external reviewers.  <b>SUMMARY OR PROBLEM:</b> At the global, national, state, regional and local levels, continuation of existing development patterns and growth trends could result in a future that many consider undesirable in terms of impacts on environmental quality and economic prosperity, equity opportunities for traditionally under served and under represented populations, and the sufficiency of public and private resources to provide desired services. California's Department of Finance projects that the state's population will grow by roughly 10.7 million people between 2000 and 2020 and an additional 13.2 million between 2020 and 2040. At the same time, this population is becoming more diverse racially, ethnically, linguistically and economically. This population growth is spreading out geographically.  <b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b> A concerted effort by state, regional and local governments and the private sector is warranted to avoid living conditions that many will regard as having numerous major quality of life problems. To avoid many of these problems, the state will need to assume a strong leadership role. Specific recommendations, reflecting detailed guidance by Caltrans staff in the Office of Policy Analysis and Research, Division of Transportation Planning, are provided for the state, Caltrans, regional and local governments and the private sector.			
17. Key Words land use planning; population growth; regional planning; sustainable development; transportation planning		18. Distribution Statement This Final Draft Report will be provided to the Sponsoring Agency, which will be responsible for any revision, publication and distribution.	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	Security Classifi. (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 58	22. Price Not Applicable

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<b>BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>The Transportation Setting</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>THE PROBLEM STATEMENT</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>The Global Challenge</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>The National Challenge</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>The California Challenge</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>The Local Community Challenge</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>EMERGING CONCEPTS</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Definitions</b> .....	<b>10</b>
Sustainable Communities .....	10
Livable Communities .....	10
Smart Growth .....	11
<b>EXISTING TRENDS AND PRACTICES</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>The United States in an International Perspective</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>Trends and Practices Related to Concerns About Future Conditions</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>CHANGE IS EMERGING</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>A National Perspective</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>California Perspective: Indicators of Change</b> .....	<b>18</b>
Business Advocacy for Change .....	19
Environmental Movements .....	19
Social Justice Movements .....	20
Open Space and Agricultural Land Preservation .....	20
Urban Growth Boundaries .....	21

Infill Development .....	21
Voter Support for Transit .....	22
State Encouragement for Inter-Regional Partnerships .....	22
Smart Growth Legislation .....	22
Regional Planning Initiatives .....	23
Local Government Sustainability Initiatives .....	24
Increasing Role for Citizen Participation and Partnerships .....	24
Formation of Regional and State Coalitions .....	25
Increasing Use of Technology .....	27
<b>BARRIERS AND CONTRARY INCENTIVES .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Four General Types of Barriers .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Specific Barriers .....</b>	<b>29</b>
Local Government Fiscal Needs .....	29
Automobile Dependency and Inadequate Public Transportation .....	31
Insufficient Infrastructure Funds .....	30
Funding for Planning .....	30
Public Opposition to Compact Development .....	29
Public Opposition to Increasing Housing Supply and Affordability .....	29
Financing and Lending Practices .....	30
Threats to Local Control of Land Use .....	29
Fragmented Planning Processes .....	31
Regional Diversity .....	31
Lack of a Coordinated and Consistent Local, Regional and State Vision .....	32
<b>What is needed to overcome barriers? .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>The State of California .....</b>	<b>36</b>
Recommendations for the State .....	36
<b>Caltrans .....</b>	<b>38</b>
Recommendations for Caltrans .....	38
<b>Regional Agencies .....</b>	<b>42</b>
Recommendations for Regional Agencies .....	43
<b>Local Agencies .....</b>	<b>44</b>
Recommendations for Local Agencies .....	44
<b>Regional and Statewide Non-Profit Organizations .....</b>	<b>47</b>
Recommendations for Non-Profit Organizations .....	47
<b>Business and Development Interests .....</b>	<b>48</b>

---

Recommendations for Business and Development Interests .....	48
<b>Community-Based Organizations and the General Public .....</b>	<b>48</b>
Recommendations .....	48
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT A: SELECTED SOURCES .....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Books .....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Articles, Reports &amp; Studies .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Online Sources .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>ATTACHMENT B: TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FUNDING SOURCES.....</b>	<b>55</b>



## Sustainable Communities Study

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Mineta Transportation Institute (MTI), established as the Norman Y. Mineta International Institute for Surface Transportation Policy Studies (IISTPS) at San José State University, conducted this study in conjunction with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) between June 2000 and May 2001. The purpose of the study is to investigate current development and growth trends and to explore the usefulness of new approaches to planning – specifically the concepts of sustainable communities, smart growth, and livable communities – to better manage California’s projected future growth. Within that overall purpose, the usefulness of new planning approaches to meeting the state’s future mobility and accessibility needs is of particular importance.

Several key factors define the context for this study. They are described and documented in this report and in much greater detail in the Working Papers produced as part of this effort. These factors include:

- Continuing population and economic growth is raising concerns about global sustainability. A significant number of business and political leaders and scientists are expressing concern that today’s growing consumption (and related environmental impacts) could jeopardize the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Fossil fuel-powered auto-oriented transportation systems are an important element of this global concern.
- Projected growth from the current California population of approximately 34 million (roughly 10.7 million people between 2000 and 2020 and an additional 13.2 million between 2020 and 2040) is causing many of California’s leaders – governmental, business, non-profit, and community – to fear that current methods of managing growth (and meeting mobility and accessibility needs) could result in significant future economic, quality of life, and environmental quality problems for California and its communities.
- Interest is growing rapidly, around the world, the nation, and the state, in new approaches to community planning and development that could accommodate expected growth with fewer adverse impacts. This interest focuses on planning approaches that (among other things) would reduce the rate of growth in vehicle miles traveled, facilitate more balanced development, promote the practicality of transit, biking, walking, and other alternative modes of transportation, and increase accessibility by non-transportation means (including substituting the movement of information for the movement of people and things).

As a result of the research undertaken for this study, it was concluded that:

- At the global, national, state and local levels, continuation of existing development patterns and growth trends could result in a future that many consider undesirable in terms of impacts on environmental quality and economic prosperity, equity opportunities for traditionally

under-served and under-represented populations, and the sufficiency of public and private resources to provide desired facilities and services (including accessibility and mobility).

- The concepts of sustainable communities, livable communities, and smart growth, as being applied, can contribute significantly to reducing many of the problems of concern, and specifically can contribute to meeting the future mobility and accessibility needs of California.
- Smart, sustainable, livable development patterns will be difficult to implement widely and consistently without changing the incentives for developers, residents, and local governments. Key areas of change include the relationship of local plans to finances, incentives created by tax codes, regional frameworks for decision making, and state policies backed by consistent investments.
- The state will need to assume a strong leadership role. Although the state cannot and should not act solely to solve the many growth-related challenges facing California, no other level of government can achieve what the state can accomplish. Most regional agencies are limited by the unwillingness of local governments, who provide much of their political and financial support, to vest them with sufficient planning responsibility and authority. Local jurisdictions, on the other hand, lack the authority and political support to address comprehensively and consistently the broader regional and state issues.

As a result of these conclusions, the project team developed a wide range of recommendations concerning actions that the state, Caltrans, regional and local governments and the private sector could take to address growth in a sustainable, smart and livable manner. The project team's recommendations were reviewed by Caltrans and revised in consultation with Caltrans staff. Key recommendations include:

- The state should develop and implement a comprehensive strategy, including a comprehensive set of state sustainable development, smart growth and livable community goals, policies and criteria, as has been done in the states of Florida, Maryland, New Jersey, and Oregon. The strategy should have a strong orientation to urban revitalization, and it should focus priority efforts on providing residential and employment opportunities within already developed areas. Where expansion of the urbanized area is needed, the expanded area should be designed to be sustainable, livable and smart. The strategy should also incorporate protecting the state's agricultural areas (avoiding wherever possible expanding urban areas into prime agricultural land). The state planning process would then need to be revised to coordinate the actions and investments of state agencies and departments, consistent with these goals, policies and criteria.
- The state should reform the state-local fiscal relationship (tax structure, grant award criteria, funding programs, etc.) to promote more balanced land use development. It should also provide greater certainty for both conservation and development by requiring that cities and counties update and strengthen local general plans.

- 
- Caltrans should explicitly recognize that improvements in planning for California’s ongoing growth are critical in providing for future mobility and accessibility needs. Having done this, it should reexamine its mission to identify how to respond most effectively to the mobility and accessibility challenges of existing and future development.
  - Caltrans should, through both existing relationships and new partnerships, contribute institutional support, financial support, and technical assistance to other state agencies, regional agencies, and local governments as they seek to promote sustainable, livable, smart community development.
  - Caltrans should consider changes in its physical facilities as well as in its operating, design, corridor planning, and facility programming and prioritization policies and procedures where those changes would support sustainable, livable, smart planning approaches while continuing to protect public safety and promote mobility and accessibility.
  - Caltrans, working with metropolitan planning organizations and regional transportation planning agencies, should develop a framework for integrating Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and other system management strategies into state and regional transportation planning and programming processes, and should design and implement a Statewide Telecommunication Deployment Strategy.
  - Regional agencies should develop publicly-supported, comprehensive, and meaningful strategies incorporating sustainable development, smart growth and livable community planning and development goals, policies and criteria. Regional planning procedures could then be revised to coordinate the actions and investments of all agencies, consistent with these goals, policies and criteria. New initiatives could include designating smart growth priority investment areas, increasing funding for alternative transportation projects, linking grants to improvements in land use planning, providing technical assistance, and facilitating multi-jurisdictional planning coordination.
  - Local agencies can implement dozens of significant planning policies and practices supporting sustainable, livable, smart approaches to planning. Many of these are outlined in the report below. In broad terms, local plans should be consistent with both regional plans and state strategies that address development patterns and the allocation of state resources; local agencies and transit providers should improve the coordination of their plans and programs; and, local agencies should increase emphasis on management of the transportation system to improve efficiency, safety and effectiveness.
  - Non-profit organizations should target ongoing and seed grant funding to give priority to programs that address sustainable communities, smart growth and livable communities as well as actively participate in related collaborative regional and state initiatives.
  - Business organizations should actively support efforts to address the quality of growth and development, identify and promote opportunities to plan for, invest in, and develop smart growth projects, and establish endorsement programs that provide public support for proposed infill projects that conform to a set of pre-established criteria.

- Community-based organizations and the general public should participate (and be encouraged to participate by their local governments) in the budgetary, planning and program implementation processes that shape the future of their communities, including transportation projects and services.

## **BACKGROUND**

In 2000, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) initiated the first phase of the Sustainable Communities/San Joaquin Valley Growth Response Study. The study's scope of work combined what had been originally planned as two efforts – one focused on sustainability and livability issues statewide and the other on planning principles, techniques and issues in the San Joaquin Valley. The goal of the combined effort is to identify initiatives and responses to the problems associated with existing development and future growth. The San Joaquin element of this study has a separate draft final report entitled *San Joaquin Valley Growth Response Study Phase I Draft Final Report*. This draft final report focuses on the “Sustainable Communities” portion of the study.

The objectives of the overall study include:

- Define the concepts of sustainable communities, livable communities, and smart growth.
- Provide a baseline of information for Caltrans as well as regional and local agencies to use in developing appropriate transportation policies and programs.
- Identify barriers for local, regional and state agencies in responding to growth.
- Complete the first phase of the *San Joaquin Valley Growth Response Study*.

Research for the study investigated a wide range of concepts related to sustainability, livability, and smart growth in order to put transportation and land use relationships into a comprehensive context. Once this was completed, the study then focused on development and future growth.

The baseline of information developed includes a set of recommendations on how the state, Caltrans, regional and local agencies, and other stakeholders can promote sustainable and livable communities. The desired outcomes of the recommendations include implementation of policies and actions that protect and promote environmental quality and economic prosperity, enhance opportunities for all social groups and otherwise promote equity, and provide sufficient public and private resources to pay for desired public facilities and services. Achieving these outcomes will be difficult and will require clear objectives and plans for action. Most importantly,

achieving these outcomes will require leadership and change at the state, regional and local levels.

Caltrans contracted with the Mineta Transportation Institute (MTI) to undertake this study. MTI is part of the College of Business at San José State University and was established by Congress as part of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991. MTI focuses on international surface transportation policy issues as related to three primary responsibilities: research, education, and information and technology transfer. MTI receives policy oversight from an internationally respected Board of Trustees who represent all of the major transportation modes.

To undertake the project, MTI selected a team including both professional and student researchers which:

- conferred with Caltrans project managers throughout the research process;
- identified literature for review based upon Caltrans' recommendations, library research, database searches, online searches, and interviews with professionals in the field;
- read and evaluated a substantial number of documents (see the bibliographies attached to the individual working papers);
- interviewed experts and working professionals, including city and county elected and appointed officials, special district officials, Caltrans Sacramento and district office staff, other state officials, academic experts, advocates, business leaders, developers, and others;
- prepared a series of research-related working papers including Working Paper #1 – *New Planning Concepts: Emerging Trends in Policy and Practice*, Working Paper #2 – *Sustainable Land Use and Transportation Implementation Activities*, and Working Paper #3 – *Transportation Planning Funding Sources*;
- prepared the *San Joaquin Valley Growth Response Study Phase I Draft Final Report* under the guidance of Caltrans staff;
- prepared a draft final report for review by a panel of experts under the guidance of Caltrans staff in the Office of Policy Analysis and Research (OPAR), Division of Transportation Planning;
- and, completed this draft final report for use by Caltrans in preparing for subsequent phases.

(Attached to this report is a list of published and web site resources to promote sustainable/livable/smart communities as well as a list of funding resources.)

This Draft Final Report may be found online at the website of the Office of Policy Analysis and Research (OPAR), Division of Transportation Planning, California Department of Transportation.

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/Offices/OPAR/OPAR.htm>

## The Transportation Setting

The California transportation system is an extensive network of public and private roads, airports, railroads, transit routes, waterways, terminals, ports, and pipelines. The system links regions and connects small and large cities and urban and rural areas, including international destinations. People and businesses rely on this expanding system to get to work, make recreational and social trips, conduct business, move goods and perform services. A variety of state, regional and local agencies, as well as private sector entities, plan, develop, operate and maintain the system.

As of 1998 (the most recent date for which consistent figures are available), California's transportation system had nearly 166,000 miles of streets and roads, including 15,200 miles of state highways (2,400 miles of which were also interstate highways). People registered almost 24.5 million cars and trucks and traveled more than 290 *billion* miles on the total system. While figures for all transit and rail services were not available for this study, more than 642 million people rode on the eleven major bus systems in the state, and almost 73 million passengers rode on the light rail systems (including the Red Line in Los Angeles). More than 2.6 million passengers traveled on the three major intercity rail lines that are operated by Amtrak (Bay Area to Sacramento, service within the San Joaquin Valley, and Santa Barbara to San Diego). Almost 96 million passengers rode on the state's four commuter rail lines (two in the Bay Area – including the Bay Area Regional Transportation (BART), and one each in the Los Angeles region and San Diego County). Nearly 3.2 million people took ferries in 1998, while the commercial airlines and airports accommodated more than 165 million enplanements and deplanements.

The decision-making process for planning, programming, building, operating and maintaining this interrelated transportation network is complex – requiring extensive planning, environmental and engineering work and interagency cooperation among federal, state and local agencies.

Caltrans primarily owns and operates the state (interregional) highway system, most of which consists of conventional highways in rural areas, while cities and counties own and operate local streets and roads. In many of the more populous counties, voter-approved sales tax measures help provide funding for new construction or major rehabilitation. Caltrans also provides funding support for the three intercity rail lines. Local and regional agencies own and operate the bus, light rail and commuter rail services, public authorities own and operate public airports and seaports, and private industry owns and operates the airplanes, ships and trucks.

Most funding for transportation in California comes from state and federal gasoline and diesel fuel taxes, truck weight fees, sales taxes, and toll bridge revenues. These funds are distributed to local, regional and state agencies. Major decision makers include the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, California Transportation Commission, Caltrans, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), non-metropolitan regional transportation planning agencies (RTPAs), county transportation commissions, county transportation authorities, rail properties, transit districts, and cities and counties.

Chapter 622, Statutes of 1997 (Senate Bill 45 – Kopp) reformed California's transportation funding programs. Local land development and growth drive transportation needs, and SB 45 focuses transportation-funding decisions at the regional level. Regional agencies now decide how to program 75 percent of state and federal transportation funds (programmed projects are to be consistent with adopted regional transportation plans (RTPs)). The state determines how the remaining 25 percent of the funds are used. (The two primary statewide planning documents are the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan and the 10-Year State Highway Operation and Protection Program Plan.) The SB 45 process has regional and state agencies working together to program projects, although each may make separate final funding decisions.

## **THE PROBLEM STATEMENT**

At the global, national, state and local levels, continuation of existing development patterns and growth trends could result in a future that many consider undesirable in terms of impacts on environmental quality and economic prosperity, equity opportunities for traditionally under served and under represented populations, and the sufficiency of public and private resources to provide desired services.

As described in more detail below, population and economic growth at the global and national levels will need to be accommodated in a manner that is environmentally sustainable and socially equitable while at the same time maintaining quality of life and acceptable levels of public and private services. At the state and community levels, challenges range from traffic congestion and high housing costs to energy and water supply and the loss of agricultural land and the decline of timber and extractive industries.

These problems can be described as challenges to be managed at multiple levels, from global to local, as follows:

### **The Global Challenge**

At a global level, growth in population from six billion to somewhere between eight and twelve billion together with a continuing improvement in living standards will require a very significant expansion of the economy. Achieving equitable living standards on a global scale could require an even larger increase in economic activity. The concern is that the natural resource requirements and environmental impacts of this growth may be unsustainable, and that in turn could result in what many regard as unacceptable impacts in terms of living standards, environmental quality, social equity, and public and private service levels.

### **The National Challenge**

At the national level, the United States population growth rate is much greater than most of the other developed countries, and the economy has likewise been growing at a robust rate. Some of the per capita gains in resource efficiency that had been achieved have been reversed in recent years. For example, according to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the fuel economy

of the average new light vehicle (i.e. automobiles, sport utility vehicles and light trucks) has declined since 1988 and is back to the level it was in 1980. The average fuel economy of all vehicles on the road has been declining since the mid-1990s. Higher average fuel consumption is primarily due to the increase in the market share of light trucks and to the tradeoff of fuel economy for increased vehicle weight and performance. The result is that the U.S., with less than five percent of the global population, consumes one-quarter of global petroleum production and emits one-quarter of the total global greenhouse gas output. Sustainability concerns range from oil-import dependency to impacts on the U.S. economy (if global growth falters) to U.S. economic standing in the world (flowing from global equity concerns) to long-term environmental impacts.

### **The California Challenge**

At the state level, California's population and economy have both been growing faster than the nation's, and concerns about the state's ability to meet projected growth-related needs are many. After a slowdown in the early 1990s, the population growth rate increased for the balance of the decade. By 2000, California had approximately 34 million residents. In the next two decades, the state is projected to add another 10.7 million residents; an additional 13.2 million are expected between 2020 and 2040. The current energy shortage and related cost impacts are one aspect of the growth challenge. The adequacy of the water supply is another. Loss of agricultural land to urban development, and the impact of that on the state's agricultural economy, is of critical concern in the Central Valley. Statewide, but particularly in the most urbanized areas, traffic congestion has been growing, and few observers expect it to be possible to build additional lane miles at a rate sufficient to keep up with the growth in vehicle miles traveled. Growth in housing demand has been pushing prices up and out of reach of many residents.

### **The Local Community Challenge**

At a local community level, the issues of traffic congestion and housing costs mentioned above are significant in major metropolitan centers. In mid-size communities and the more rural areas, concerns are expressed about possible development of the traffic, housing and other problems prevalent in the state's largest urban areas. Additional concerns in mid-size communities and rural areas include the loss of agricultural land, the need for economic growth and creation of well-paying jobs, declining timber and extractive industries, and provision of adequate water supplies. California communities are struggling with many of the same issues as communities across the nation, including sprawl, declining urban cores and older suburbs, and access to jobs and housing for low-income groups and minorities. While strong economic growth has helped many local governments in the last decade, the long-term growth in demand for government facilities and services related to continuing population and economic growth worries many local government leaders.

## **EMERGING CONCEPTS**

At all levels, including global, national, state, regional and local, interest is growing in new concepts that address both the functioning of existing land uses and the future use of urban,

suburban and rural land. Among the concepts most often cited and discussed in the literature reviewed and in the interviews conducted for this study are sustainable communities, livable communities, and smart growth.

The broader visions, goals and objectives for these concepts are not new. The desire for prosperous communities with economic opportunities and a high quality of life for all social groups is longstanding. What is new may be found in both the context and the content of these aspirations.

The context for sustainable and livable communities and smart growth is the daunting global, national, and statewide challenges described above as well as the current trends and practices described below. Individuals, businesses, and communities are increasingly worried about the future. They are not taking for granted the fulfillment of aspirations for an improved quality of life, and they are not seeing an improved quality of life as an automatic byproduct of growth.

The way people see the world is changing in another way as well. It was once the case that environmental quality, economic growth, and social justice were seen by almost everyone as competing goals that had to be balanced. Too much emphasis on protecting the environment was seen as bad for the economy and in conflict with improving the lot of the poor and minorities. Too much emphasis on increasing incomes for the poor was seen as detrimental to business competitiveness. While this way of looking at things is still widespread, it is beginning to be challenged by a very different view, one that holds that economic prosperity, environmental quality, and social equity are synergistic rather than competing goals, and that many things done to advance one can in fact advance them all.

On the level of content – what constitutes quality of life – change is also occurring. In the U.S., suburbia was once almost universally seen as offering clearly the best quality of life, and city cores and older suburbs were places to be escaped when improving family incomes allowed. Again, while this view is still widespread, other views are growing in importance and beginning to compete. New suburbs are beginning to be designed to resemble older urban neighborhoods, with porches to the front and garages to the rear, with more emphasis on pedestrian and bicycle facilities, neighborhood parks and open space, and other amenities designed to promote neighborhood interaction. Mixed-use, and higher densities near transit, while still often opposed, are more frequently prevailing in decisions about the design of new residential development.

The abandonment of older areas is being resisted and even reversed in a growing number of communities. Concerns about urban blight now coexist with concerns about gentrification. Older areas are being rehabilitated, more is being spent to maintain and improve public facilities in existing neighborhoods, reconstruction and redevelopment are placing increasing numbers of new residents and businesses on brownfields, on the sites of older and no longer viable shopping centers, and in similar locations. As the population ages, more residents see benefits in attached housing, in housing near transit or shopping, and in housing with common landscaping maintained by another party. While traditional suburbs still predominate, values and tastes are

beginning to change, and this is creating a more heterogeneous marketplace for urban development and redevelopment.

## **Definitions**

Detailed discussions of the concepts of sustainable communities, livable communities, and smart growth may be found in Working Paper #1. Illustrative examples and further discussion are contained in Working Paper #2 and in the *San Joaquin Valley Growth Response Study Phase I Draft Final Report*. Obtaining agreement on specific definitions has sometimes proven difficult or even counterproductive. This study has sought to use the terms in a way that reflects how most people use them. The terms are often used interchangeably and share many broad policies and practices. However, general definitions are helpful since the concepts 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. While the idea embodies most if not all of the characteristics of livable communities, it tends to also involve goals and issues both long term and global in scope, such as slowing global warming.

### Livable Communities

Livability as an idea generally refers to a range of things both local and immediate in nature. Livable communities are pedestrian and bicycle-friendly, provide affordable housing, offer 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 fine 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 which reduce the quality of life, or livability of an area.

While there may at times be conflicts between specific elements of the sustainable communities and livable communities concepts, most of the elements that make a community more sustainable help also to make it more livable, and most of the guidelines 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, and 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 and inside the area permitted for development. Specific local programs may be summed up as intended to make the community livable, sustainable, healthy, or clean.

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. On the other hand, slow growth does not in itself avoid many growth-related problems, nor does it in itself secure many of the positive benefits of smart growth.

## **EXISTING TRENDS AND PRACTICES**

The problem statement as put forward above has a distinctly global cast. The concern for sustainability is a global phenomenon, and the initial reports that placed the concept of sustainable development on the global stage were produced under the sponsorship of the United Nations.

Before presenting information about trends and practices related to land use and transportation issues in the United States, this introduction will place these issues in their global context.

Cities all over the world are developing programs under the banner of sustainability. These efforts have a number of broad features in common. To some extent, many subscribe to the concept of thinking globally, but acting locally. Many subscribe to the concept of a “triple bottom-line” focus – that is, a focus on economy, environment, and equity as the three bottom-line issues. Many stress global interconnectedness, and explicitly recognize that the so-called global issues, such as greenhouse warming, will in reality impact individual cities as sea levels rise, weather patterns change, storm intensity and frequency increase, and so on.

Internationally, much attention is given to a United Nations agreement called Agenda 21. Agenda 21 was adopted by more than 178 governments at the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in June 1992. It is focused on sustainability issues related to all levels of society, with an element specifically dealing with local governments and communities. In the U.S., very few persons are familiar with Agenda 21.

The U.N. has an organization called the International Council of Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) that coordinates local government activity on these issues on a global scale.

In the broadest sense, the issues of sustainability, livability, and smart growth are connected everywhere. While livability and smart growth are terms popularized in the U.S., the objective connections between the elements to which these terms refer tend to apply globally.

The enormous diversity of cultures, economies, political systems, laws, development patterns, and histories (among other factors) means that concepts like sustainable development, sustainable communities, sustainable transportation, livable communities, smart growth, eco-city development, green cities, healthy cities, and so on are understood and applied differently around the world.

### **The United States in an International Perspective**

The approach to and constraints on community growth and development in the U.S. are relatively distinct as compared to the rest of the world. (There are also significant differences between Europe, Asia, Africa, and other regions on a global scale.) Some of the more important distinctions include:

- Differences in political history and structure result in different roles being assigned to different parts of the governmental apparatus. In many areas, higher levels of government have relatively more power. In the U.S., there is a very strong tradition of local control, and this functions in tandem with our federal system in which states are accorded the presumption of authority in all matters not assigned to the national government.
- The U.S. lacks anti-sprawl and land protection traditions such as those found in Europe. Land in Europe has been protected for centuries, and the frontier notion of a superabundance of agricultural and rangeland is absent. Europeans have long understood that their supply of farmland and rangeland is finite and must be managed and conserved to last. For example, according to a report entitled *Preserving Global Cropland* contained in *State of the World 1997* by the Worldwatch Institute, agricultural land in the United Kingdom is seldom developed because such development requires gaining governmental approval, and that approval is typically not granted. The U.K., according to the report, often employs “greenbelts” around cities in which development is virtually prohibited for long periods. In Norway, as another example cited by Worldwatch, real estate transfers require a concession from the King, which serves to control changes in land use. Overall, the report concludes, in Europe “agricultural land is already given the high levels of protection that characterize a strategic asset.”
- The United States has a traditional practice of heavy subsidies to both suburban development and auto transportation. Tax and spending policies, from the homeowner mortgage interest tax deduction to the federally funded highway system, have

underwritten substantial parts of the economic cost of suburban development. As with all subsidies, these policies have had and continue to have the effect of expanding demand by reducing apparent cost.

- Most of the developed world taxes gasoline at a much higher rate than the U.S. The lower rate of taxation increases the relative affordability of vehicles with low fuel economy and of homes built distant from where their occupants must travel to earn a living.
- Most of the other developed countries have provided much more public financing for rail and transit systems, both metropolitan and intercity. In the less developed countries, the primary means of transportation in the larger cities are biking, transit, and walking.
- The U.S. has a particularly strong tradition of property rights. This makes the imposition of land use regulations difficult when they reduce the market value of the regulated land. Our political culture tends to see property owners as having a right to the value of their land at its highest (market value) use.
- In much of the developing world, sustainable cities issues tend to focus on things which many communities in the U.S. are more likely to take for granted. These include public sanitation, drinking water that won't make you sick, basic shelter for the less affluent, and economic development to provide jobs and income for the lower classes. In this sense, some of the livability issues may be seen as luxuries of the more affluent.

For these reasons, other parts of the world are addressing the creation of sustainable and livable communities differently, and likewise, they are defining what patterns of development are “smart” within the context of the particular characteristics of their own countries and regions.

### **Trends and Practices Related to Concerns About Future Conditions**

There are many trends and current practices that contribute to the concerns summarized in the problem statement – a future, if current trends and practices continue, that would be considered by many to be undesirable or less desirable in terms of environmental quality, economic prosperity, equity opportunities, and the sufficiency of services.

Some of the more significant trends and current practices that contribute to this are:

- Changes in population size, composition, and distribution. California's Department of Finance projects that the state's 2000 population of approximately 34 million will grow by roughly 10.7 million people between 2000 and 2020 and by an additional 13.2 million between 2020 and 2040. At the same time, this population is becoming more diverse. The University of California Transportation Center's California Trends Project has analyzed the projected growth over the next two decades and identified several aspects of its distribution that have significant planning implications. These include:

1. California will have a growing percentage of young people. The number of residents under 18 years of age is projected to grow by 37 percent (compared to overall population growth over the same period of about 31 percent).
2. California will have a growing percentage of older residents. The number of Californians between the ages of 55 and 64 years will increase by 58 percent, and there will be 51 percent more residents age 65 and older.
3. Population growth will not be even across the state. Eight counties – Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange, San Diego, Alameda, Contra Costa and Santa Clara – will account for 60 percent of the state's population growth.
4. The greater Los Angeles area will account for 47 percent of new households, the San Francisco Bay Area 20 percent, Sacramento and the San Joaquin Valley 16 percent, San Diego 8 percent, and the rest of the state 9 percent.
5. Employment growth will continue to be heavily concentrated in the San Francisco Bay Area and the South Coast. Much, but not all, of the employment growth in those regions will be in outlying areas (e.g. Riverside and San Bernardino in the South Coast and southern Santa Clara, the Tri-Valley and Santa Rosa in the Bay Area).

As a part of its analysis, the Trends Project also identified various likely features and consequences of projected growth. Many of these have important policy and planning implications. For example:

1. Growth in Sacramento County and the San Joaquin Valley could have significant negative impacts on the state's agricultural economy (Fresno, Kern, Sacramento and Stanislaus counties are each projected to grow by more than 250,000 in the next 20 years).
  2. There will continue to be a strong preference for single family detached housing, but there will also be growth in demand for alternative housing (often in more urban settings).
  3. The increase in non-work travel, which grew from 64 percent to 82 percent of all trips between 1969 and 1995, will continue.
- Increasing traffic congestion and delay in urban areas. In the more intensely urbanized areas of the state, the San Francisco Bay and the Los Angeles areas in particular, population and employment has been growing more rapidly than roadway capacity. At the same time, there has been a trend of increases in per capita vehicle miles traveled. Availability and use of other transportation modes is not growing rapidly enough to fill the expanding gap between roadway capacity and total vehicle miles traveled. As a result, measures of congestion, such as percent of highway miles experiencing congested

conditions at peak hours and per capita and absolute time lost to congestion delays, have been growing

Concerns are being raised about mobility and accessibility. Mobility is the ability of people and goods to move easily and effectively through the transportation system. Accessibility is the ability of people to conveniently reach desired locations. Increasing attention to mixing residential development with commercial and public services represents an effort to create improved accessibility.

- A growing number of residents cannot afford conveniently located housing. Perhaps the strongest evidence that a growing number of residents cannot afford the housing that meets their perceived needs is the lengthening commute. As cities have sought over the last twenty years to increase net revenue generating forms of development, they have not given priority to affordable housing. As a result, more jobs have been added than housing units in some communities, and what housing has been added has often been relatively larger and more costly. As with any situation where growth in demand exceeds growth in supply, this has meant rising prices. This has in turn meant that employees have had to live further from their jobs, commutes have lengthened accordingly, and employers have responded by locating new jobs closer to housing. The cycle of outward growth thus continues spreading into more areas.
- Urban consumption of agricultural and range land. While some communities have made efforts to approve higher density housing in core areas and near transit, as a whole, both nationally and statewide, the urbanized land area has been growing more rapidly than the urban population. This reflects the pressure for more urban land consumption, with increasing population compounded by growing use of land per person. This is related to a larger trend nationally and globally of a shrinking supply of agricultural and range land per capita as a growing population must meet its agricultural land needs from a diminishing absolute supply of rural land. Recent trends as tracked by the California Department of Conservation show that urbanization of agricultural land in the Central Valley has been continuing and in some areas accelerating. This has in turn raised substantial concerns about the future of the state's agricultural economy and employment base. As a consequence, general plans for cities and counties in the San Joaquin Valley portion of the Central Valley stress the need for preservation of agricultural land. Some of the strongest advocacy for compact development comes from business and agricultural organizations in the San Joaquin Valley.
- Business concerns with quality of life, transportation issues. Business groups have increasingly expressed concerns about the potential impact of a falling perceived quality of life on the state's economy. Groups including local Chambers of Commerce, the Center for the Study of the California Economy, the Bay Area Council and the Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group have been expressing fears that businesses would be unable to attract or retain the employees they need if congestion, high housing prices, and related phenomena result in the perception of a declining quality of life. Highly skilled

technology workers have many employment options, and they may choose to locate outside of California if the perceived quality of life in the State deteriorates. Chambers of Commerce and business councils in the San Joaquin Valley are concerned that while current congestion is generally moderate, future congestion could harm efforts to create the quality of life that is needed to attract business and to address both existing high unemployment and future population growth.

- Ability of state, regional and local governments to comprehensively address land use and transportation linkages. As discussed below, there are substantial barriers (disincentives and contrary incentives) to planning land use and transportation systems as integral wholes. Individual communities pursue imbalanced development because they perceive it as fiscally beneficial, while adjoining communities often do not coordinate their planning decisions in terms of impacts on regional systems (such as roads, sewers, water supply, energy supply, storm drainage, etc.). A complex and fragmented structure of governments (cities, counties, special districts, regional agencies, state agencies, and federal agencies) all push for outcomes which they believe are consistent with their particular mandates, but the whole often does not fit together very well.
- Public expectations are not being met (transit, housing prices, commute conditions). Surveys have repeatedly shown substantial public concerns about the trends in urban communities. Young people worry about ever being able to afford home ownership, rents in some areas have been growing far faster than incomes, and concerns about congestion increase. The unprecedented voter response to two San Francisco Bay Area transportation funding measures on the ballot in the 2000 elections may be the harbinger of a public sense of a transportation crisis. Voters approved a Santa Clara County sales tax extension for expanded transit services by more than 70 percent despite significant political opposition. Alameda County residents approved a sales tax to be used primarily for transit by more than 80 percent. Clearly the attitude of voters in these counties is that the transportation system is broken, and as a result, huge majorities are willing to pay to fix it.
- Ability of local governments to provide desired quality of life. The economic growth of the last decade has substantially improved the fiscal condition of many local governments, and related local government revenues have been used to meet a wide variety of needs. At the same time, there remains in many communities a very large and often growing backlog of unmet needs, and the underlying forces that drive the growth of these needs persist. Many of California's cities grew in the decades following World War II, and for a time maintenance, repair, and replacement requirements were relatively small because most facilities were new. As communities have aged, however, their streets, sidewalks, sewer and water lines, libraries, recreation centers, parks, public landscaping, and many other types of facilities have also aged. Many communities have not kept up with growing maintenance, repair and replacement needs. If the state economy falters and local government revenue growth is halted or slowed, the challenge of maintaining the quality of life in California's communities will become even greater.

- Energy demand growing and driving prices higher. As noted above, the average fuel economy of new light vehicles has been falling in recent years and has recently reached the 1980 level. At the same time, growth in per capita vehicle miles traveled means that overall energy use in the transportation sector has been increasing. In 1999, California drivers used 14,448,971,000 gallons of motor fuel, a 15.3 percent increase over 1990 and a 34.5 percent increase over 1980 consumption. These growing demands are currently putting upward pressure on gas prices. California's transportation sector consumes one-half of the energy used in the state, remains almost entirely dependent on petroleum, and is a major source of emissions. If current growth trends continue, gasoline use in the state would increase approximately 40 percent over the next twenty years. In the other sectors of California energy production and use, trends have not been favorable to meeting the state's energy needs. Investment in conservation and renewable energy has lagged, while demand has been growing. Larger homes, more electronic equipment requiring some amount of constant power, more computers and related equipment, economic growth, population growth, and other factors have combined to produce a supply-demand imbalance and contributed to the electricity price increases currently being experienced in California.

## **CHANGE IS EMERGING**

### **A National Perspective**

A large and growing number of national organizations are calling for land use practices which support sustainable development, smart growth and livable community strategies. Groups involved range from traditional and relatively conservative organizations, such as the American Planning Association (APA), the American Public Works Association (APWA), the American Public Transit Association (APTA), the Urban Land Institute (ULI), and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA), to advocacy organizations like the Congress for New Urbanism and the Surface Transportation Policy Project.

A few of the other prominently involved organizations include the National Association of Counties (NACo) and the U.S. Conference of Mayors (USCM) (collaborating to sponsor the Joint Center for Sustainable Communities), the National League of Cities (collaborating with NACo and USCM to provide the sustainability, livability, and smart growth related programs of Public Technology, Inc.), the National Governors' Association, the Center for Neighborhood Technology, PolicyLink, the Sierra Club, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Environmental Defense, the World Wildlife Fund, the Trust for Public Land and many others. These organizations research and advocate more compact development patterns, greater choices in housing opportunities, social equity in development policies, and the provision of transportation choices. They often collaborate on research and educational activities.

The National Governors' Association recently reported that at least 23 state governments have established significant smart growth or related initiatives. The National Conference of State Legislatures has identified 38 states that have enacted or are considering enacting incentive-based growth management legislation.

One of the most notable and closely watched statewide growth-related initiatives has been Maryland's "Smart Growth and Neighborhood Conservation Program," established in 1997. It has three primary goals:

1. Saving the state's most valuable remaining natural resources before they are forever lost.
2. Supporting existing communities and neighborhoods by targeting state resources to support development where infrastructure is already in place or planned.
3. Saving taxpayers the cost of building the infrastructure to support sprawl.

The centerpiece of the Maryland program is the establishment of and focus on priority funding areas. This policy limits most state infrastructure funding and economic development, housing and other program expenditures to specific areas designated by local governments for development. The priority funding areas policy has encouraged local governments to shrink the areas planned for future development, turn down sprawling development proposals, and reinvest in urban areas.

The Maryland effort also includes a rural legacy program to promote agricultural and natural resource preservation, a brownfields program to expedite cleanup and redevelopment of contaminated properties, a live-near-your-work program to encourage home ownership in targeted communities, and a job creation tax credit to encourage small and medium-sized businesses to invest in smart growth areas.

In many of the state efforts identified and described by the National Governors' Association, state transportation departments are playing roles in developing program or policy initiatives and/or on statewide interagency task forces charged with program and policy development. (For more details about state government efforts, see Section VI. of Working Paper #1.)

### **California Perspective: Indicators of Change**

A variety of diverse groups and activities provide evidence of interest and support for sustainable development, smart growth and livable communities throughout California. Although significant incentives and regulatory reforms have not yet been enacted in California, these examples of organizational activities suggest a growing interest in and pressure for such change.

The state has initiated a variety of programs that address components of sustainable communities, smart growth and livable community approaches to development and growth. These programs address such components as affordable mortgages, higher density housing and mixed use planning, farmland mapping and monitoring, urban parks, urban stream restoration, mainstreet revitalization, and assessment and cleanup of contaminated sites. Caltrans itself administers several programs addressing sustainable communities, smart growth and livable communities. They include the traffic congestion relief program, a statewide transit-oriented development study, bicycle, capital and planning grants, transportation preservation and

enhancement grants, a safe routes to schools program, community based transportation planning grants (with an emphasis on underserved or underrepresented communities), and special studies addressing energy, conservation and equity issues. More about Caltrans' existing programs is presented below.

### Business Advocacy for Change

In California's Silicon Valley, business leaders have joined together in organizations such as the Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group (SVMG) and Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network to press for solutions to housing, transportation, education, and other issues affecting the economic prosperity of the region. The SVMG has organized itself to involve principal officers and senior managers of over 175 member companies in a cooperative effort with local, regional, state and federal government officials to address major public policy issues affecting the economic health and quality of life in Silicon Valley. The organization is directly embracing the sustainable communities concept. The SVMG recently initiated what it calls "Sustainable Silicon Valley – a pilot project formed in partnership with regulatory agencies and academic institutions – to create a new environmental management system for businesses achieving excellence in environmental business practices with the goal of enhancing the quality of life for residents of the South Bay while maximizing efficiency and return on their investment."

Many business organizations, including the Bay Area Council, the Business Roundtable, the California Chamber of Commerce and various local Chambers, and the Pacific Industrial and Business Association are embracing the concepts of livability, sustainability, or smart growth as part of their strategies to promote a strong business climate.

In the San Joaquin Valley, the San Joaquin Valley Building Industry Association, the Fresno Business Council, and numerous local area Chambers of Commerce are leading advocates for infill and compact development. Their objective is to protect farmland and create residential and mixed-use areas with commercial uses within walking distance of residences.

### Environmental Movements

The Sierra Club has endorsed smart growth as a critical strategy in preventing sprawl. They specifically recommend:

- Enacting growth boundaries as well as park and open space protections to allow growth without creating sprawl.
- Planning pedestrian-friendly development where people have transportation choices, such as commuter trains and bus service.
- Directing new highway transportation dollars to existing communities to improve safety for walkers, bicyclists and drivers, and to promote public transportation choices.
- Reversing government programs and tax policies that help promote sprawl.

- Saving taxpayers money by having developers pay impact fees to cover the costs of new infrastructure, and requiring property tax impact studies on new developments.
- Advocating for revitalization of already developed areas through measures such as attracting new businesses, reducing crime and improving schools.

The Planning and Conservation League (PCL), the state's largest coalition of environmental organizations, has expressed support for the establishment of more sustainable development, smart growth and livable community practices. The PCL, along with 26 other like-minded groups, recently released a report titled *Restoring the California Dream: Ten Steps to Improving Our Quality of Life*. Recommendations for policy makers included in the report are:

- Provide incentives for cities and counties to pursue more compact development within identified boundaries to avoid growth patterns that consume open space and habitat.
- Strengthen local agencies' ability to redevelop and reuse vacant lots and brownfields.
- Provide funding sources for conservation easements and purchases of strategically located natural habitats, and encourage integration of natural systems and green spaces into the urban area.

### Social Justice Movements

The Latino Issues Forum is a non-profit public policy institute dedicated to a better, more equitable and prosperous society. It has established, for the Latino community leaders, a leadership development and educational program on California's growth and environmental concerns called *Latinos & Sustainable Development: A Crisis in Equity, Participation and Access*. The program's primary intent is to fill a major void in the growth and environmental debate – the perspective of the Latino community. Forum leaders are concerned that their community, which plays a central role in California's population growth, is absent from the discussion of sustainable development policy. The forum promotes community-level understanding and facilitates dialogue and cooperation between community groups and policy makers.

Another organization, the Urban Habitat Program (UHP), is dedicated to building multicultural urban environmental leadership for socially just and ecologically sustainable communities in the San Francisco Bay Area. Through actions, networking, conferences, publications, teaching, and advocacy, UHP has assisted more than 100 organizations working on environmental justice issues (including health, food security, recycling, energy, military base conversion, arts and culture, education, immigration and population, and parks and open space). UHP actively collaborates with business and environmental leaders, and brings the vision of environmental justice to struggles for community development and ecological sustainability.

### Open Space and Agricultural Land Preservation

In the Fresno area, the American Farmland Trust, the Fresno County Farm Bureau, the Fresno Chamber of Commerce, the Building Industry Association of the San Joaquin Valley, and the Fresno Business Council formed the Growth Alternatives Alliance. They have been advocating the enactment of local planning policies consistent with the following principles:

- Utilize urban land as efficiently as possible.
- Develop livable communities that emphasize pedestrian and transit-oriented design.
- Recognize the importance of agriculture and the need to protect productive farmland.

In Sonoma County, voters recently passed a sales tax increase to support the preservation of agricultural land. A land trust is now in place and using the voter-authorized revenues to protect agricultural land threatened by urbanization. In a companion activity, the county established a “right-to-farm” policy that gives notice to future residents that farming is an important activity that will be protected.

### Urban Growth Boundaries

A growing number of California localities have established or have endorsed the establishment of urban growth boundaries (sometimes called urban limit lines) in recent years. In some cases, they have been established by city council or board of supervisor action. In other cases, they have been created by a direct vote of the people. The exact method of line placement and justification varies on a case-by-case basis. It is clear, however, that the primary motivations are to control urban expansion and to protect rural open space and agricultural land.

Although there has been opposition and expressions of concern about the impacts of such boundaries, the popularity of this tool in communities as diverse as San Jose and Healdsburg makes their establishment a trend of significance.

### Infill Development

The most established and effective organization advocating for infill development in California is the Housing Action Coalition. It was formed eight years ago to support higher density housing and mixed-use development, particularly near transit. The Coalition is made up of business organizations, environmental groups and civic organizations. One element of their activity is the housing endorsement program. It provides public support for proposed developments that conform to established infill criteria. The track record of project approval and local public agency response to this advocacy effort has been extremely positive. Leaders in other parts of California (including Los Angeles and Solano County) are considering the establishment of similar programs.

At the regional level, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) amended their Regional Transportation Plan by reprogramming approximately \$500 million originally planned for major highway improvements on the fringes of the region. These funds were redirected into

the "Urban Serving Highways" program. This dramatic change was made as a way of implementing the recently enacted Region 2020 Strategy, which calls for focusing growth and infrastructure within existing urban areas.

Other examples of public programs encouraging infill development include the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transportation for Livable Communities program and the greenline and transit-oriented development strategies in San Jose.

### Voter Support for Transit

In November 2000, more than 70 percent of voters in Santa Clara County approved a sales tax increase to support the extension of the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) system into their county. At the same time, more than 80 percent of voters in Alameda County approved a sales tax increase for a mix of primarily non-auto transportation projects. The Alameda and Santa Clara measures signal that the public is willing to pay increased taxes to support the provision of alternative transportation measures in locations with significant traffic congestion.

### State Encouragement for Inter-Regional Partnerships

The California Legislature created two new programs in 2000 to attempt to alleviate the jobs-housing imbalance. The first is the Inter-Regional Partnership (IRP), a state pilot project to help improve, using various incentives, the balance of jobs and housing in the San Francisco Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa and Santa Clara, and in the San Joaquin Valley counties of San Joaquin and Stanislaus.

The second is the jobs-housing balance improvement program. This program, initially funded at \$100 million, is designed to provide state fiscal incentives to local governments if they adopt housing elements in compliance with state law and increase issuance of housing permits. In the first year, local governments could use grants from the jobs-housing balance improvement fund for capital outlay projects. The governor's 2001-2002 budget proposes an additional \$200 million for the program, adds a second year to the funding cycle, and eliminates the limitation to capital outlay projects.

### Smart Growth Legislation

A smart growth caucus, formed in 2000, has more than 25 California state legislators who share a common belief that the state must pursue land use policies that are "economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable." Because it includes the chairs of key policy committees (transportation, housing, economic development and natural resources), the caucus provides a forum for legislators to address the crosscutting issues raised by growth.

Caucus members, as well as others interested in promoting sustainable development, smart growth and livable communities, have initiated a wide range of specific legislation in 2001. Some examples include:

- The Assembly Housing Committee has proposed a pilot program for the creation of a smart growth mortgage (“Transportation-Efficient Mortgage”) program. It would allow prospective buyers to qualify for larger loan amounts if they purchase a home served by public transit and located in a community with a specified minimum density.
- The Assembly Housing Committee has also proposed creating a smart growth down-payment assistance program to provide incentives for home buyers to purchase their home in a higher density neighborhood that is well-served by public transit. Applicants would have to qualify by income, and the homes to be purchased would have to fit the same or similar criteria as in the mortgage assistance program described above.
- Senator Torlakson has proposed a bill to encourage more transit-oriented development. The bill would amend an existing statute relating to transit village plans by expanding the boundaries of transit village areas from one quarter to one half mile from a rail transit station. Most importantly, it sets forth a process that would both allow for the use of tax increment financing and facilitate parcel aggregation. If adopted, the bill would substantially improve the attractiveness of development opportunities in these areas.
- Assembly member Steinberg has introduced the Sacramento Region Smart Growth-Smart Energy Act of 2001. If enacted, the bill would create a new system of population-based sales tax sharing throughout the Sacramento region and thus remove the incentive for local jurisdictions to approve high sales tax generating land uses while limiting new residential development. The bill would replace sales tax revenues with redistributed property taxes. For energy, the bill would facilitate, under new U.S. Environmental Protection Agency guidelines, the sale of air quality credits from new smart growth initiatives to power generators (thereby enabling power plant construction). The proceeds from the air quality credits would be used for permanent acquisition of open space within the Sacramento region.

### Regional Planning Initiatives

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) recently established an alternative land use plan that calls for directing a larger percentage of future growth into urban areas rather than to the fringes of the region. This “smart growth” alternative was prepared with input from local government planners and adopted by the SANDAG board as their preferred land use plan for the region. To encourage its implementation, SANDAG committed significant funds for the development of local smart growth plans. Such plans would include an emphasis on transit-oriented development within proximity of light rail and major bus corridors. SANDAG is now encouraging and assisting localities with planning and zoning changes that conform city and county policies with the regional preferred land use plan.

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) led in the establishment of a Regional Smart Growth Initiative in 2000. They are working in a partnership with the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Development, and in collaboration with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. A key objective is to prepare smart growth alternative development scenarios and to forecast how different land use development patterns and transportation investments could improve the future of the region. The strategy is to pursue a “bottom-up” process leading to changes in local and regional policies that focus on regional mobility and the creation of livable communities.

### Local Government Sustainability Initiatives

Many local governments are pursuing initiatives under the heading of sustainability or sustainable communities. San Francisco, San Jose and Portland, Oregon joined forces more than 10 years ago for a major three-year sustainable communities project funded through Public Technology Incorporated (a joint venture of the National League of Cities and the International City/County Management Association). This effort studied community applications of the sustainability concept and developed policy and program initiatives for implementation by the participating cities, including several in the areas of land use and transportation. Many of those initiatives are ongoing.

San Mateo County has for several years been developing its “Sustainable San Mateo” program. This effort spans the county, cities, and business and advocacy organizations in San Mateo County. Santa Monica has long had a sustainable city program under which it organizes many of its environmental management functions. Palo Alto is currently developing sustainable community policies and programs. Many other cities and counties are or have developed programs using the concepts of sustainability, and many are or have made similar efforts but used different terms (such as livable communities, eco-city, green city, or smart growth).

### Increasing Role for Citizen Participation and Partnerships

Partnerships in the planning and decision-making process function at two interrelated levels – involvement of the public and citizen groups and involvement of governmental agencies. What has emerged over the past four decades is a strong belief and expectation on the part of citizens, both as individuals and as groups, that they have a right to be, and in fact, will be involved in the governmental decision-making process when it affects them. For local government, greater emphasis on the development of general plans using processes that involve affected parties is critical to identifying and implementing the communities’ planning goals and policies.

Federal and state transportation legislation adopted in recent years has resulted in more decisions related to transportation planning, project funding and construction being made at the regional level. For example, decisions on the use of about 75 percent of federal and state transportation

funds in California are now made by regional transportation planning agencies in close consultation with local agencies, including transit operators, and Caltrans. Caltrans is responsible for the remaining 25 percent, focusing on interregional facilities and services but also coordinating the state's needs with those of the various regions. In this complex environment, Caltrans has a statewide leadership role to play. All stakeholders, including the private sector, must cooperate and coordinate if California is to have an efficient, safe and effective transportation system.

In short, governance today is partnership based on the one hand, between government agencies themselves, and on the other hand, between those agencies and individual, organizational, and corporate citizens. In this new environment, all parties must be actively engaged and be accountable for their respective responsibilities for the whole to work properly. Government cannot take public cooperation and participation for granted however, or command it by dictate. Persuasion, involvement, and winning support are now much more important than ever before. In no area of public facilities and services is this shift more dramatic than in transportation.

### Formation of Regional and State Coalitions

A number of statewide and regional collaborations have recently been established to foster sustainable development, smart growth and livable communities. Although they differ somewhat in structure and approach, they are similar in involving the private sector, the public sector, and civic leaders in finding common ground.

The California Futures Network (CFN) is a statewide coalition of more than 100 affiliated organizations. It was created to educate and organize at the state, regional and local levels, and its goal is to achieve land use policies that are fiscally, socially and environmentally sound.

CFN affiliates are united in their belief that California should:

- Steer public and private investments toward existing developed areas.
- Promote increased social justice, including economic and housing opportunities for disadvantaged populations and communities.
- Conserve the state's valuable agricultural lands.

To accomplish these goals, CFN is conducting research and education to develop effective alternatives to the current "rules of the game" governing growth and development in California, specifically the taxing, spending, land use, and infrastructure investment policies now in place at the local, regional, and state level.

The California Smart Growth Initiative of the Urban Land Institute (ULI) was initiated in late 2000 to advance smart growth through a statewide but regionally based effort. It is examining growth and development trends in California, and it will identify specific local, regional, and state solutions that advance a collaborative smart growth agenda.

A Smart Growth State Coordinating Committee guides this initiative. It brings ULI leaders together with a carefully selected cross section of business, environmental, social justice, civic and local government leaders that have an interest in fostering smart growth practices in California. This committee will meet periodically with key state leaders to discuss their work and their findings.

The Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Development is a multi-stakeholder coalition established in 1997 to develop and implement an action plan that will lead to a more sustainable region. The Alliance is a forum in which 200 public and private sector stakeholders at all levels, including leaders from Bay Area economic, environmental and social equity organizations, come together to address major regional challenges.

All regional agencies were invited to be founding partners of the Bay Area Alliance. The overall goal of the Alliance is to reach consensus region-wide among a critical mass of stakeholder organizations and civic leaders on a new shared vision and values addressing how the region can grow in a more sustainable manner. The overarching strategy is to achieve agreement on a compact that can become the foundation for implementation actions.

The Great Valley Center (GVC) is a private, non-profit, and non-partisan organization committed to building support for California's Great Central Valley as a distinct region and to assisting in the process of planning for the 21st century. The GVC is attempting to address the challenges of the valley's growing population by creating modern, livable communities, sustaining agricultural production, preserving natural resources, and fostering competition in the global economy.

The GVC provides grants to non-profit groups, community organizations and local governments that are working together to improve the well being of the valley (called LEGACI Grants – Land use, the Environment, Growth, Agriculture, Conservation and Investment). In addition, the GVC has a partnership with the California Technology, Trade and Commerce Agency focusing on identifying and enhancing technology development opportunities in the valley. This includes creating a telecommunications infrastructure plan, developing geographic information system standards, and identifying emerging technology-based industry clusters. The GVC also created the San Joaquin Valley Water Coalition, which brings together the diverse water interests in the valley and assists them in speaking with a cohesive voice on water supply and distribution issues and in addressing the related issues of land use and population growth within the region.

The Local Government Commission (LGC) is a non-profit, non-partisan, membership organization, composed of elected officials, city and county staff, and other interested

individuals. Commission members are committed to developing and implementing local solutions to problems of state and national significance. The LGC provides a forum and technical assistance to enhance the ability of local governments to create and sustain healthy environments, healthy economies, and social equity. Serving as a complement to the League of California Cities and the California State Association of Counties, the LGC provides peer networking opportunities, acts as an interface between city and county officials, and provides practical policy and implementation ideas for addressing serious environmental and social problems.

### Increasing Use of Technology

The applications of computers, electronics, telecommunications and other technologies are rapidly increasing and form a significant resource for the development of sustainable communities, smart growth and livable communities. Three major areas of technology are:

- Travel substitution.
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS).
- Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and related improvements in land use and transportation modeling.

Travel substitution includes practices such as telecommuting, electronic commerce, and distance learning. The Southern California Association of Governments has an active effort to promote travel substitution policies and programs as part of broader strategies to reduce the use of the automobile and improve air quality.

Intelligent Transportation Systems involve the integrated application of advanced information, communications, and other technologies to improve the safety and efficiency of the surface transportation system. ITS applications include:

- Transportation management to monitor events, speedily dispatch incident response teams, manipulate signal systems, predict and estimate delays, and advise on route alternatives.
- Traveler information to allow individual travelers to make informed decisions concerning the most appropriate routes, modes, and/or travel times.
- Electronic payment to provide users with a broadly deployed, interoperable mobile payment system for tolls, parking, transit, and private commercial transactions.
- Goods movement for efficient, safe, and legal movement of trade goods into, out of, and through California.
- Public transportation to enhance existing services and add new delivery options for door-to-door service competitive with the private automobile.

- Vehicle safety and control to provide multiple levels of automated driver warning and assistance and increase driving safety, comfort and convenience.

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) permit analysis in the land use planning process of complex locational information. GIS is a critical element in the development of new and more powerful computer models that can evaluate future land use, transportation, environmental and other conditions under a variety of development scenarios. The *San Joaquin Valley Growth Response Study Phase I Draft Final Report* contains information on twenty-two major land use models.

## **BARRIERS AND CONTRARY INCENTIVES**

There are significant barriers to the implementation of land use and development plans, policies and programs that would effectively address California's development and growth related problems and that would incorporate sustainable communities, smart growth and livable communities concepts.

### **Four General Types of Barriers**

First, attitudes and beliefs often pose significant barriers to sustainable, livable, smart development. Many people continue to believe that choices must be made between economy, environment, and equity. They may also believe that choices are required between cars and transit, or between single-family homes and attached housing, or between infilling and outward development.

Second, legal, regulatory, and financial barriers are often significant. Zoning codes, building codes, other regulations, and lending practices pose a variety of barriers to the types of development communities would otherwise prefer.

Third, existing urban patterns are not easily changed one buyer or renter at a time. People who might live in urban cores or older suburbs may not find conditions encouraging unless a lot of other people have the opportunity to make the same decision during the same time period.

Fourth, many economic and fiscal incentives and disincentives operate to block "smart" decisions or promote less "smart" ones, for individual residents or businesses, for developers, and for local governments. Most of these incentives and disincentives, such as the income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments and the distribution pattern for state collected sales tax revenues, are not "free market realities" but rather artifacts of tax laws and economic regulations imposed on the economy by government (often at the behest of interest groups).

## **Specific Barriers**

### Public Opposition to Compact Development

Because many smart growth-oriented projects are sited in existing developed areas, and because they typically involve increased densities or non-traditional mixes of uses, they often encounter opposition from neighboring residents or businesses. Concerns expressed include density, traffic, loss of open space, design compatibility, and other issues. As a result of such fears, local officials are frequently pressured to modify or deny smart growth projects. Sometimes they resist such pressures.

The public often does not perceive that well-designed infill developments can make their communities more attractive and livable, provide significant landscaping, and facilitate preserving open space in other locations. Both extensive public education and public participation processes have to be part of addressing this issue.

### Public Opposition to Increasing Housing Supply and Affordability

The public often does not make the connection between failing to provide adequate housing near job centers and their declining quality of life, including related transportation problems. As a result, there often is public resistance to the development of new housing near employment centers. New housing frequently is located far from job concentrations, is inaccessible via existing transit systems, and requires tolerating excessive commute times and highway congestion.

While the public has a tendency to oppose many new housing developments, gaining approval for “affordable” housing proposals is particularly challenging. People often believe that affordable housing development brings down neighboring property values and increases crime.

Responding to the housing supply problem requires recognizing the need for both single family detached and multiple family housing. Attractive and desirable single family housing can be built on somewhat smaller lots thus saving land and increasing the viability of transit. Not everyone desires to live in a detached single family house. Facilitating attractively designed and located multiple family alternatives can respond to a variety of housing needs, including those of the young, empty nest adults and the elderly. As the baby boom generation ages, the desire for more and better multiple family housing alternatives will increase.

### Threats to Local Control of Land Use

Cities and counties fiercely protect their jurisdiction to plan for and regulate the use of land within their boundaries. Proposed state or regional strategies that require changes in local practices also require strong leadership. The use of state financial incentives to foster local conformity with sustainable development, smart growth or livable community concepts is

perceived as a more acceptable approach, even though the impact of such incentives may be modest. It is unlikely that any comprehensive and effective program to address California's existing and future development problems, including housing affordability and traffic congestion, will be successful without stronger state requirements and/or significantly stronger incentives for cities and counties.

### Financing and Lending Practices

Private investors are often reluctant to finance redevelopment of infill development sites in older inner city or inner suburban communities because of concerns regarding liability for potential contamination, adequacy of schools and other public services, adequacy and cost of infrastructure, utility connection and other fees that place on infill development the infrastructure costs associated with urban expansion, and marketability of the projects. As more smart growth type of developments are completed, occupied and demonstrate profitability, this barrier should be reduced.

### Insufficient Infrastructure Funds

The Department of Finance recently estimated the state's unmet capital outlay needs at \$40.4 billion over the next ten years, exclusive of transportation. The \$40.4 billion estimate does not include the need for local facilities, such as hospitals, jails, or other public buildings. There is no comprehensive estimate of local governments' unmet infrastructure needs or current spending on capital projects. Estimates of unmet transportation needs, exclusive of maintenance, are in the range of \$15 to \$25 billion to more than \$75 billion, according to estimates developed by the California Business Roundtable and the state Department of Finance.

Resources available for transportation infrastructure include federal funds, gas tax and other state special funds, and general fund supported debt. Over the next 10 years, the Department of Finance estimates that \$33.1 billion will be available for infrastructure, including \$16.2 billion in federal funds, \$13.3 billion from state special funds, such as the fuel tax proceeds, and \$3.6 billion in miscellaneous revenues, primarily private contributions for the University of California and resource-related programs. The state also has \$2.5 billion in previously authorized general obligation bonds that have not been issued as of September 1, 1998.

### Funding for Planning

Land use and transportation strategies in California stem from policies and programs approved in local, regional and state plans and initiatives. Partially because of cost and the complexity of the planning process, many localities and regions have not funded the development of sustainable, smart and livable community strategies, plans and implementation programs (although limited funding does not by itself necessarily undermine the process or prevent positive outcomes).

As an example of cost issues, small non-affluent communities have been unable to hire planners with the expertise needed to provide consistent and creative input to the planning and

development review process. Also, use of more sophisticated and data intensive analytical tools (which often require establishing and maintaining detailed databases) increases the cost of planning studies.

Often, entities simply choose other priorities for funding. Where sustainable, smart, and livable communities planning efforts are not undertaken for this reason, solutions may involve providing additional funding and/or changing the perception of priorities by demonstrating the benefits of planning focused on these issues.

### Fragmented Planning Processes

Within the state of California, there are a large number of public agencies responsible for a wide range of growth and transportation related issues. These include regional councils of governments, metropolitan planning organizations, regional transportation planning agencies, statutory county transportation commissions, countywide congestion management agencies, counties, cities, school districts, and other special districts. All of these agencies have responsibilities affecting the pattern of development and the livability of communities. Under current state planning law, there is no requirement that the plans of these various agencies be coordinated. More specifically, there is no requirement that local land use plans be coordinated with the plans of neighboring communities. In addition, there is no requirement that local or special district activities be consistent with regional policies. However, state statutes do require each transportation planning agency to consider and incorporate, as appropriate, the transportation plans of cities, counties, districts, private organizations, tribal governments, and state and federal agencies.

### Automobile Dependency and Inadequate Public Transportation

Several factors contribute to the current reliance on cars for mobility: common destinations (jobs, stores, services, entertainment centers) are often located far from housing; the public transit system is inadequate or inconvenient; and the costs of driving are subsidized. In addition, the current density of development in many areas makes expanding transit systems more expensive. Thus over time, the United States has developed a “car culture” in which driving, often in a single occupant automobile, is the expected and most convenient and reliable way to travel.

The success of public transit is constrained by several factors. Systems are often fragmented, with numerous separate service districts and little coordination between them. It can be challenging to decipher schedules and routes. The many languages spoken by the non-English speaking population add to the difficulty of communicating schedule and route information. Service hours and routes may be limited. Some locations in metropolitan areas cannot be accessed by public transit at all, and others are served infrequently. In the planning and public review of new development, transit is often ignored or given a much lower priority than provision of roadway access. Public transit may be perceived as unsafe, dirty, uncomfortable, unreliable, slow and expensive.

At the same time, there is increasing public support for transit, including the willingness to enact local taxes to help pay for system operations and expansion. Existing and new transit services need to be supported by land use plans and procedures that situate significant numbers of new housing units and jobs within walking or easy shuttle bus distance of transit stops and stations.

### Local Government Fiscal Needs

The structure of our tax system unintentionally rewards local governments for making imbalanced development decisions. This widely recognized problem has led to what is known as “fiscal zoning,” or the approval of developments whose tax revenues are anticipated to exceed local government costs and the denial of developments whose tax revenues are anticipated to be less than those costs.

These fiscal incentives and disincentives are a major barrier to implementing smart growth. Because of dwindling federal funding and legislation limiting property taxes, California cities and counties have been forced to increasingly rely on sales, utility, and business tax revenues to balance their budgets. In addition, the state budget impact of resolving the electrical energy crisis may reduce the state’s capacity to absorb the cost of near-term solutions.

Examples of fiscally-driven approvals include “big-box” retailers, such as WalMart, Costco, or Home Depot, that often receive approval because of the large sales tax revenues they provide. On the other hand, examples of fiscally-driven denials most often involve affordable housing developments for which the anticipated tax and fee proceeds overall would not cover the many municipal facility and service costs that would be associated with the new structures, vehicles, and residents.

High fees placed on new development are another result of local governments’ fiscal needs. These fees add to the difficulty of making new infill development, which is typically smaller in scale, feasible and affordable.

Any effort to improve California’s system for the planning and regulation of land use needs to address the financial incentives and disincentives that currently favor net revenue-generating land uses over other (usually residential) development. By pushing housing, and particularly affordable housing, onto neighboring lands and jurisdictions, fiscally driven land use decisions contribute to sprawl.

### Lack of a Coordinated and Consistent Local, Regional and State Vision

California lacks a coordinated system or strategy for making decisions about growth. The state’s planning and development process, largely established in the 1960s and 1970s, relies on five

elements – state conservation and development policies, state and regional growth and infrastructure plans, environmental disclosure laws, single-purpose regional agencies, and local general plans. Weaknesses in the growth management framework include:

- State policies for conservation and development are unclear, imprecise, or sometimes in conflict (such as the tension between the policy to provide affordable housing and the policy to protect open space and natural resources.) When conflicts emerge, there is little guidance on how best to resolve them.
- The opportunity to strategically invest state funds to reinforce regional and statewide goals, such as redevelopment of older cities, stimulation of rural economies, cost-effective extension of infrastructure, and preservation of farmland, open space and natural habitat, is largely unrealized. State and regional growth and infrastructure plans are narrowly focused, and sometimes work at cross-purposes (such as plans to build freeways and plans to clean the air, or plans to conserve open space and plans to accommodate housing demand), and do not provide enough funding to meet growing needs.
- Single-purpose regional agencies often cannot resolve complex problems associated with growth because of their focus on a limited set of concerns. Regional agencies that have been created to address air quality, housing, transportation, or open space and that are governed by local elected officials are often unable to implement tough solutions that cross “turf” boundaries and engender political controversy.
- Local general plans to guide development of individual communities do not provide long-term certainty for either conservation or development and lack the scope and scale to cope with issues such as transportation, air quality, jobs/housing balance and water supply that cannot be limited to a single jurisdiction. Most growth problems do not respect the boundaries of cities and counties, and local strategies to accommodate or control growth sometimes shift problems to neighboring communities.

### **What is needed to overcome barriers?**

In relation to attitude barriers, while choices must clearly be made, and while appropriate balances must be found where goals do conflict, in many cases communities are finding that they can chart a path that combines multiple features to provide the most benefits for the most people. Public education and community participation processes can over time reduce attitudinal barriers. For this reason, many of the initiatives occurring in California and elsewhere under the headings of sustainable communities, livable communities, and smart growth include major efforts at public participation, public education, and interest group involvement. Sometimes these efforts are at the community scale and involve setting goals and values to guide overall community development. At other times, these processes are at the neighborhood level and involve understanding and visualizing the impacts of new infill development in an existing neighborhood. Their purposes generally include getting the “buy-in” of residents concerning the proper balancing of the costs and benefits of new development on communities and neighborhoods.

Legal, regulatory, and financial barriers can be reduced through a wide variety of governmental and private practice changes. All levels of government – local, state, and national – have roles to play. Often reducing these barriers involves changing zoning codes or their implementation to reduce barriers to affordable housing. Transportation level of service standards can act as barriers to desirable developments, and appropriate exception policies or more flexible standards need to be created. Sometimes excessive parking requirements reinforce auto-only style developments and make pedestrian or transit access more difficult. Financial barriers can be reduced by making development decisions less risky and uncertain for investors and developers and by setting development fees to reflect the efficiencies and community benefits of smart growth. While local governments are the direct implementers of many of these steps, regional, state and federal programs and policies can help and encourage local governments to move in these directions.

In terms of existing urban patterns and the creation of conditions supportive of livable, sustainable, and smart choices by individuals and businesses, local, state, and national governments and private businesses all have important roles. Many individuals and businesses will find it beneficial to locate in urban centers or older suburbs, but only if they have faith that the quality of life and/or business climate in those areas will be protected or restored. People and businesses will stay or move in if they believe an area is “on the way up,” but will leave or refuse to locate there if they believe the area is deteriorating. While many local programs and policies are critical, it is also true that other levels of government as well as private sector leaders can provide important assistance and encouragement. It is important to recognize that many state and federal programs and services, for education, health, social services, and more, could be redesigned and retargeted in ways that would be more supportive of urban and older suburban preservation, restoration, and redevelopment.

In terms of economic and fiscal incentives, all levels of government must participate in reshaping incentives. Fiscally driven development decisions are very difficult for local governments to change unilaterally. If a local government acts against what it believes are its fiscal interests to instead “do the right thing,” and then if a neighboring jurisdiction grabs the revenue-producing developments, the community acting responsibly may wind up with the congestion and other problems anyway and not have the fiscal benefits they could have had. Implementing balanced development in metropolitan regions, and achieving a balance of development types within subparts of regions, will in many cases require changing the structure of incentives within which local governments make their decisions. Whether the changes take the form of modifying the local government revenue structure, providing subsidies, imposing requirements, or some combination of means, action by regional, state, and federal agencies will often be indispensable.

Overall, while local action is clearly pivotal, local governments acting alone are often unable to overcome barriers to sustainable, livable, and smart decisions. On the other hand, while federal actions can be helpful in many ways, few people want to see the federal government play more than a support role. State governments are emerging as key players in the transition to new patterns of urban development and urban life.

Finally, research for this study showed that even within areas that are generally accepted as regions, such as the San Joaquin Valley and the San Francisco Bay Area, there is considerable geographic, ethnic, economic and development diversity. In formulating recommended actions to more effectively implement sustainable development, smart growth and livable communities, it is critical that the various types of diversity in California be recognized. While consistent and clear state policies and programs are crucial, a “one-size-fits-all” approach will not be as successful as programs that are tailored to the range of specific needs in the state.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The desired outcomes of the recommendations in this report include implementation of policies and actions that protect and promote environmental quality and economic prosperity, that enhance opportunities for all social groups and otherwise promote equity, and that provide sufficient public and private resources to pay for desired public facilities and services. Achieving these outcomes will be difficult and will require clear objectives and plans for action. Most importantly, achieving these outcomes will call for leadership and change at the state, regional and local levels.

The state will need to assume a strong leadership role in addressing the overall recommendations. Although the state cannot and should not act solely to solve the many growth-related challenges facing California, no other level of government can achieve what the state can accomplish. Most regional agencies are limited by the unwillingness of local governments, who provide much of their political and financial support, to vest them with sufficient planning responsibility and authority. Local jurisdictions lack the authority and political support to comprehensively and consistently address broader regional and state issues.

Key elements of the changes needed include:

- **Local Plans and Finances.** As described above, the state and local fiscal arrangements in California encourage communities to seek net revenue generating land uses. Reform is needed to promote a better balance of residential, commercial, industrial and other land uses. In addition, to reduce political conflict over growth, local plans should focus on efficient land use patterns and provide greater certainty for both conservation and development. To accomplish these goals, local plans need to be more up-to-date, be consistent with state policies and regional frameworks, be linked to adequate financing, take into account the impacts on adjacent communities and jurisdictions, and protect open space, agricultural land, and habitat.
- **Regional Frameworks.** While regional agencies could make better use of the tools and authority already vested in them by state law, the state needs to facilitate stronger regional approaches. A more integrated framework for regional and local land use and infrastructure decisions is needed. The process for preparing single-purpose regional plans and investment programs for air quality, housing, transportation, open space protection and other issues should be reshaped into a more comprehensive and effective

one. It should encourage joint problem solving and the balancing of interests in order to better guide regional growth onto a sustainable path. Riverside County provides an example for combining land use, transportation and planning efforts into one growth blueprint. The goal is to channel and accommodate new growth while meeting regulatory obligations to protect wildlife habitat. The result will be three new plans – the Multi-Species Habitat Plan, a Transportation Plan, and an updated General Plan.

- **State Policies and Investments.** Finally, in order for local and regional incentives and policies to be effective, the state needs to set and communicate clear policies and then ensure that the actions of state agencies (including the investment of state funds) are coordinated with one another and implemented in conformance with state policy.

In addition to various actions needed at different levels of government, support for sustainable development, smart growth and community livability strategies will be needed from key non-profit organizations, business and development interests, community-based organizations, and the general public. Also, local and regional agencies would need to cooperate with the state if the state is to identify and implement meaningful reforms.

### **The State of California**

The state should develop and implement a comprehensive strategy for addressing problems resulting from existing and future development patterns and the related allocation of resources. The strategy should address existing conditions and problems, the anticipated 10.7 million additional residents expected in California by 2020, and growth beyond 2020. The strategy should seek to minimize transportation-related energy use, should reduce reliance on petroleum and should incorporate sustainable development, smart growth and livable community concepts through a mix of incentives and requirements. It should recognize that many state programs that are not typically regarded as related to the preservation of existing communities and to responding to future growth (e.g., education, health, welfare) are nonetheless critical to success. The strategy should have a strong orientation to urban revitalization, and it should focus priority efforts on providing residential and employment opportunities within already developed areas. The strategy should incorporate protecting the state's agricultural areas and address the distinctive problems and issues associated with the rural/urban edge.

### Recommendations for the State

#### Public policy changes:

- Enact a comprehensive statewide strategy that addresses both future use of existing developed and undeveloped areas and growth. The strategy should be based on a set of state sustainable development, smart growth and livable community goals, policies and criteria, as has been done in the states of Oregon, Florida, Maryland, and New Jersey. The state planning process would then need to be revised to coordinate the actions and

investments of state agencies and departments, consistent with these goals, policies and criteria.

- Reform the state-local fiscal relationship to promote more balanced land use development. Some options to consider include: Earmarking a portion of the state income tax for localities based on the number of people who live and work in the community or within a designated jobs/housing subregion; allowing localities to keep a larger proportion of the property tax generated by new housing development, with the state backfilling revenue lost by schools and other local entities; and/or providing other fiscal incentives (such as authority to raise funds for transportation, housing, open space and other smart growth purposes) for localities that update and strengthen their general plans based on the comprehensive state strategy.
- Provide greater certainty for both conservation and development by requiring that cities and counties update and strengthen local general plans, and then call for localities to expedite project review and approval for proposals consistent with the plans.

Fiscal incentives and targeted investments:

- Develop criteria for designating smart growth priority investment areas. State-funded and state-authorized infrastructure funding would go to these areas. State funds could not be used to pay for infrastructure that facilitates development outside of the priority investment areas, but could be used for conservation purposes. The State of Maryland has developed an investment program that should be reviewed for its applicability to California.
- Provide financial incentives for private development in priority investment areas meeting sustainable development, smart growth or livable community criteria. Possible incentives could include tax write-offs for investments in smart growth areas, tax-increment financing for infrastructure and development projects consistent with smart growth development plans, and “smart growth mortgage” loans for housing purchases in qualifying areas to reflect savings in transportation and commute costs.
- Provide additional incentives for local communities to adequately plan for their fair share of regional housing demand, consistent with local employment generation, infrastructure, and environmental constraints. Possible incentives include providing cities and counties with a larger share of the property tax from new housing development in targeted areas, providing funding priority for transportation or other infrastructure for communities that meet or exceed fair-share housing requirements (particularly higher-density infill housing), and creating a regional jobs/housing balance fund to provide support for affordable housing development in job-rich and housing-poor communities.

- Increase the funding available for alternative transportation projects, and enact provisions that tie regional investments in transportation projects to improvements in land use planning, in order to ensure a better jobs/housing balance and improve air quality at the regional and subregional levels.
- Increase funding for farmland conservation and open space protection, and give priority to communities, subregions and regions that adopt land use conservation and development programs to ensure more compact development based on smart growth criteria.

#### Voluntary measures and technical assistance:

- Provide funding and technical assistance to localities both for the development and implementation of sustainable community, smart growth and livable community strategies and for the coordination of planning and implementation with neighboring jurisdictions. Options include providing grants to cities and counties for the preparation of general and specific area plans and providing longer term technical assistance to address both planning and implementation efforts.
- Provide funding and technical assistance to regional agencies to support collaborative regional planning, including the preparation of coordinated plans that address housing, transportation, environmental quality and economic development in a comprehensive and integrated fashion.

### **Caltrans**

In order to provide for the future mobility and accessibility needs of California, Caltrans should adopt the following directions as a framework for future efforts:

1. Caltrans should explicitly recognize that improvements in planning for California's ongoing growth, including the incorporation of sustainable communities, smart growth and livable communities concepts, is a critical factor.
2. Caltrans should continually seek out opportunities to coordinate growth management related programs and activities with other state and federal agencies and with the private sector.
3. Caltrans should increase its efforts to work with local and regional agencies on land use, transportation, and growth management issues.

#### Recommendations for Caltrans

- Caltrans should reexamine its mission and identify how to most effectively respond to the mobility and accessibility challenges of existing and future development and growth. Caltrans periodically assesses its mission. As part of this process, the department should

address how the principles of sustainable/smart/livable communities and transportation systems would help carry out Caltrans' mission of improving mobility across California. The active involvement of senior Caltrans managers would be crucial to success. Caltrans is a very large organization. The positive actions of one unit can be invalidated by the activities of other parts of the organization. The assessment of how Caltrans plans for the state's mobility and accessibility should include development of a specific implementation strategy for the agreed upon organizational approach as well as a program for monitoring agreed-upon actions.

### Near-Term Actions

A number of specific actions would place Caltrans in a leadership or support role on critical sustainable development, smart growth or livable community initiatives. Each of these actions would require a financial and staffing commitment to design and initiate (or to partner with other state and/or regional agencies). It is recommended that Caltrans staff review the potential actions, identify additional actions, and then select those that should be pursued in the near future. Implementation of any of these actions is not dependent on the initiation or completion of the broader organizational process (mission assessment) identified above.

The following actions involve existing state programs:

- Participate in the Inter-Regional Partnership (IRP) program. This year's state budget includes \$5 million to be distributed through a competitive grant program to implement planning strategies that address solutions to the job-housing balance problem in areas of the state that are suffering significant traffic congestion as a result of increasing distances between employment and housing. The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is administering this program. Caltrans, which does meet and coordinate with HCD, could propose involvement through technical assistance and/or financial support.
- Seek opportunities to provide innovative, reasonable and feasible transportation alternatives that reflect community values as part of Caltrans' intergovernmental review, community planning, and other staff work with local and regional planning agencies. Caltrans should work with local and regional agencies to achieve consistency and compatibility between regional and inter-regional plans as well as comment on land use-transportation relationships in these plans.
- Support smart growth, sustainable communities and livable communities through the Overall Work Program (OWP) review process. Caltrans is actively involved in the formal OWP review process for metropolitan planning organizations and regional transportation planning agencies. When commenting on an OWP, the department should emphasize sustainable community, smart growth, livable community, and citizen participation objectives as a work program and budget priority.

- Increase support for the use of modeling (transportation, land use, energy and air quality) to evaluate alternative land use scenarios. Increase support for cooperation and coordination among local, regional and state agencies. Provide funding to demonstrate the benefit of energy efficient land use practices in urban communities.
- Provide support to ensure success of the department's Energy Efficiency and Conservation initiatives and the integration of sustainable energy practices in the statewide planning effort. Within the framework of the transportation system, this initiative will integrate the issues of transportation energy use, transportation funding, environmental policies, and the impacts of transportation on the California economy. Previous efforts have addressed them individually. Implementation will provide analysis of transportation energy infrastructure and related alternative fuel and vehicle markets, system operations, transportation revenues, and environmental policies.
- Increase the level of effort of the Community Based Transportation Planning grant program. The program offers planning grants for transportation-related projects that promote livable community objectives and integrate land use/transportation planning concepts. The increased level of effort should include providing for capital facility investments as well as planning activities.

The next action is recommended in response to numerous comments raised by local and regional officials regarding the state highway design standards as they are applied to state routes that serve a local street function. Caltrans has recently initiated a Flexible Design Working Group to investigate modification of highway design standards in this area. Caltrans continually updates the standards for the State Highway System. The next major update is scheduled for July 2001. The working group is exploring issues and opportunities related to the use of context sensitive roadway solutions, and it is assisting with the development of a related training module. The group consists of state and local agency representatives as well as representatives of non-profit entities. Related to this effort, Caltrans has prepared a list of state routes that serve as "mainstreets." The list allows Caltrans districts to identify opportunities to create partnerships with local agencies and to identify roadway use issues, including issues related to context sensitive design. This work has started in several locations, including District 9 – Lone Pine on State Route 395, District 10 – Los Banos on State Route 152, and District 1 – Willow Creek on State Route 299.

- Over the next 12 to 18 months, Caltrans should continue investigation of the specific issues involved with determining appropriate design standards for state routes that serve as local streets and work with local communities to determine when exceptions to minimum design standards are appropriate. In the Flexible Design Working Group process, the experience of the Federal Highway Administration's Context Sensitive Design Program, and of the states that have modified their highway design standards (including Oregon, with its Main Street Design Guidelines), should provide valuable insights.

The following recommended actions would be new initiatives for Caltrans:

- Establish more active partnerships with regional agencies that are pursuing comprehensive sustainable, smart and livable growth strategies. There are many options that could be considered. The San Diego County Association of Governments (SANDAG), the Bay Area's Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) are developing regional smart growth strategies that could have significant long-term transportation benefits. The San Luis Obispo Council of Governments is interested in developing a strategy that would include the preparation of a model for assessing the transportation impacts of various land use scenarios. Caltrans' participation could include financial support and/or technical assistance.
- Participate in the initiatives of the many smart growth/sustainability/livability organizations. One such project is the Urban Land Institute's (ULI) California Smart Growth Initiative. The ULI has begun a two to three year effort aimed at exploring opportunities for smart growth in California. It involves the creation of coalitions made up of private sector developers, public officials, civic organizations and interest group leaders. These coalitions are being formed at both the regional and statewide level to identify high-priority challenges and solutions. The mismatch of jobs and housing (which contributes to excessively long commutes) is one issue that has already been raised as a priority. Caltrans could offer to assist the ULI in its exploration of smart growth incentives.
- Increase the level of effort of the department's Environmental Justice activities, especially the existing competitive statewide grant program providing funding assistance to low-income and minority communities and economically-depressed neighborhoods to plan and implement transportation projects of local significance. The grant program demonstrates the benefit of inclusive planning processes and exemplifies transportation investments that improve mobility, access, equity and economic vitality in underserved communities. The increased level of effort should include providing for capital facility investments as well as planning activities.
- Support transit-oriented development (TOD) through an incentive program and promotion of the social and economic benefits of living and working near transit. Caltrans is currently involved in investigating the effect of TOD development on transit and automobile use. Since the encouragement of TOD is a key sustainable development/smart growth strategy, Caltrans ought to consider providing significant funding for both TOD planning and the capital facilities that would support TOD projects.

- Work with communities to develop new policies, standards, and procedures for the retrofit or reconstruction of existing Caltrans facilities. Landscaping, soundwalls, lighting, maintenance facilities, parking lots, and similar facilities could be modified to reduce impacts on adjacent “smart” developments or on the lands on which such developments would subsequently be more feasible. In making location decisions for yards, offices, or other Caltrans facilities, develop and use new criteria that factor in smart growth considerations.
- Work with metropolitan planning organizations, other regional transportation planning agencies, air districts and other public and private sector entities to develop programming prioritization criteria for new interchanges, intersections and routes. The new criteria should evaluate potential growth inducing and growth shaping impacts and give priority to facilities and services in communities planning for smart growth.
- The department is fully engaged in corridor and route studies (Transportation/Route Concept Reports). These studies are a basic component of planning at Caltrans, and land use, including agricultural and environmental considerations, is a fundamental element of them. The studies are prime sources of information on corridors for trip generation, proposed strategies, actions for improvements along the corridors, and other input. Guidance for these studies should place sufficient emphasis on smart, sustainable and livable principles and practices, including accessibility as well as mobility.
- Caltrans, working with metropolitan planning organizations and regional transportation planning agencies, should develop a framework for integrating Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and other system management strategies into state and regional transportation planning and programming processes.
- Caltrans, working with metropolitan planning organizations, other regional transportation planning agencies, air quality management districts, and other public and private sector entities should implement a Statewide Telecommunication Deployment Strategy designed to improve the use of telecommunications in accessing information and services with resulting reductions in the movement of people and goods.

## **Regional Agencies**

California should establish a process through which regional agencies can develop publicly supported comprehensive and meaningful strategies to address the future of existing developed, agricultural and undeveloped areas. These strategies should incorporate sustainable community, smart growth and livable community planning and development concepts and objectives, and should include comprehensive transportation energy policies to reduce reliance on petroleum. They should also be consistent with a statewide strategy that addresses the future use of developed and undeveloped areas.

Based on interviews and investigation, it is clear that most of California's regional planning agencies, whether metropolitan planning organizations, other regional transportation planning agencies, associations of governments, or councils of governments, are generally supportive of pursuing community sustainability, livability and smart growth plans and projects. It is also clear that they are restricted in what they can do.

Limitations on regional planning agencies come from a variety of sources. The most significant limiting factor is that local jurisdictions, whose officials govern the regional agencies, usually do not want the regional agencies to undertake land use planning that could call into question the wisdom of the land use decisions made independently by local governments. Thus regional agencies are often limited to encouraging progressive land use practices in general terms, and the level of that encouragement varies significantly from region to region. The issue of the roles and authority of regional agencies should be addressed in any process seeking to modify how the state responds to development and growth issues.

The recommendations outlined below could be undertaken by most regional agencies under their current authority.

### Recommendations for Regional Agencies

#### Policy modifications:

- Forecast the implications of current growth trends and develop alternative growth projections based on sustainable community, smart growth and livable community concepts. This effort could flow into the consideration and enactment of a comprehensive set of sustainable community, smart growth and livable community goals, policies and criteria. Regional planning procedures could then be revised to coordinate the actions and investments of all agencies, consistent with these goals, policies and criteria.
- Strongly advocate reforms to the state-local fiscal relationship to promote more balanced land use development.

#### Fiscal incentives and targeted investments:

- Develop criteria and then designate smart growth priority investment areas. Infrastructure funding would be programmed to go into these priority investment areas.
- Countywide and regional transportation planning and funding agencies should increase the funds available for alternative transportation projects and enact provisions to tie investments in transportation projects to improvements in land use planning. These improvements in planning should promote better jobs/housing balance and better air quality at the regional and subregional levels.

#### Voluntary measures and technical assistance:

- Develop model smart growth, sustainable and livable community policies and implementing ordinances that could be used by localities in developing city and county plans, zoning codes, and building and development standards.
- Implement a telecommunication deployment strategy designed to improve the use of telecommunication, resulting in reducing the movement of people and goods. The Southern California Association of Governments is implementing such a strategy as part of efforts to reduce the growth of traffic and improve air quality.
- Develop a framework for integrating Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and other system management strategies into state and regional transportation planning and programming processes.
- Provide technical assistance to localities that develop and implement sustainable communities, smart growth or livable community strategies. One example is to provide up-front planning grants to cities and counties for the preparation of transit-oriented development plans.
- Facilitate multi-jurisdictional efforts to consider and resolve growth and planning related problems. This should involve both providing technical assistance and facilitating communication processes to encourage and assist neighboring jurisdictions in coordinating their land use planning and implementation.

#### **Local Agencies**

California's cities and counties are primarily responsible for determining the intensity and geographic arrangement of land uses in their communities. These responsibilities are carried out through plan "making" and plan "implementation." 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.

#### Recommendations for Local Agencies

There are a great many diverse strategies and actions that localities could and, in some cases, do follow to foster sustainable communities, smart growth, and livable communities. Examples include:

- Local plans should be consistent with both regional plans and state strategies that address development patterns and the allocation of state resources. Yolo County and the City of Davis have forged an effective agricultural protection program. It includes firm support for farmland protection in General Plans, an innovative revenue-sharing agreement that promotes orderly urban expansion and discourages leapfrog development, a strong right-to-farm ordinance, and a farmland mitigation requirement that limits the loss of farmland.
- Local agencies, along with regional agencies and the state, need to have comprehensive transportation energy policies to reduce reliance on petroleum. Land use planning programs and urban design elements that minimize transportation related energy use are important in achieving this objective.
- Local agencies and transit providers need to improve the coordination of their plans and programs.
- Local, regional, and state agencies should increase emphasis on management of the transportation system to improve efficiency, safety and effectiveness.

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), in *Making Better Communities by Linking Land Use and Transportation*, identifies five land use and transportation strategies and related best practices that local communities should consider in the pursuit of smart and livable development (including minimizing transportation-related energy consumption). The strategies and best practices as described by ABAG are outlined 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 (day care, dry cleaning, cafes, etc.) 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 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 serve and link activity centers, with priority for transit vehicles, direct routing, and few turns.

#### Pedestrian-friendly development standards:

- Orient buildings and entrances to the pedestrian network by encouraging visually interesting building facades, encouraging frequent building entrances, encouraging front porches, and reducing setbacks for both 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 to help mark pedestrian paths through parking lots.
- 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.

### **Regional and Statewide Non-Profit Organizations**

California is fortunate to have a number of major non-profit organizations that actively support sustainable communities, smart growth, and livable communities. Leading philanthropic nonprofits with commitments to these concepts include the Hewlett, Irvine, Packard and Columbia Foundations. Some of the public interest nonprofits that have been actively participating in a variety of activities include the California Futures Network, the Local Government Commission, the Great Valley Center, the Urban Land Institute, the Surface Transportation Policy Project, and the Congress for New Urbanism.

#### Recommendations for Non-Profit Organizations

##### Philanthropic non-profits:

- Target ongoing and seed grant funding to give priority to programs that address sustainable communities, smart growth and livable communities.
- Increase involvement in local, regional and state planning processes.

##### Public interest non-profits:

- Actively participate in collaborative regional and state initiatives aimed at promoting sustainable communities, smart growth and livable communities.

## **Business and Development Interests**

A number of regional and statewide groups representing business and development interests have been actively promoting efforts aimed at fostering sustainable communities, smart growth, and livable communities on a regional or statewide basis. Some of these groups include the Bay Area Council, the Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group, the Sierra Business Council, the California Business Roundtable, and the California Chamber of Commerce. These organizations have recognized the need for a collaborative approach to the resolution of transportation, housing, and related issues, as well as for more stability and certainty in rules and regulations.

### Recommendations for Business and Development Interests

- Actively support efforts to address the quality of growth and development, including participating in partnerships with other private sector groups and with the public sector.
- Participate in the transportation planning process. Identify and promote opportunities to plan for, invest in, and develop smart growth projects.
- Establish project endorsement programs modeled after the successful one undertaken by the Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group. Such programs provide public support for proposed infill projects that conform to a set of pre-established criteria.

## **Community-Based Organizations and the General Public**

It is critical that community-based organizations and the general public gain an understanding of the importance of sustainable communities, smart growth and livable communities to their lives, and to the quality of life within their communities. Too often public participation is in reaction to a proposed project or policy, rather than as a stakeholder in the formulation of new approaches.

### Recommendations

- Local groups and individuals should participate, and be encouraged to participate by their local governments, in the budgetary, planning and program implementation processes that shape the future of their communities, including its transportation projects and services.

## **CONCLUSION**

At the global, national, state and local levels, continuation of existing development patterns and growth trends will result in a future that many consider undesirable in terms of impacts on environmental quality and economic prosperity, equity opportunities for traditionally under served and under represented populations, and the sufficiency of public and private resources to

---

provide desired services. In response to a widely-shared conclusion that new approaches to planning for future growth are needed, communities and advocates for many interests are coming together around a set of ideas variously referred to under headings including sustainable communities, livable communities, smart growth, and similar terms.

These new planning concepts are not only related to local and neighborhood concerns about quality of life and the future prosperity of individual communities. They are also directly related to resolving problems normally understood as state, national or global in character (such as global warming, preservation of species diversity, preservation of agricultural land, the conservation of fossil fuels, etc.).

Smart, sustainable, livable development patterns will be difficult to implement widely and consistently, however, without changing incentives for developers, residents, and local governments. Key areas of change include the relationship of local plans to finances, incentives created by tax codes, regional frameworks for decision-making, and state policies backed by consistent investments.

All levels of government need to cooperate and work together as partners to accomplish the objectives involved. Many such partnerships will also include significant participation by community and private sector interests. Both the public and private sectors have opportunities to contribute to finding solutions to growth related problems. Development and growth decisions are likely to be more sustainable, more livable, and more beneficial to all concerned if the state provides appropriate leadership and support.

## ATTACHMENT A

### SELECTED SOURCES

There is a great deal of written and internet-based information available on sustainable communities, smart growth and livable communities. The following items were selected for citation here primarily because of the practical information they contain. Items marked with an asterisk (\*) were directly used in preparation of Working Papers and/or the Draft Final Report. Many more references are cited in the bibliographies and in the footnotes of the Working Papers. Reviewing the footnotes, bibliographies and web connections found both below and in the Working Papers would lead to a wide and substantial variety of additional information.

#### Books

\**Blueprint for a Sustainable Bay Area*. Urban Ecology; 1996.

\*Baldassare, Mark. *California in the New Millennium*. University of California Press, 2000.

\*Curtin, Daniel J. and Cecily Talbert. *Curtin's California Land Use and Planning Law*. Solono Press, 2001.

\*Diamond, Henry and Patrick Noonan. *Land Use in America*. Island Press; 1996.

McKenze-Mohn, Doug and William Smith. *Fostering Sustainable Behavior: An Introduction to Community-Based Social Marketing*. New Society Publishers, 1999.

\*Moe, R and C. Wilke. *Changing Places: Rebuilding Community in the Age of Sprawl*. Henry Holt and Co.; 1997.

\*O'Neill, Daniel J. *The Smart Growth Tool Kit: Community Profiles and Case Studies to Advance Smart Growth Practices*. Urban Land Institute, 2000.

Roseland, Mark, ed. *Eco-City Dimensions: Healthy Communities*. New Society Publishers, 1997.

Roseland, Mark. *Toward Sustainable Communities: Resources for Citizens and Their Government*. New Society Publishers; 1998.

Van der Ryn, Sim and Peter Calthorpe. *Sustainable Communities: A New Design Synthesis for Cities, Suburbs, and Towns*. Sierra Club Books; 1986.

\*Weitz, Jerry, AICP. *Sprawl Busting: State Programs to Guide Growth*. American Planning Association, 1999.

## Articles, Reports & Studies

*The Ahwahnee Principles for Smart Economic Development*, The Local Government Commission, 1998.

\*Anderson, Geoff. *Why Smart Growth: A Primer*. International City/County Management Association, July 1998.

\**Beyond Sprawl: New Patterns of Growth to Fit the New California*, Bank of America & Greenbelt Alliance, 1995.

\**Building Livable Communities: A Policymaker's Guide to Infill Development*, Local Government Commission, 1995.

*California Transportation Futures, Summary of a November 30 and December 1, 2000 Symposium on Forces Shaping Mobility Strategies*. University of California Press, 2001.

\**Building Livable Communities: A Policymaker's Guide to Transit-Oriented Development*, Local Government Commission, 1999.

\**The Costs of Sprawl—Revisited*, Transit Cooperative Research Program, National Academy Press, 1998.

\**Designs for Air Quality & Background Report*, by Peter Calthorpe, et al, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, May 1997.

*Downs, Anthony. What Does 'Smart Growth' Really Mean?* Planning. American Planning Association, April 2001.

\*Ewing, Reid. *Best Development Practices: A Primer for Smart Growth*. ICMA, April 1998.

\*Ewing, Reid. *From Highway to My Way*. Planning. American Planning Association. January 2001.

\*Ewing, Reid. *Pedestrian and Transit-Friendly Design: A Primer for Smart Growth*. ICMA; June 1999.

\*Ewing, Reid. *Transportation & Land Use Innovations*. American Planning Association, 1997.

*Growing Smart Legislative Guidebook, Phases I and II Interim Edition*. American Planning Association; September 1998.

\**Growth Within Bounds: Planning California Governance for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Commission on Local Governance for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, January 2000.

\*Hirschhorn, Joel. S. *Growing Pains: Quality of Life in The New Economy*. National Governors' Association, 2000.

*Hirschhorn, Joel S. In the Fast Lane: Delivering More Transportation Choices to Break Gridlock*. National Governor's Association. 2000.

\*Krizek, Kevin and Joe Power. *A Planner's Guide to Sustainable Development*. Planning Advisory Service Report #467. American Planning Association; 1996.

\**The Land Use–Air Quality Linkage: How Land Use and Transportation Affect Air Quality*. California Air Resources Board, 1997.

\**A Landscape of Choice: Strategies for Improving Patterns of Community Growth*. The Growth Alternatives Alliance, April 1998.

\*Levy, Stephen. *Land Use and the California Economy*. Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy.

\**Main Streets...when a highway runs through it: A handbook for Oregon Communities*. Oregon Department of Transportation and Oregon Downtown Development Association, 1999.

\**The Principles of Smart Development*. Oregon Transportation and Growth Management Program, Planning Advisory Service Report # 479, American Planning Association; 1998.

\**Roads Less Traveled: Intelligent Transportation Systems for Sustainable Communities*. Public Technology, Inc., 1998.

\**The Role of Transit in Creating Livable Metropolitan Communities*. Transit Cooperative Research Program, National Academy Press; 1997.

\**Sustainable America-A New Consensus*, The President's Council on Sustainable Development, U.S. Government Printing Office. 1996.

\**Telecommunications Deployment Strategy*. Southern California Association of Governments; July 1996.

\**Theory in Action: Smart Growth Case Studies*. Association of Bay Area Governments, April 2000.

## **Online Sources**

\**Agenda 21* – United Nations Sustainable Development

<http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/agenda21.htm>

*Building Sustainable Communities - The Historic Imperative For Change*. Dr. Siegfried Brenke, et al, Nation's Cities Weekly, April 16, 1990

[http://www.ecoiq.com/dc-products/prod\\_ncw.html](http://www.ecoiq.com/dc-products/prod_ncw.html)

\**California Farmland Conversion Report, 1996-98*. California Department of Conservation

[http://www.consrv.ca.gov/dlrp/FMMP/fmmp\\_98rpt.htm](http://www.consrv.ca.gov/dlrp/FMMP/fmmp_98rpt.htm)

\**California Trends Project*. The University of California Transportation Center

<http://www.uctc.net/trends>

\**The Governor's Commission on Building for the 21st Century*.

<http://www.ltg.ca.gov/programs/cb21/index.asp>

*In the Fast Lane: Delivering More Transportation Choices to Break Gridlock*. Joel Hirschhorn, National Governors' Association

<http://www.nga.org/cda/files/001129TRANSREPORT.pdf>

*The Great Valley Center*

<http://www.greatvalley.org>

*International Urban Sustainable Development Website*. Sustainable Development Communications Network

<http://www.rec.org/REC/Programs/SustainableCities>

*The Local Government Commission*

<http://www.lgc.org>

\**The National Governors Association Center for Best Practices*

<http://www.nga.org/Center>

\**Straight Talk From Americans*. Princeton Survey Research Associates, February 2000

[http://www.pewcenter.org/doingcj/research/r\\_ST2000.html](http://www.pewcenter.org/doingcj/research/r_ST2000.html)

*\*Sustainable Development Initiative. Minnesota State Planning*

<http://www.mnplan.state.mn.us/SDI/index.html>

*\*What is Smart Growth? New Jersey Future.*

<http://www.njfuture.org/HTMLSrc/njfsmartgrowth.html>

*\*World Scientists' Warning to Humanity. Union of Concerned Scientists, 1992*

<http://www.ucsusa.org/about/warning.html>

## ATTACHMENT B

### TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FUNDING RESOURCES

Working Paper #3: Transportation Planning Funding Resources presents “a summary of available funding sources for projects related to sustainable land-use transportation concepts.” The resources listed below are excerpted from that Working Paper.

The best sources of information developed for Working Paper #3 were agency-related or funding databases published on the World Wide Web. The following are *topically specific* web sites specific to various categories of transportation planning or funding. Each of the funding sites has grants or other financial incentives for projects related to sustainable / livable development, sustainable / livable communities, smart growth, or related topics. Each of the topically specific sites is well regarded and has links to other web-based resources.

#### **California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)**

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/siteindex.html>

The California Department of Transportation is the primary contact for a variety of federal and state funded transportation programs. The Caltrans web site index lists resources in the “Doing Business” section under the following headings: Local Programs, Mass Transit Programs, Transportation Enhancement Activities Program, and Transportation Programming.

#### **A Guidebook of Financial Tools: Paying for Sustainable Environmental Systems**

<http://www.epa.gov/efinpage/guidbk98/index.htm>

Produced by the Environmental Financial Advisory Board and the Environmental Finance Center Network.

#### **Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Programs (CFDA)**

<http://aspe.os.dhhs.gov/cfda/>

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Programs (CFDA) is a government-wide compendium of all 1,425 Federal programs, projects, services, and activities that provide assistance or benefits to the American public. These programs provide grants, loans, loan guarantees, services, information, scholarships, training, insurance, etc., to millions of Americans every day.

#### **Conservation Assistance Tools**

<http://www.sonoran.org/cat/>

Conservation Assistance Tools (CAT) is an excellent searchable database of grants, cost sharing, and technical assistance available for natural resources projects in the western United States. One category of their listing specifically addresses sustainable communities. A majority of funding sources are private non-profits. It is designed to help local communities reach the information, potential partners, and financial support needed to accomplish grassroots conservation projects in the West.

**Foundation Center**

<http://fdncenter.org>

The mission of the Foundation Center is to foster public understanding of the foundation field by collecting, organizing, analyzing, and disseminating information on foundations, corporate giving, and related subjects. Audiences include grant seekers, grant makers, researchers, policymakers, the media, and the general public.

**Funders' Network For Smart Growth And Livable Communities**

<http://www.fundersnetwork.org/>

The network informs and strengthens philanthropic funders' individual and collective abilities to support and connect organizations working to improve quality of life, create better economies, build livable communities, and protect and preserve natural resources.

**Moving Costs -- A Transportation Funding Guide for the San Francisco Bay Area. Where Money Comes From - How It Is Spent - Summary of Major Funding Categories**

[http://www.mtc.ca.gov/publications/funding\\_guide/fund\\_guide-htm/funding\\_guide01.htm](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/publications/funding_guide/fund_guide-htm/funding_guide01.htm)

The Bay Area's Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is providing this guide in an effort to answer basic questions about transportation finance, and provide information for citizens who want to be involved in transportation funding decisions. These pages include a comprehensive overview of the San Francisco Bay Area transportation funding process -- including where the money comes from, and what it can be used for -- as well as suggestions for effective public participation in the funding process.

**Smart Growth Network**

[http://www.smartgrowth.org/ISSUEAREAS/cities\\_fiscal.html](http://www.smartgrowth.org/ISSUEAREAS/cities_fiscal.html)

A series of selected on-line readings that explore some of the central themes of financing Smart Growth development.

**Livable Communities Website**

<http://www.livablecommunities.gov/>

The Livable Communities Website contains information about Livable Communities Initiative and the work of the White House Task Force. The site discusses federal agencies' efforts to assist communities to grow in ways that ensure a high quality of life and strong, sustainable economic growth. Also included is information on and links to specific programs, resources, guides, and tools offered by federal agencies to assist every community.

**Center of Excellence for Sustainable Development**

<http://www.sustainable.doe.gov/index.shtml>

The Center is a national initiative of the US Department of Energy. The site offers a host of useful information to help foster understanding about the concept of sustainable development. Contents include overview articles, slide shows, links to other sources of information, recommended books and videos, and educational materials and programs that can help communities in their sustainable development efforts.

**The Center for Livable Communities**

<http://www.lgc.org/clc/welcome.html>

The Center for Livable Communities is a national initiative of the Local Government Commission (LGC). A nonprofit, nonpartisan, membership organization of elected officials, city and county staff, and other interested individuals throughout California and other states, the Local Government Commission helps local governments identify and implement solutions to today's problems.

**The International Institute for Sustainable Development**

<http://iisd.ca/>

The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) has an international focus and is therefore broader in its coverage of topics than other sites listed in this document.

**Smart Growth Network**

<http://www.smartgrowth.org/index2.html>

The mission of the Smart Growth Network is to encourage development that better serves the economic, environmental and social needs of communities. The Network provides a forum for information sharing, education, tool development and application, and collaboration on smart growth issues.

**Sustainable Communities Network (SCN)**

<http://www.sustainable.org/>

The Sustainable Communities Network is for those who want to help make their communities more livable. A broad range of issues is addressed and resources are provided to help make this happen. This web site is being developed to increase the visibility of what has worked for other communities, and to promote a lively exchange of information to help create community sustainability in both urban and rural areas.

## **Information Clearing House Sites**

**The Clearinghouse for Subject Oriented Resources (the Argus Clearinghouse)**

<http://www.clearinghouse.net/>

The Argus Clearinghouse provides a central access point for value-added topical guides that identify, describe, and evaluate Internet-based information resources.

**BUBL Link**

<http://link.bubl.ac.uk/>

BUBL Link is a catalogue of selected Internet resources covering all academic subject areas that is catalogued according to the Dewey Decimal Classification system. All items are selected, evaluated, catalogued and described. Links are checked and fixed each month. LINK stands for

Libraries of Networked Knowledge. While the site is based in the United Kingdom, sites relevant to US researchers are covered extensively.

## **Limited Access Databases**

Access to some or parts of the resources listed below is limited to students and faculty of the UC system. In most but not all cases, visiting the university and accessing the online systems from any on-campus library computer easily bypasses this limitation.

### **UC Berkeley PathFinder**

<http://sunsite2.berkeley.edu:8000/>

Pathfinder is the Web-browsable online public access catalog of the University of California at Berkeley Library. An experimental version of PathFinder, accessed from the address above, also provides access to electronic books. The e-book service is campus accessible only.

### **California Digital Library**

<http://www.cdlib.org/>

The CDL's Directory of Collections and Services gives library users access to a vast array of intellectual resources (some resources are campus accessible only).

### **Indexes and Abstracts**

[http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/cgi-bin/searchref.pl?keyword=&DC.subject=Reference&DC.type=Data\\*&usertitle=Indexes+and+Abstracts&display=full](http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/cgi-bin/searchref.pl?keyword=&DC.subject=Reference&DC.type=Data*&usertitle=Indexes+and+Abstracts&display=full)

This is a long list of databases and indexing services, some of which provide full-text digital access to documents. These services are available through many university campuses such as Harvard, Stanford, State Colleges, etc (campus accessible only).

### **ProQuest Direct**

<http://www.umi.com/pqdauto>

### **JSTOR**

<http://www.jstor.org/>

ProQuest and JSTOR are two of the indexes from the list above. They are both powerful tools to access digital documents (campus accessible only).