Getting the Most Out of Online Engagement

Whether you are presenting a neighborhood plan, environmental analysis, or design assessment, the effective engagement of the public is one of the most fundamental goals in any planning process. Regardless of the technical expertise or novel approach at play, the success of any policy or development proposal is largely contingent on the ability to reach the public, not only to collect individual perspectives and suggestions, but to get the pulse of the community as a whole. This issue of the CalPlanner focuses on the topic of public engagement and how planners from around the state are employing different tools and methods to successfully reach their respective communities while helping to guide the process and shape the outcome of a particular proposal. From employing digital technology to ferreting local context, the articles assembled here highlight the latest in engagement strategies. In addition to these features, you will find Affiliate News, California Legislative Update, Commission and Board Report and much more.

Our next issue will feature the topic of historic preservation. We invite you to consider submitting an article that illustrates efforts to highlight and preserve the narrative of your community’s past. We are seeking topics that aim to advance how planners and communities view and treat cultural places and landmarks. As usual, your comments and suggestions are welcomed by contacting me at myplanning@live.com.

Happy Reading, MY

Frank W. Clark, AICP | President

Engaging the Public

Online and mobile engagement tools encourage participation by allowing people to choose where, when and how to share their ideas. They require significantly less time than attending an evening workshop, commission or council meeting and provide more flexibility. Many tools can be accessed from smartphones and mobile devices. And while the costs of tools vary significantly, they typically offer a better value than workshops when measured by the number of participants.

Public comment and participation opportunities that can be posted, forwarded and tweeted are also more likely to reach a broad section of the community. Through our work assisting cities and public agencies has shown that online engagement is more successful at reaching a greater number and a greater diversity of respondents than traditional tools. The number of responses to an online survey is typically several times that of workshop attendance. Online tools are more effective at reaching a broad section of the population in terms of age, tenure and length of residency. They also create opportunities to hear from residents who don’t typically interact with local government, and further help staff reach beyond “the usual suspects.”

Like any good community engagement process, the selection and use of online engagement exercises should be based on clearly defined outreach goals. The old adage “form follows function” applies here. Don’t write questions to fit the format of your application; choose the application that best matches your needs. The following questions and tips will help you select and apply the best web-based tool to meet your needs.

What’s Your Budget?

Costs for online and mobile tools vary substantially. There are many free, open-source and low cost options to choose from as well.

Putting the Pulse of the Community on Display
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Putting the Pulse of the Community on Display
Main Street in Santa Ana, California, was once Highway 101, a thriving corridor full of shops, character, and history. But, changes to the urban fabric over time, including freeway development and big-box stores, gave way to the “placelessness” that exists today. Freeway development, big box stores. South Main Street is a linkage for businesses, commercial areas, popular destinations in Orange County, and is the connection to the heart of Downtown Santa Ana. The research area included the adjacent neighborhoods that bordered the approximately three-mile stretch of South Main. The project area had a significantly higher Latino population (94%), than the rest of Santa Ana (74%) and Orange County (35%). These census, statistical, and geographical data were augmented through many first-hand efforts.

The focus of this project was to research the symbiotic relationship between socio-cultural and physical environments. This included identifying cultural ecological concepts manifest in the existing built environment as well as traditional Latino streetscapes. Understanding the cultural relationships to space was particularly important. During the data collection phase of the project long interviews were conducted with a number of stakeholders. These included the merchants’ association members, individual merchants, and planners. Further, interviews were conducted with members of the adjacent neighborhood associations. Equally crucial was to seek ways to have community input, participation and engagement. These were sought in a number of ways. As it was found that not all community members were able or willing to participate in traditional mechanisms, such as speaking at announced public meetings, our engagement efforts were broadened to four levels: Individual level, family level, community level, and (the usual) city planning level. Special effort was made to seek involvement and feedback at all these levels. Furthermore, in addition to standard verbal techniques, engagement was sought through story telling and artwork.

Culture can be defined as a set of interacting people with shared beliefs, values and norms. Cultural ecological concepts provided knowledge, cues and meaning related to the built environment. These include nonverbal communication cues that communicate meaning through visual elements, sounds, smells, languages, and activities in the physical environment. Demographic data led to a study of the local Latino/Mexican culture.

Cultural Assessment of the built environment revealed that Latino heritage was evident throughout South Main. A variety of different stores, including restaurants, retail, and auto services existed within the project area. The design, décor, and colors of the built environment reflected Latino/Mexican heritage outside and inside some buildings. In many stores and restaurants, walls were painted in bright colors, the menus and signage were in Spanish and English, and furniture was embellished with symbolism and tiles. In the restaurants, the cuisine was symbolic and festive. In this area, although automobiles were prevalent, walking was also common. South Main Street is a busy fifty-foot-wide...
Newly Elected Board Members are Getting to Work

It is an honor to serve as your Chapter President in these auspicious and challenging times. I want to start by acknowledging the dedicated efforts of our past-president, Hing Wong, AICP, who has given more time and energy to APA California than just about anyone I know. Hing helped guide our Chapter through challenging financial times and he’s done so much to improve member services. Hing will continue on the Chapter Board in 2017 as past-president and I am so thankful to have his continued counsel and experience. And lest anyone think Hing is backing away from his service to APA, he’s serving as the Chair of the local host committee for the 2019 National Planning Conference in San Francisco!

The APA California Board of Directors met for its annual retreat on January 27 & 28. The Board welcomed several new members. Kimberly Brousseau, AICP is the Chapter’s new Vice-President for Professional Development; Hanson Hom, AICP is the new VP for Conferences; Stephen Haase, AICP is the new Commission and Board Representative; and Daisy Villafuerte is the new Student Rep on the Chapter Board. We also have several new Section Directors around the state: Rob Terry, AICP, has taken over in the Central Section; John Hildebrand in the Inland Empire Section; Sharon Grewal, AICP is the new Northern Section Director; Rachel Hurst, AICP is the new San Diego Section Director; and Tricia Stevens, AICP is back for another stint as Sacramento Valley Section Director. I look forward to working with these dedicated planning professionals to shape the direction of the California Chapter over the next two years!

The Chapter Board also heard the final report on our record-setting 2016 Conference in Pasadena. Over 1,800 students, professionals, guests, APA members and non-members registered for the Conference and an additional 200 speakers attended 3 ½ days of outstanding programs, networking and just plain fun. The 2016 conference was financially successful too, which helps support the many member services that are offered by the Chapter and our Sections. There are far too many volunteers and team members to call by name, but a huge shout-out is due to the Conference Host Committee Co-Chairs who worked so hard to make this conference successful: Melani Smith, AICP, Meghna Khanna, AICP and Kevin Keller, AICP. And of course, the recently “retired” VP for Conferences, Betsy McCullough, AICP deserves major kudos for her tireless efforts.

The Chapter Board uses its annual retreat to set goals for the coming year. Last year we focused on improving the financial stability of the Chapter, development of a comprehensive communications strategy, improvements at our annual conferences and membership development. This year our focus will be on strengthening our voice, as an organization and as planning professionals, and on growing our membership. We’ll be talking more about the specifics in the coming months, but our goals include developing a grass-roots advocacy training program, a “Planners’ Day at the Capitol” and possibly an annual legislative conference. We also plan to develop strategies to more effectively engage planning commissioners as a key voice in supporting both our profession and the values and ethics that guide professional planners. On the membership side, we plan to focus our efforts on developing toolkits targeted to specific audiences, including university faculty, students, planning directors and decision makers. We will also develop an outreach program to employers that demonstrates the value that APA membership brings to an organization and encourages them to financially support their staff in APA membership and AICP certification.

Lastly, I’m pleased to announce that the Chapter is one of 28 around the nation that has received a grant under APA’s “Planners4Health” program. The aim of this program is to build relationships and capacity between planners and public health professionals. More details to come!

Keep your chins up and let’s accomplish some great things in 2017! PP
Using Engagement to Strategically Minimize Risk and Maximize Benefit

The role of CEQA in today’s planning world is a topic of much debate and discussion. Actions subject to CEQA can be thwarted by political agendas and/or regulatory inefficiencies. In a simple, bifurcated view, the dispute is between those seeking reform to ensure CEQA’s continued relevance in a rapidly evolving development landscape, and those emphasizing CEQA’s as a proven tool to minimize projects’ environmental harm and promotes sound decision-making.

While acknowledging the important role that CEQA has played in balancing environmental protection with community and economic development, many in the planning and development community see CEQA reform as imperative to its continued success. In particular, reform-minded practitioners point to statutory changes as vital to CEQA’s continued ability to enable and even promote sustainable, innovative development projects that help our communities to grow and change for the better. Some of these recent changes include requiring litigants to disclose their identities, prohibiting courts from invalidating project approvals, and further streamlining the approval process for transit-oriented, infill development.

The debate around how to maximize CEQA’s legitimacy and effectiveness will likely continue for as long as the statute remains in effect. Recent evidence indicates that most challenged projects tend to be higher density, transit-oriented housing in existing urbanized areas. This suggests there is a the need to minimize non-environmentally motivated legal challenges and maximize CEQA streamlining to facilitate “good” development. Yet, looking beyond bulletproofing documents, and in parallel to proposed reforms, why not also attempt to maximize local community buy-in and benefit from proposed projects by improving the participatory planning process?

Not all legal challenges can or will be avoided by providing community stakeholders with ample opportunities to help shape their built environment. For example, labor unions (while not categorically unconcerned about the environment) often have motives beyond what is best for the local community when they mount opposition via CEQA to development projects in California. And, ultimately, even a well-designed and executed public engagement plan cannot dissuade every opponent from attempting to derail a project—no matter how many concessions are made. Yet, there are many good reasons to focus more on engaging folks in up-front planning. The literature on public engagement in planning demonstrates, for instance, that:

1. Participatory planning offers opportunities for direct democracy and promotes collaborative decision-making;
2. Non-expert opinions can generate creative solutions from participants unbound by professional constraints;
3. Local knowledge is vital to ensuring that projects are designed to have the greatest potential to improve the communities in which they are sited;
4. Participatory processes result in higher quality plans (i.e., designs that maximize usable space, are well suited to their prescribed use and surroundings, and serve an array of users), because a plurality of community opinions and concerns can be solicited and incorporated;
5. When engaged authentically in the planning process, stakeholders grow more invested and have more opportunities to come to terms with opposing viewpoints; and
6. Community stakeholders may be less likely to bring eleventh-hour challenges to project approval if they’ve been involved early and authentically in the process.

Developing and implementing long-range community improvement strategies also provide important opportunities for authentic public engagement that can build capacity among stakeholders. A capacity-building process generally promotes an educated and informed public; a better understanding among stakeholders of the complexity and challenges of the issues and decisions at hand; and improved long-term relationships between and among stakeholders. For instance, participants who engage in public process around a particular project or plan of personal concern may emerge having expanded their knowledge of planning issues as well as their understanding of how to effectively get involved in public policy debates. More broadly, advocates of participatory planning claim that it not only leads to greater consensus around particular decision-making and approval processes, but also fosters more empowered communities, whose civic capacity is then heightened and available for future mobilization. This is true both for singular projects that have the potential to contribute to larger neighborhood improvement and for more extensive collaborative planning processes that aim to inform policy and program implementation.

Among the critiques of public process are that it is expensive and time-consuming, and ultimately may not lead to better project outcomes. Moreover, the loudest and most polarizing voices not only often drown out other, more balanced perspectives, but may also discourage some people from contributing or voices that may be valuable. As Hibbard and Lurie, professors of planning who’ve written copiously on the participatory process describe, “The very presence of special interest groups in the planning process, who show up to planning meetings representing the interests of some facet of the public, may intimidate the average citizen with elaborate charts, maps, empirical evidence, and expert advice, thus deterring future involvement by non-experts in the community.”

While these counter-arguments are valid, some challenges can be addressed with updated and thoughtful approaches focused on early, authentic community input and buy-in. For instance, developers could (as some are) employ strategies that aim to promote real opportunities for community input and debate such as:

• Getting to know the community;
• Thinking of the community broadly;
Getting the Most Out of Online Engagement

as services that require a contractual agreement. Consider not just direct fees, but staff time at both the start and finish of your endeavor. You’ll need to provide an introduction and instructions, write and edit questions, choose question types, and add images, maps, graphics and other materials for self-guided exercises. The most substantial costs often come once the input period has ended and the data needs to be carefully analyzed and reported.

What Are You Getting?
Weigh direct costs and labor time carefully against what the tool offers. Some programs have staff who will work with you from start to finish, offering expertise on how to craft questions and present results, while others are entirely self-directed. It’s critical to know in what form the data will be delivered. Some systems will provide data analysis, while others output raw data that will need to be manipulated, analyzed and summarized.

Do Looks Matter?
Consider how much control you want over the look and feel of the survey. Do you have a project logo and color palette that need to be included? Can you work within a template? Is your community budget-conscious and would prefer a simple format?

What Type of Answers Do You Want?
You may be presenting questions with discrete answers that are suited to multiple-choice questions. Or you may be seeking more nuanced but quantifiable information. While most tools offer both multiple-choice and open-ended question types, look for the added flexibility of question types such as drag-and-drop ranking and slider scales that are more intuitive for users. Visual preference surveys and budgeting exercises can also be accommodated by many online platforms.

Does Place Matter?
Obviously, most of our work is place-based. But there is a large range of options when it comes to capturing location-specific community input. Some simple tools will allow you to collect answers about neighborhoods or sites using static images or maps. If you are seeking more specific information, look for tools that have interactive mapping capability. Responses can be “pinned” to a map and geolocated, and, in some instances, linked to a GIS dataset and mapped.

Are You Taking Your Survey on the Go?
It’s important to ensure applications work on tablets and phones as well as desktop and laptops. Everyone, but members of economically disadvantaged communities especially, increasingly access the internet through mobile devices. The use of tablets and kiosks in the field also allows even greater reach and flexibility. Staff can take surveys on tablets into public places and to events to collect input from people who may otherwise not engage with— or be aware of—your project. Some platforms can also be set up on City-owned or rented kiosks in community spaces such as libraries, city hall, or near the planning counter.

Other Considerations
More factors to keep in mind include:
• Translation and other accessibility needs
• Whether this is a one-time tool or an ongoing service
• The ability to easily adapt your online tool into a hard copy for distribution
• Whether respondents should be able to view answers from other participants

Once you’ve selected a tool, be sure to design its use and promotion to get the most out of it. Ensure your questions will yield effective and manageable data. Keep the length of your questionnaire or exercise to something that can be completed in about 10 minutes to maximize participation. Include the estimated time in your introduction. Longer exercises may be appropriate in some contexts, but anticipate that participation will decline as more time is required. Limit open-ended questions to no more than two, to focus input and ensure you can analyze and manage the responses.

A strategic promotion strategy is critical to maximizing the benefits offered by online engagement. Seek opportunities to use existing communication tools, such as city social media accounts and mailing lists. Get a short, easily identifiable URL that can easily be pasted, shared and remembered. Encourage relevant commissions, advisory groups and advocates to share the tool with their networks. Promoting your platform an opportunity to reach more audiences, test out through creative outreach strategies, and learn more about how community members are interacting online.

Integrating online instruments into your engagement strategy can be an effective way to broaden the perspectives weighing in on civic issues. When carried out thoughtfully and strategically, these tools provide novel opportunities for community education and participation and demonstrate public agency relevance and flexibility.

Ellie Fiore and Ryan Mottau are planners and project managers with MIG, Inc. They work on with public sector clients and communities throughout California and the western US.

Greta K. Brownlow, PhD is an environmental and adjunct professor in San Jose State University’s Department of Urban and Regional Planning. She has been a CEQA practitioner for almost 20 years, and has done extensive research on public involvement in planning.
Online Community Engagement Resources: A Partial List

Here are some resources and platforms to explore in your hunt for the ideal online engagement tool.

Bang the Table: bangthetable.com
Citizen Budget: http://www.citizenbudget.com/
Cityzen: cityzen.io
Community Remarks: communityremarks.com
CoUrbanize: courbanize.com
CrowdBrite: crowdbrite.net
CrowdGauge: crowdgauge.org
eDemocracy: forums.e-democracy.org
Granicus: granicus.com
 Lime Survey: limesurvey.org
MetroQuest: metroquest.com
Maptionnaire: maptionnaire.com
Neighbor Land: neighborland.com
Open Town Hall: peakdemocracy.com
Poll Everywhere: pollenwhere.com
Public Stuff: publicstuff.com
See Click Fix: seeclckfix.com
Survey Monkey: surveymonkey.com
Tidepools: tidepools.com

Source: “Six things to look for when selecting online community engagement software”, BangTheTable.com
commercial corridor, with sidewalks less than ten feet wide. It is not pedestrian friendly, and is visually stark in nature. Conversely, the Mexican street is bright with color, terra cotta planters, varying street widths and sidewalks.

The City of Santa Ana and the South Main Street Merchants Association, desired a consistent aesthetic and attractive business environment, without losing sight of the neighborhood culture and historical character. City officials were hopeful of rejuvenation of South Main and a stronger business corridor. Residents desired safer pedestrian circulation, aesthetic improvements and a safer public realm.

Being sensitive to the local culture is imperative for creating successful, unique places. The above-summarized efforts that included brief but deep immersion, and subsequent in-depth analysis, led to the idea that creative and great placemaking needed to include a number of features. First, a vision was needed for the city to act on and for the merchants and residents to know what to expect. This included enhancements such as a gateway to mark the area and its physical character, and street and sidewalk improvements to enable safe pedestrian circulation. An urban design primer was prepared for the physical character of the area to help define it as a viable and flourishing enclave. Second, to engage the merchants, a Tenant Beautification Toolkit was proposed. This provided individual merchants with ideas and self-help actions they could take that would be within a framework the City had agreed to. Third, to engage residents, and encourage communicative art, several mural locations were proposed wherein the residents could tell a story of the area, its history, and its special nature. Opportunities were created for residents and merchants to collaborate to co-create parts of the sidewalks, alleyways, store entrances, etc.

The project intended to make recommendations to support a holistic business and pedestrian environment in the Historic South Main Business District and provide a planning strategy for the City to create a more economical, aesthetic and viable linkage to the downtown while celebrating a vibrant, cultural ethnic enclave. By modifying both policy and design, streets and sidewalks could become social incubators, economic vitality could be established, local culture be celebrated and a sense of place re-established along South Main.

Though this was an academic project, it yielded several lessons. First, even though participation in planning is fairly common these days, this project revealed that not all are able or willing to participate. Thus, if planners rely solely on the standard form of participation, it is likely that not all affected people will feel and be engaged. Cultural views, features, and needs require sensitive exploration beyond the standard forms of participation. Participation efforts may need to be modified to include long or in-depth interviews with those who are unable to be present. Second, engagement with various stakeholders yields different and sometimes contradictory perspectives. These can lead to interesting and innovative ideas. Third, laying out a plan of continuing community engagement may imply that not all re-development components be completed by the City, but that some components be planned so that the community can continue discussions and execute the project over a period of time. This may result in a changing landscape as opposed to a fixed one. Fourth, community engagement can take various forms. Activities and policies should be treated as standard procedure during the design, construction and implementation phases of a project, to ensure respect of local culture, contextual awareness, and public support, as they foster empowerment and build community.

Cultivating Economic Prosperity and Creating Identity along South Main Street in Santa Ana was a Professional Report prepared by Kristin Kaczmarek, RLA, APA, for a Masters in Urban and Regional Planning degree at the University of California, Irvine. Sanjoy Mazumdar, Ph.D., Professor of Planning, Policy, and Design, was the advisor.

Thus, if planners rely solely on the standard form of participation, it is likely that not all affected people will feel and be engaged.
When CEQA and NEPA Public Participation Requirements Aren’t Enough

When CEQA and NEPA public participation requirements aren’t enough to see your project through certification, it’s time to do more. But why is public participation essential, and how do we know when we need to go beyond just checking the box?

“Public participation is an essential part of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process.” – CEQA Guidelines Section 15201

One of the primary reasons to engage the public in your CEQA or NEPA process is so that the public can be informed and have the opportunity to be involved in a project that may impact them or their interests. Planners often turn to the CEQA and NEPA guidelines for how to conduct public participation. But deciphering when your project calls for an expanded outreach effort can be tricky, especially when the impacts to budget and schedule are inevitable. Ask yourself the following eight questions at the inception of a process to make sure you are soliciting sufficient public participation so that your project doesn’t go awry:

1. Does the project impact a geographic area and/or stakeholders beyond where the project is located?
2. Does the project touch on a topic that is currently controversial in the media or among the general public?
3. Is the project itself controversial?
4. Is there the potential for misinformation? For example, could your project be easily confused with another project or program? Can the facts be misconstrued?
5. Does the project name imply an action that can be negatively perceived by the public, such as the word “expansion” or “clean up”?
6. Are there perceived impacts to a set of the population who may not receive any of the benefits of the project?
7. Is there a high amount of public interest in the outcome of the proposal?
8. Is the project description finalized, or is there room for the public to help shape it?

For some projects, the minimum public participation requirements may be more than sufficient for project success, but if you answered yes to any of these questions, you may be looking at a rough road ahead. It could be time for you to take an extra step and develop tailored public engagement strategies. Why go through the trouble of additional community engagement? Because doing so can help you deal head-on with the challenges that are likely to arise from the scenarios above, and is critical to:

- resolving potential issues early;
- soliciting meaningful input to inform analyses;
- developing creative solutions; and
- raising awareness of and gaining support for the project.

It may also prevent more costly and time-consuming challenges later in the process, including potential litigation.

“Agencies shall make diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing their National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) procedures.” – Guidelines for Implementing NEPA Part 1506.6

The CEQA and NEPA processes provide an excellent foundation for broader public participation. If your project requires augmented community involvement, consider the following best practices for developing a successful public participation program:

- Design a public engagement plan to serve as the road map for conducting outreach from the early stages of the CEQA and NEPA process all the way to certification.
- Identify who needs to be informed about the project and involved in the CEQA and NEPA process, what their interests and concerns are, and how best to engage them.

- Use multiple methods to reach the public, and tailor those methods to best respond to a specific stakeholder group’s needs.
- Designate a single point of contact that is the direct source of communication.
- Promptly correct misinformation.
- Maintain a high-quality, open, proactive and transparent communication process.
- Communicate accurate information about the project, the environmental review process and the comment opportunities early and often.
- Ensure all information is accessible and provided in clear language.
- Diversify engagement opportunities to connect with stakeholders who do not typically attend public meetings, obtain information online or access local media outlets.

Achieving project success is often assisted by going beyond the usual posting of public notices and hosting the customary public hearings.

– Natalia Hentschel

The tips above can help you establish a strong public involvement program during the CEQA and NEPA process for successful communication with key stakeholders not only during development of the environmental document, but during project implementation as well.

By creating more conduits for community participation, lead agencies can expand public understanding of the project’s purpose, need and characteristics, as well as increase opportunities for people to provide meaningful and effective input. A wider outreach platform is critical to identifying and resolving issues early in the process and enhancing the credibility of the environmental document and agencies involved.

Natalia Hentschel and Tania Fragomeno are Public Outreach Specialists for Katz & Associates in San Diego, California.
Since November, as a gay person of color, my discomfort at public meetings has increased. Many folks, especially women and minorities, have been on edge. The presidential election - not to mention its lead-up and aftermath - has brought the divisions within our country into sharper focus.

As an urban planner, I find that much-needed community engagement has become more difficult. But I think planners can take on a new role and become healers in divided communities, making everyone feel comfortable and providing a way to create sincere, meaningful engagement that peels away differences and helps us find common goals. We need this now more than ever.

In my experience facilitating more than 500 design- and participation-based community visioning workshops in underrepresented communities, people are more positive when they use their imaginations and their hands to create, make, and do. When we start by doing something rather than just talking, we have a more personal connection to the outcome because we are physically building it.

We humanize the planning process when we use storytelling, objects, art making, and play. I start by asking participants to build their favorite childhood memory with ubiquitous, small, recycled objects. This method helps break down barriers posed by language, age, ethnicity, and professional training. The process can create a safe space for everyone to come together, listen, share, collaborate, and bond. This is especially important for those who have difficulty expressing their feelings (not just their views) in a public setting. Through this process participants can find common values and generate cutting-edge ideas and solutions for their communities.

Participants in the planning process need to be supported as they work together and develop a shared sense of attachment and ownership over their places. This is particularly important for women and people of color, who may feel marginalized by the public engagement processes. Planning professionals who want to access and use crucial community knowledge must start with an effective engagement strategy rooted in respect for differences.

The urban planning outreach process does not always highlight or respect various people’s experiences. Humanizing and relaxing the community meeting format allows for all voices to be expressed in a variety of different ways - not just in a public meeting where oftentimes the loudest voices are the only ones heard.

Assume that everyone is an urban planner with something to offer. We all have skills in critical thinking, creative problem solving, collaboration, and civic literacy. In acknowledging those human strengths, we validate community members’ identities and experiences. We also increase the likelihood that they will engage further in civic participation, when otherwise they might feel intimidated, fearful, or skeptical.

Urban planners have a social responsibility to engage with all members of the community. Their contributions are needed in shaping the future of our cities. The public meeting can become a key part of the healing process for our divided communities if it is run the right way. By learning how places and people matter in citizens’ lives, public meetings can encourage collaboration to generate new ideas and common values that give everyone a voice in the planning process.

As a community member, I have always found public planning meetings to be uninviting. The format is often intimidating and technical, and planners frequently ask questions that are too open-ended, which often invites the loudest, most outspoken citizens to dominate the conversation. That leaves out people who might not feel comfortable speaking up.

James Rojas

Jam es Rojas is the founder of Place It!, an inclusive visualization method for engaging communities in the planning process, and a founding member of the Latino Urban Forum.
Join the APA California Board

APA California is seeking qualified candidates from our membership to run for positions on the Chapter Board of Directors. The following positions are open during the upcoming election cycle:

- President-Elect
- Vice President for Administration
- Vice President for Marketing and Membership
- Vice President for Public Information

A list of duties for each position as well as the APA California’s Election Policies and Procedures can be found on the APA California website, www.apacalifornia.org. Please consider serving your profession and colleagues as part of APA’s leadership.

The following materials (available at www.apacalifornia.org) must be returned to Hing Wong, AICP, APA California Past President, by April 30, 2017 to be considered by the Nominating Committee. Please e-mail your complete packet to hingw@abag.ca.gov.

Required Materials

- **Position Statement**: A position statement, no greater than 600 words, prepared in accordance with the “Guidelines for Writing Background/Experience and Position Statement” (Appendix 1 to Election Policies and Procedures). You are encouraged to focus your statement on issues and ideas affecting the future of the organization.

- **Eligibility Form**: Asks you to identify the office for which you wish to be considered and to make a personal commitment to serve, if elected. (Appendix 2 to Election Policies and Procedures)

- **Candidate Agreement to Abide Form** (Appendix 3 to Election Policies and Procedures)

- **Commitment to Serve Statement** (Appendix 4 to Election Policies and Procedures)

Optional Materials

- **Photographs**: Candidates running for office may also submit, by April 30, 2017, a recent photograph to be published with the position statement. Please refer to the Election Policies and Procedures Section 4.2 for details.

- **Supplemental Materials**: If the nominating committee determines that it requires information or materials not mentioned above, you will be contacted. Unsolicited additional materials and phone calls to nominating committee members are strictly prohibited.

If you have any questions on the APA nomination process, please contact Hing Wong, AICP, APA California Past President at hingw@abag.ca.gov or (415) 820-7966. Thanks for your interest! HW

Spotlight: 2016 Mentor Program

Mentoring has proven to create lasting relationships and APA Orange Section recognizes the importance of linking our local planning community together for professional development. The Orange Section launched its first mentor program in 2015 and recognized the inaugural class at the 2016 Awards Banquet.

Samantha Singer experienced direct benefits from the mentor program and commended the group setting with their mentor, Maryann Marks. As a group, Samantha said that “we learned how to reframe our experience for future job opportunities that may arise. That exact situation did arrive for a few of us less than a year after our time with our mentor. We also learned from each other about experiences in our various job settings.”

The program offers two options: one-on-one with a mentor and protégé, or a group setting with one mentor and two to three protégés.

Many planners join APA for the professional development and networking opportunities. As a protégé, Samantha found that the program achieved both, noting that “the mentor group helped me grow my professional network as well, in a deeper and direct way than standard networking.”

As a mentor, Maryann Marks said that the experience of mentoring offered an opportunity “for having someone new to entice me to explore a different perspective from which I could examine and evaluate what I did and why I did it.” There are several benefits to mentors, including the chance to reflect on one’s own practice. “I looked at my work and past experiences more critically and realized that there were so many different ways that I could present and frame those experiences, both theirs and mine. I enjoyed being able to work closely with young professionals, sharing ideas and plans, helping to see the big picture of what they wanted to gain so we could establish the focus and direction of our mentoring experience,” said Maryann. Other participants found that the mentor program enhanced job satisfaction, developed strong professional relationships, and helped practice interpersonal skills.

The connections made through the program helped Johnwilly “Willy” Agulpos make the transition from private to public sector planning. Willy highlighted that “the Mentorship program gave me a holistic perspective of the planning profession by allowing me to meet other Planners coming from different fields and understand how my interest fit into the profession. It was nice to just be and talk with Maryann (our mentor) who not only has the professional experience but the drive to see us discover and succeed.”

After the program’s pilot year completed in 2016, the mentor program has been renamed to APA Orange PEEL (Planning: Education + Experience + Leadership). The mission of the APA Orange PEEL program is to foster a thriving, impactful mentoring program that continually builds a network of professionals to strengthen ties within the planning community in Orange County. The second year of the mentor program begins January 31 and will conclude in June. The PEEL Subcommittee has been working hard to enhance the program’s second year with additional support, more hosted events, and monthly follow-up.

Maryann volunteered to serve as a mentor in the second year, concluding that “there was more to the experience that I found valuable. I believe I also made some forever friends and I will enjoy watching as their careers blossom and they know I will always be available to assist in any way I can.”

From Left: Michael Sahimi, Willy Agulpos, Maryann Marks and Samantha Singer. Source: Belinda Deines
JEFFREY LAMBERT, AICP | VP Communications for CPR

What is the California Planning Roundtable? What We Do?

The California Planning Roundtable (CPR) is an organization of experienced planning professionals who are members of the American Planning Association (APA). Membership is balanced between the public and private sectors and between Northern and Southern California. The California Planning Roundtable advances planning practice and influences policy through innovation and leadership to create healthy, prosperous and equitable communities. CPR’s President Coleen Clementson says “The California Planning Roundtable is pleased to share news of the past year’s work. We encourage California planners to take advantage of the tools and resources that our members have produced to advance planning and promote planners as leaders.” For more information on CPR, please visit our website at http://www.cproundtable.org/

CPR is currently engaged in several efforts to advance planning practice in California. For our inaugural column in CalPlanner, a summary of some of these efforts is presented.

Infill Development

Planners are increasingly called to address urban challenges with strategies that rely on infill development. Yet infill development encounters difficult obstacles in spite of the social, economic and environmental benefits, which it can leverage. CPR initiated the Infill Project to examine obstacles to infill development and how they can be overcome. CPR has published several articles addressing obstacles to infill development and several more are anticipated. Articles published as of late January 2017 include the following.

Examining Obstacles to Infill Development. This article, written by Matt Taekker and Stan Hoffman, provides an overview for navigating the project and can be accessed at: http://cproundtable.org/infill.

Facing Opposition to Infill: Still Passionate About Planning? Vivian Kahn describes how infill development needs to be connected to clear measurable community benefits to gain both political and community acceptance of infill development.

Encouraging Infill through Impact Fee Design. Marc Roberts describes how municipal governments adopt development impacts fees that - when considered together - can make or break the finances of infill development, and, if properly shaped, can better address community objectives.

Infill Infrastructure Planning. Jeffrey Lambert illustrates how limited infrastructure capacity can be an obstacle to infill development, and describe measures to deliver infill infrastructure more effectively.

Financing Infill Development, Post-Redevelopment. Stan Hoffman and Bill Anderson examine public finance tools available to support urban infill, describe their limitations, and identify where new tools are needed.

Strategic Thinking

CPR had a well-attended workshop at the 2016 APA California Chapter Conference in Pasadena on Strategic Thinking Skills. Participating in the workshop were CPR members Carol Barrett, Liz Falletta, Hanson Hom and Janet Ruggiero, with Marc Roberts serving as the moderator: Because the session was well-received and the topic of essential professional skills is recognized as important training for planners, the topic has now been added as a regular part of the annual conference program presented by the CPR session, along with two other CPR sessions and the pre-conference leadership and management workshop. For the 2017 conference in Sacramento (September 23-26), CPR will continue to offer a workshop on strategic thinking or similar professional skills training.

CPR has reached out to the APA California Sections on partnering to provide training on essential professional skills. Each section can suggest topics they would like to cover and CPR members would lead or assist in the training. The schedule and format of the training can also vary with each section deciding what is most appropriate for their members (e.g., a series of weekday sessions or a Saturday workshop.) CPR has received a positive response from the sections and the following is the status of the partnering efforts.

Healthy Communities Annual Report 2016 - The Social Determinants of Health for Planners Paper

CPR’s Healthy Communities work group continues to promote the Social Determinants of Health for Planners paper. CPR member Miguel A.Vazquez, AICP highlighted it during his presentation at the US Green Building Council International Summit which took place at 2016 Greenbuild Conference and Expo in Los Angeles, California.

In addition, the paper was included in the convening resource list for the event entitled “Capitalizing on New Opportunities: Planners & Public Health Work Together to Promote Healthy Communities.” This event was organized under the Chronic Disease Prevention Leadership Project which is led through unique partnership between the California’s local public health leaders in the California Conference of Local Health Officers (CCLHO) and the County Health Executives Association of California (CHEAC).

Planners4Health - In collaboration with APA California, members of the CPR Healthy Communities work group prepared and submitted a successful Planners4Health grant application to the American Planning Association.

APA California was selected as one of 28 APA state chapters to participate in the $1.5 million grant-funded Planners4Health initiative. The initiative focuses on building capacity at the chapter level to create stronger, healthier communities statewide by fostering greater coordination between planners and public health professionals. CPR and APA California has put together a task force to oversee the project deliverables and ongoing activities. This task force will identify potential partners, leverage existing healthy community initiatives and efforts under way, share planning and public health information, bring together key stakeholders, and develop a strategic plan that will provide the necessary guidance to continue to build a health and planning movement in California beyond the six-month project timeframe. “California planners have been leaders in making communities healthier places to live,” noted APA California President Pete Parkinson, AICP.”The Planners4Health initiative provides a great opportunity to build an even stronger connection between planners and public health professionals.” JL
The New Kid on the Block

Hey there! It is truly an honor to serve as your Commission and Board Representative for 2017-18. My experience spans both the public and private sectors along with my five+ years as a Planning Commissioner for the City of San Diego, where I now serve as chairperson. I’ve spent my career in big cities; first San Diego, then San Jose, and then back to San Diego. I have also worked for large scale development companies on master plan projects. Despite these years of experience, there is much room to learn from my colleagues in smaller communities where planning decisions may have a much greater impact. While my view of planning has shifted as my career unfolded, my commitment to planning principles and our professional organization stands firm. The opportunity to interact with planners and public officials throughout the state is a wonderful gift to continue the work outlined in our Strategic Plan and that of my predecessor, Scott Lefaver. Thank you Scott for your service to our Chapter!

THE YEAR AHEAD

The annual Board retreat this past January helped me to integrate my ideas with those of other Board Members with their many years of service to our Sections and the Chapter. My action item from the retreat is to develop strategies to engage Planning Commissioners to be champions for APA and to promote the value of certified planners in the decision making process. Fortunately I have the support of other Board Members from throughout California to develop practical strategies to deliver our message to our commission and board members.

With your help I intend to take full advantage of our Annual Conference to support the needs of our appointed officials as well as strengthen the relationship with professional planners in both the public and private sectors. This dialogue has the opportunity to elevate our topics beyond the nuts and bolts of CEQA and Findings to “Planning 201”; a robust exploration of planning policy and implementation and our opportunities — and obligation — as advocates and educators for planning with our citizens and elected officials. I expect these sessions to be both serious and fun, though perhaps not at the same time!

In the upcoming months I will be reaching out to the network of Commission and Board Representatives from the local Sections. As articulated in our Mission Statement, I will commit myself to promote the role of commission and board members in building public and political support for sound planning. You are an invaluable resource to me to understand and respond to your specific needs and our profession. Lastly, if you are interested in being an active participant this year in Sacramento, consider this my call for moderators and panelists.

The large majority of planning and land use decisions are local; made by city and county elected and appointed officials. Our Strategic Plan acknowledges our changing environment and the role APA California must play to stay at the forefront of trends and emerging issues, including the demographic shifts in our communities. In my role as a Commissioner, I ask how can we build the planning bench to empower our communities to ensure they are represented in the planning process? One place is to support planners in their efforts to be appointed to a commission or board. With that thought in mind, I plan to connect with my Professional Development colleagues to explore opportunities to encourage planners to develop the skillsets to serve as a decision maker in their community.

I look forward to hearing your experiences and thoughts to connect our decision makers with our planning professionals. All the best for 2017. SMH

My action item from the retreat is to develop strategies to engage Planning Commissioners to be champions for APA and to promote the value of certified planners in the decision making process.
If you haven’t noticed, we’ve re-launched our APA California Facebook page. It’s another way for you to stay in touch with your colleagues on planning topics and activities and be a part of the conversation.
C A P I T O L N E W S

AB 1598 – Community housing revitalization and investment authorities
Position: Support

AB 1670 – Tax credit for affordable housing developers
Position: Support

ACA 4 – 55% vote for affordable housing and infrastructure bonds
Position: Support

SB 2 – Permanent source for affordable housing
Position: Support

SB 35 – New ministerial (by right) approval process for housing
Position: Support if Amended

SB 166 – Expansion of no-net loss to loss of affordability
Position: Oppose Unless Amended but working with author

SB 540 – Workforce Housing Opportunity Zones
Position: Watch

SB 697 – Development fees
Position: Oppose

CEQA

AB 278 – CEQA exemption for bikeways
Position: Support

AB 594 – Extends CEQA exemption for photovoltaic/wind energy generation facilities
Position: Watch

AB 1055 – CEQA Historical and architectural evaluation consultant standards
Position: Get more information from author before taking position

AB 1117 – CEQA aesthetic effects consideration
Position: Support if Amended

SB 80 – CEQA notices and posting
Position: Oppose Unless Amended

SB 224 – Baseline physical conditions
Position: Watch

SB 771 – Requirement for public employees to meet continuing education requirements for CEQA/AICP CM courses
Position: Neutral if Amended

PERMITTING

AB 546 – Permitting and fees for advanced energy storage
Position: Watch

AB 1414 – Permitting for energy solar systems
Position: Watch

SB 182 – Single business license for companies with facilities in multiple jurisdictions
Position: Oppose

SB 252 – Restrictions on well permits in critically over drafted basins
Position: Watch

SB 649 – Small cell facilities permitting
Position: Oppose

OTHER ISSUES

SB 780 – Revised water efficient landscape ordinance standards
Position: Watch

AB 943 – Initiatives that restrict growth
Position: Watch

SB A8 – School site acquisition/local zoning override process
Position: Support

SB 697 – Mitigation/development fee determinations
Position: Oppose

AG LAND/FARMWORKER HOUSING

Position: Still reviewing all bills below

AB 571 – Redefines farmworker housing

AB 925 – Williamson Act additional public benefits

SB 435 – Williamson Act payments/protection of resources

SB 530 – Farmworker housing building standards

All Hot Bills

To view the full list of hot planning bills, copies of the measures, up-to-the minute status and APA California letters and positions, please continue to visit the legislative page on APA California’s website at www.apacalifornia.org.

JT, SG, LDS
Seeking New Sponsorship Strategies

Now that the new editorial format for the CalPlanner has been established, we are seeking suggestions from APA California’s partners and sponsors on ways to better reach the Chapter membership. This means rethinking the traditional calling card ads for example, as well as all ad placement and associated links. So we need to hear from you on innovative ideas that would complement the new design and format while offering a more effective way to generate awareness for your business or service. We hope you will continue to support the CalPlanner and encourage your comments and ideas by contacting Marc at mmyplanning@live.com.
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Calling card advertisements support the publication of CalPlanner. For more information on placing a calling card announcement and to receive format specifications, contact:
Laura Murphy at 916.773.0288
or email
nhe2011@live.com.

Click on a sponsor call card and be linked to their website.
You’re invited to come to Sacramento, America’s Farm-to-Fork Capital, during the heart of the harvest season. Grab a plate and enjoy our exciting dining scene and vibrant urban street life, including the home of our opening reception – the revitalized R Street Corridor.

We’ve saved a seat for you!

IN SACRAMENTO, WE KNOW HOW TO THROW A PARTY!

Exhibitor and Sponsorship Opportunities are Now Available on the APA California Conference Website