Back to (Planning) School

With school back in session, we also return to Planning’s academic environment. As such, CalPlanner revisits the planning programs to highlight some of the work that will influence future trends of planning. Specifically, the content here explores a few new topics currently being contemplated, analyzed and critiqued within some of the 11 planning schools throughout the state. I would like to again take this opportunity to thank Julia L. Johnston, APA California’s University Liaison, for helping to encourage those in academic community to share their research and ongoing work. Without her assistance, this issue would not have been possible. So [another] thank you Julia!

Continuing on the theme of the future of planning, this issue also highlights some of the key legislation that APA California has been lobbying, giving an important voice to our membership. The current legislative session has been rather extraordinary in the both the scope and significance of the issues. To put this in perspective, the average session sees approximately 200 to 250 planning-related bills. This session, there were 130 bills introduced currently being contemplated, analyzed and critiqued within some of the 11 planning schools throughout the state. I would like to again take this opportunity to thank Julia L. Johnston, APA California’s University Liaison, for helping to encourage those in academic community to share their research and ongoing work. Without her assistance, this issue would not have been possible. So [another] thank you Julia!

Continuing on the theme of the future of planning, this issue also highlights some of the key legislation that APA California has been lobbying, giving an important voice to our membership. The current legislative session has been rather extraordinary in the both the scope and significance of the issues. To put this in perspective, the average session sees approximately 200 to 250 planning-related bills. This session, there were 130 bills introduced currently being contemplated, analyzed and critiqued within some of the 11 planning schools throughout the state. I would like to again take this opportunity to thank Julia L. Johnston, APA California’s University Liaison, for helping to encourage those in academic community to share their research and ongoing work. Without her assistance, this issue would not have been possible. So [another] thank you Julia!

Planning for a Carbon-Neutral California in 2050

Although California has been widely praised for its climate change planning to date, the biggest challenges lie ahead. In particular, we need to plan as a state how to approach carbon neutrality by mid-century. (By carbon neutrality I mean a condition of no net global warming emissions when life cycle impacts of production and consumption are considered. The state’s official goal is 80 percent below 1990 levels of greenhouse gas [GHG]) emissions by 2050.)

In this brief summary of a forthcoming article in the open access journal Urban Planning, I’d like to consider the problem at two levels. First, what additional policy directions might the state need in order to approach carbon neutrality? Second, what broader changes in social ecology can help carbon neutrality planning come about? By social ecology I mean the web of human systems in our state along many different dimensions, as shown by Figure 1.

The Need to Look Beyond Current Policy Directions

A number of recent modeling studies provide evidence that California’s existing policy directions are inadequate to meet long-term GHG reduction needs. Morrison et al. (2015, 546) reviewed nine models of deep emissions reductions for the state, and warned that “without new policies, emissions from non-energy sectors and from high-global-warming-potential gases may alone exceed California’s 2050 GHG goal” (emphasis original). Yang et al. (2015) found the 2050 goal potentially achievable only by assuming rapid adoption of questionable technologies including biofuels and carbon capture and sequestration. Greenblatt (2015) and Yeh et al. (2016) both found that California’s mid-term 2030 target could only be reached by policies going well beyond existing initiatives. Finally, Jones et al. (2017) argue that the state’s existing sector-based GHG accounting leaves out emissions due to residents’ consumption...
Sonoma State: Bringing Planning Elders, Students, and Community Partners Together

Since 1972, Sonoma State University’s Department of Environmental Studies & Planning (ENSP) has offered an undergraduate, professional preparation focused, planning program. From its inception, providing students with a direct connection to the planning profession and to community service has characterized the program. And starting in 2009, Sonoma State’s Center for Sustainable Communities has played a key role in those functions. The CSC offers a unique approach to preparing students for a range of planning careers by matching them with faculty and professional mentors—including recently retired “encore career” planners—to work on real world projects for state and local governments.

Four Decades of Design with Nature
Sonoma State’s Department of Environmental Studies & Planning (“ENSP”) was founded in 1972 by a biologist and a political scientist as one of the first undergraduate environmental studies programs in the U.S. It was further distinguished by including “Planning” in its name and curriculum. In fact, according to department legend, among its inspirations was Ian McHarg’s seminal work in “ecological planning,” Design with Nature.

ENSP is currently in the process of merging with Sonoma State’s Geography Department, to become the new Department of Geography, Environment, and Planning (GEP). ENSP’s Planning Program will become one of the new department’s concentrations. It remains distinguished by a commitment to professional preparation—uncommon for an undergraduate program. Program graduates have established careers in planning and related environmental professions, with government agencies, consulting firms, and non-profits throughout California and beyond.

Another signature of ENSP’s (now GEP’s) Planning Program is its connection to the planning profession and to working with communities. For example, planning students must complete an internship. And seniors in Planning take a year-long general studio course, in which they research and prepare a plan based in a local community. In addition, the program’s Senior Seminar is highlighted by a simulated job interview with a panel of local planning professionals.

Center for Sustainable Communities: Connecting Students, “Recycled” Planning Professionals, and Communities
Beginning in 2009, ENSP Professor Tom Jacobson, FAICP, and Alex Hinds, then just-retired Director of Marin County’s Community Development Agency, began work on morphing the University’s Institute for Community Planning Assistance into a 21st century model specializing in the intersection between land use planning, climate change, health, energy, and water. Since then, the Center for Sustainable Communities (CSC) has played a key role in preparing students for a range of planning careers by matching them with faculty and professional mentors working on projects for local and state governments. A unique aspect of the CSC is its use of recently retired (recycled) leaders in the planning profession who now work with the university assisting communities while training the next generation of planning professionals. These projects focus on the development and implementation of sustainable community strategies.

Projects are selected based on their alignment with the CSC’s core mission, including opportunities for meaningful student involvement. For example, the CSC has assisted the cities of Santa Rosa, Benicia and Vallejo and the Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority in developing or implementing climate action plans. Similarly, the CSC has worked on healthy community planning with Sonoma County’s Department of Health Services and Permit and Resource Management Department, as well as the planning directors in all nine cities in the county, on a range of healthy community planning projects. Among these is Healthy by Design: A Public Health and Land Use Planning Workbook, which won awards from APACA and the chapter’s Northern Section. Collaborations have also resulted in developing and offering a Planning for Healthy Communities course at Sonoma State with support from the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and a series of University-sponsored Community Forums on healthy communities planning topics. After assisting the City of Vallejo secure a grant from the California Strategic Growth Council, the CSC, in collaboration with the Solano County Public Health Department, prepared a Healthy Community Element for the city’s new general plan. The CSC has also developed an integrated water and land use calculator for the California Department of Water Resources, which compares the economic and environmental costs and benefits of low impact development compared to business-as-usual practices.

Turning Challenges into Opportunities
Back in 2009, California remained mired in the “great recession” and the associated downturn in paid internships and professional planning jobs. Furthermore, the CSC’s rollout overlapped with a reduction in university funding and related challenges in developing new classes in the evolving fields of climate action, sustainability, and planning healthy communities. In addition, financially constrained local and state planning agencies were in need of low cost, professional quality technical assistance. A related concern emerged, namely how the university could provide that assistance in ways that promoted collaboration over competition with private sector planning and environmental consultants.

What has worked? The CSC business model evolved into a project-based planning team generally consisting of up to 10 accomplished, highly motivated students, one or two faculty, two to four recently retired Bay Area planning directors, and at times, a recent graduate just embarking on a career in government, consulting, or non-profit work. This combination of well supervised students, faculty, and “recycled” planning professionals enables cost effective preparation of professional quality planning products that generate sufficient funding to operate a no-frills CSC without the university’s financial support. Depending on circumstances, the CSC either works directly for a government agency or teams with private consultants.

An additional benefit from the collaborations that have emerged has been support for ENSP’s curriculum. For example, the Sonoma County Department of Health Services—one of the CSC’s project partners—has helped to fund healthy communities planning curriculum, keeping course offerings vital while at the same time strengthening opportunities for planning and other environmental studies students to connect with public health professionals doing leading edge community health work. And the Sonoma County Water Agency is working with GEP.
Get Involved, Stay Connected

As you get ready for another APA California conference, I want to highlight the Chapter’s 2017 legislative advocacy program. Since I self-identify as a policy wonk (and served as the Chapter’s VP for Policy & Legislation from 2005 to 2010) my perspective may be a bit skewed, but I think our legislative program is the Chapter’s most important external activity; our program accounts for about 25 percent of the Chapter’s operational budget. Most importantly, though, we bring professional planners’ perspectives and expertise to legislative debates in Sacramento, and we are seeing the results of our hard work in the bills that get passed (and some that don’t).

To start, let’s meet the people whose hard work and dedication have made this program so successful. On the Chapter Board of Directors, VP for Policy & Legislation John Terell, AICP has overall responsibility for the program, including crafting our legislative platform and positions on key bills. The Chapter contracts with Stefan/George Associates for lobbying services and that team is led by Sande George, APA California’s long-time lobbyist and Executive Director. I can’t tell you how much I have learned from Sande over the years and she has been essential to raising the Chapter’s profile in Sacramento. In 2009, Lauren De Valencia y Sanchez joined Stefan/George as a lobbyist.

As I’m sure you’ve noticed, the current legislative session has been all about housing. To say the legislature and governor are “woke” to this issue is an understatement. APA California’s position on housing is straightforward: every city and county needs a reliable source of funding to support affordable housing development; and local governments need incentives to encourage housing development. As straightforward as this seems, reaching consensus on the best legislative approach is anything but.

As I write in late August, the legislature is still in session and the fate of myriad housing bills is uncertain. The governor’s office is throwing its weight behind a package of bills that would, among other things, increase funding for housing (SB 2 and SB 3), streamline the local approval process for some housing developments (SB 35), and make it even more difficult for local governments to deny or reduce housing developments (AB 678/SB 167). The package currently under debate reflects the governor’s and some legislators’ view that California’s housing crisis is largely due to the actions (or inactions) of local governments that “don’t want housing.” As planners on the front lines of this debate in our communities, we know that the full picture is far more complex and nuanced. For this reason, APA California’s positions on these bills vary; we support bills that we believe will result in additional housing production, including subsidized affordable housing, we oppose bills that we believe will not be effective and may even be counter-productive, and we seek changes to pending bills to make them more effective and practical.

Here is where you come in. APA California’s legislative and policy positions are shaped by the views of its members who have decided to get involved. For example, if you like getting into the details, join the Chapter’s Legislative Review Teams and help us dissect planning bills so we can land on a well-reasoned position. You can also write letters to your legislator(s) to help bolster APA California’s position; the Chapter’s position letters are online here. If you’re involved in legislative advocacy for a city or county, you can encourage your jurisdiction to take positions that support good professional planning. You can stay informed and connected by attending the Legislative Update session at this year’s conference, tuning in to our new Legislative Briefing Webinars and staying current with our legislative activities through the Chapter website.

Get involved, stay connected and help APA California advocate for great planning in California! PWP

I think our legislative program is the Chapter’s most important external activity; our program accounts for about 25 percent of the Chapter’s operational budget.
Estimating Project-Level VMT Reductions: How Do Sketch-Level Tools Perform?

Greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction is the name of the game in California, thanks to Assembly Bill 32 of 2006 and the innovative state policies it engendered. In 2008, Senate Bill 375 established targets for reducing GHG emissions in part by reducing vehicle miles of travel (VMT) through coordinated land use and transportation planning at the regional level. To encourage local transportation and land use plans and projects that support these regional plans, California has established several grant programs, some funded with revenues from the state’s cap-and-trade program, launched in 2012. Senate Bill 743 of 2013 triggered a shift from vehicle delay to VMT as an indicator of environmental impact in assessments required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

In order to develop plans and projects that most effectively contribute to GHG reductions, state, regional, and local agencies need methods to estimate the VMT impacts of land use decisions. Regional travel demand models, for example, are used to estimate the VMT and GHG implications of alternative scenarios in the development of federally-required regional transportation plans and state-required sustainable communities strategies. These models are resource intensive, however, requiring modeling expertise and sometimes many days to complete a single analysis. “Sketch” tools are less resource intensive and more appropriate for localized plans and individual projects, but they have notable limitations; practitioners are often unsure as to which method to use for a particular project and have little information to guide their choice.

In this study, we compared and evaluated six VMT estimation tools (Table 1) across a sample of land use projects. We compared the results from different tools for each project, considered the applicability of methods in particular contexts and for different types of projects, and assessed data needs, relative ease of use, and other practical considerations.

An Example

One of our example projects was The Cannery, a 100-acre grayfield development in Davis, California. The project comprises 600 dwelling units as well as 240,000 square feet of retail or commercial development supporting 600 to 850 employees. Using data gleaned through public sources such as the US Census, Google Maps, and the CEQA documents for the project and using default values for trip lengths and other parameters, we applied five of the tools to this project; it did not meet the criteria for the sixth tool. The results vary widely across the tools (Table 2). GreenTrip and Sketch7 produce estimates of household-generated VMT that differ by 33 percent. The other three tools produce estimates of total VMT from all land uses that range from about 36,000 VMT per day (CalEEMod2016) to a high of over 56,000 VMT per day (EPA MXD Tool). The two versions of CalEEMod produce estimates that differ by 14 percent.

Findings

Each of the six tools we evaluated have both benefits and drawbacks of the analytical and practical kind. Some of the tools are easier to implement “off-the-shelf,” such as GreenTrip Connect and CalEEMod. Others, like the Smart Growth Trip Tool, MXD, and Sketch7 require more input data from users but are easy to run once users acquire those data. Some tools allow for customization of default parameters and calculations to reflect local conditions. CalEEMod, for example, allows users to specify parameters such as trip lengths by trip purpose and trip generation rates. Sketch7 allows users to adjust to baseline data and the elasticities it uses to forecast travel behavior. MXD allows users to choose the function for calculating VMT. Customization is helpful for accounting for the specific context of a project, but it can also increase the burden of operating the tool, lead to biased results, or introduce error into the estimation.

Our application of these tools to five sample plans and projects showed that there is no “one-size-fits-all” estimation method. Each tool has a specific set of land uses built into it and is applicable only for these land uses. Each tool differs in its sensitivity to characteristics of the area around the project, with some tools sensitive to a broad range of characteristics and others mostly dependent on the characteristics of the project itself. For these reasons, practitioners may want to consider each of these methods in searching for the tool that best fits their particular need.

Table 1: GHG Estimation Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalEEMod 2013 &amp; 2016</td>
<td>Adjustment to VMT base on CAPCOA report</td>
<td>• Commercial (subset), educational, industrial, recreational, residential, retail (subset). • Any context area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Smart Growth Trip Generation Adjustment Tool</td>
<td>Statistically-based reduction in trips</td>
<td>• Mid- to high-density residential, office, restaurant, coffee shop, retail. • “Smart growth” project location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenTrip Connect</td>
<td>Statistically-based reduction in VMT</td>
<td>• Residential. • Any context area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MXD</td>
<td>Statistically-based reduction in trips</td>
<td>• Residential, retail, office, industrial (subset), commercial (subset), educational, other. • Any context area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sketch7</td>
<td>Statistically-based reduction in VMT</td>
<td>• Mixed use, residential, office, retail, industrial, public, civic, medical, educational, military, airport. • Any context area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning for a Carbon-Neutral California in 2050

of goods and services produced outside the state, which if considered would show the state’s emissions to be 20 percent higher.

A Potential Policy Path to Carbon Neutrality

So California is in a bind—its long-term GHG reduction goals go well beyond what current policies appear likely to achieve. What new policies might be needed? A full discussion is not possible here, but a summary of potential strategies and obstacles is contained in Table 1.

Table 1: Carbon Neutrality Policy Strategies and Obstacles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Potential Strategies</th>
<th>Social Ecology Obstacles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (37% of sector-based emissions)</td>
<td>Vehicle electrification brought about through feebates, other incentives, strong carbon pricing, and/or regulation. Better alternative modes of transport. A stronger state land use/housing framework to reduce driving. Incentives/education regarding lifestyle change.</td>
<td>Political opposition from motor vehicle, petrochemical, development, and airline interests; local government opposition to land use and housing requirements; difficulty of raising funds for transit and bringing about behavioral change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial emissions (21%)</td>
<td>Regulation (e.g. for building and process efficiency); much higher carbon pricing through cap-and-trade or carbon tax.</td>
<td>Industrial and political opposition; social equity concerns over cost burden and continued pollution of low-income communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity-related emissions (19%)</td>
<td>Increase renewable portfolio standards to 100%; community choice energy; further incentives for renewables and battery storage within buildings.</td>
<td>Reluctance of investor-owned utilities to embrace decentralized renewable energy systems; developer opposition to potential zero-net-energy (ZNE) home requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-electric building emissions (11%)</td>
<td>Require all-electric buildings and ZNE construction; require and subsidize upgrades of existing buildings.</td>
<td>Building industry opposition; legal and code barriers; expense and political difficulty of retrofitting existing buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (8%)</td>
<td>Increased regulation of the dairy industry and other agriculture; strong carbon pricing; diet change.</td>
<td>Political opposition from farmers; difficulty of changing behavior around diet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Global Warming Potential Gases (4%)</td>
<td>Phase-out following current regulatory trends.</td>
<td>Industry opposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfills and recycling (2%)</td>
<td>Stronger programs to capture methane and reduce waste</td>
<td>Funding; behavior change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption (out-of-state products not counted currently)</td>
<td>Behavior change campaigns; aggressive carbon pricing extended to consumer products; regulation to reduce carbon content of products.</td>
<td>Economic, political, and social opposition; difficulty of lifestyle change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon sequestration</td>
<td>Pursue maximum possible sequestration within farmland, grassland, and forests.</td>
<td>Farmer and landowner opposition to mandates; cost; difficulties of managing and verifying long-term sequestration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Ecology Changes

This agenda is very ambitious politically, and most strategies in Table 1 probably cannot be undertaken with current politics and institutions. Already those have limited the state’s climate planning. Fossil fuel interests successfully derailed a 2016 attempt by Governor Brown to secure a legislative mandate for a 50 percent reduction in motor vehicle emissions by 2030, and forced a relatively weak compromise on reauthorizing the cap-and-trade system in 2017. The state’s Chamber of Commerce continues to label climate policies “job killers” despite the fact that the state’s economy has prospered while meeting 2020 GHG reduction goals. Existing codes, standards, energy prices, tax structures, constitutional requirements, and patterns of behavior all make progress difficult. So fundamental changes in our state’s social ecology will probably be necessary if we are to plan for carbon neutrality.

Some social ecology trends are hopeful. Many stakeholders as well as a majority of residents support climate planning. The state has a rapidly growing green business sector that will help counter-balance fossil fuel interests. Technological innovation is strong, and the state’s abundant sunshine and mild winters (“environment” in Figure 1) make moving towards zero net carbon buildings easier. Most importantly, California’s population continues to become more diverse, and this trend is correlated with increasingly progressive politics.

However, other social ecology factors are obstacles. Cheap fossil fuels are one of these. A high and increasing price on carbon (an “economic” initiative within Figure 1), with some proceeds used to reduce impacts on low-income communities, would encourage technology and behavioral change.

Institutional constraints around taxes, left over from the state’s populist politics in the late twentieth century, are another main social ecology challenge. As planners know, the two-thirds vote requirement to raise many forms of revenue and Proposition 13’s limits on property taxes constrain public sector capacity and create inappropriate incentives for local planning. A general rethinking of tax structure to address these problems and add regional tax-base sharing, oil severance taxes, and anti-speculation taxes on housing and land would help establish a stronger foundation for climate planning.
P2 Sonoma State: Bringing Planning, Elders, Students, and Community Partners Together

faculty to develop a Land Use and Water Resources Planning course. Meanwhile, ENSP’s stable of guest speakers, always an important part of its program, is stronger than ever.

Is the CSC model replicable? Well, demographics are on our side. There is an abundance of recently retired professional planning talent in communities throughout California. Making use of this resource, pairing it with motivated and carefully selected students and with communities looking for an unique infusion of experience and enthusiasm, is working at Sonoma State. Necessity drove the CSC’s model—the need to self-fund its expanded sustainability-focused planning activities in the communities the university serves. The result is effectively an “honors program” for our undergraduate students, who benefit from supervision and mentoring from engaged planning elders bringing a wealth of insight and expertise. Other universities and professional communities might opt for different arrangements. But regardless of potential variation, the CSC’s story provides an example of working with available resources—in the university, the planning profession, and in communities—to meet evolving needs.

Thomas Jacobson, FAICP, is a professor for the Department of Environmental Studies & Planning and Director at the Center for Sustainable Communities at Sonoma State University and Alex Hinds is a Managing Consultant for the Center for Sustainable Communities.

P4 Estimating Project-Level VMT Reductions: How Do Sketch-Level Tools Perform

The available VMT estimation methods have not been validated as to their accuracy, owing to a lack of data against which to validate them. Actual changes in VMT resulting from land use projects are best measured through before-and-after surveys of residents, employees, and/or customers, but such surveys are rarely done. Without such data, we cannot say which of these quantification methods is most accurate. The lack of validation and uncertainties around accuracy may pose challenges for CEQA practitioners when analyzing VMT impacts and their significance. But even without validation, these tools are useful to planners. Although the accuracy of their estimates of VMT for a given project in a given situation is uncertain, their internal consistency allows for insightful comparisons between a base case and different “what if” scenarios.

Practitioners should take special care on two points. First, VMT per household (and the associated GHG emissions per household) is a better metric for comparing the impacts of different types of residential development than absolute VMT for a project, as it accounts for the greater efficiency of higher density development. Second, the tools differ as to whose VMT they estimate, with some tools estimating VMT for the project (e.g., CalEEMod and MXD) and others adjusting total VMT change in the area resulting from the project (e.g., Sketch7). Which version is more appropriate depends on the question to be answered.

To Conclude

Like any tool, these sketch tools can be useful when implemented properly. Rather than simply running the tool “off the shelf,” analysts should consider appropriate adjustments to parameters, in addition to taking care to ensure accurate inputs. These tools cannot replace the expertise of planners nor solve complex policy dilemmas, but they can offer important insight when used to compare project scenarios and to compare project impacts to threshold values, as long as common data sources and consistent assumptions are used throughout.

Amy Lee and Kevin Fang, Ph.D are Research Associates, and Susan Handy, Ph.D, Professor at the Department of Environmental Science & Policy, UC Davis; Susan is also the Director National Center for Sustainable Transportation (NCST), UC Davis

---

Table 2: VMT Estimates by Method for The Cannery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Output From Model</th>
<th>VMT Per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalEEMod 2016</td>
<td>13,351,102 VMT per year</td>
<td>36,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalEEMod 2013</td>
<td>15,191,910 VMT per year</td>
<td>41,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA MXD Tool</td>
<td>56,164 VMT per day</td>
<td>56,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sketch7</td>
<td>26,556 HH VMT per day</td>
<td>26,556 (HH only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenTrip Connect</td>
<td>32,73 VMT per HH per day</td>
<td>19,965 (HH only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVENT HOSTED BY LOCAL PLANNERS

CLICK HERE TO RESERVE YOUR SPOT AND GET EVENT DESCRIPTIONS

Sacramento has a great scene of restaurants, bars, sports games, and festivals to connect community and friends. As planners who love good communities and activities that foster great connections, the Conference Host Committee is excited to introduce planners to our special Sacramento-area venues. On Saturday night, we’ll be hosting attendees to the APA California Conference at our favorite venues. These smaller events will give attendees a chance to network in more intimate settings and see our city the way locals do. After the Diversity Summit on Saturday, you are invited to join planners from the Sacramento area at a range of great venues. It’s our way of welcoming you to Sacramento and inviting you to see what our city and region have to offer. These are in addition to the Planners of Color and LGBTQIA Community Mixer and Student/Young Planners Group (YPG) Mixer.

HOSTED EVENTS INCLUDE:

1. Sacramento Convention Center
   1400 J Street
2. Hot Italian Pizza & Gelato Dinner
   1627 16th Street
3. Old Sacramento Underground - Sacramento History Museum
   101 I Street
4. Saturday Night at the BARN
   985 Riverfront Street, West Sacramento
5. Mulvaneys’s Fine Dining
   1215 19th Street
6. Ma Jong Asian Dining and The Park
   1431 L Street
7. Rio City Café Fine Dining
   1110 Front Street
8. Der Biergarten
   2332 K Street
9. Cool Alleys Walking Tour
   1716 L Street
10. Soccer Game at Papa Murphy’s Park - Cal Expo (not on map)
Congratulations to the 2017 APA California Award Winners!

APA California is pleased to announce the people, projects and planning efforts that have received 2017 awards. A distinguished jury selected this year’s winners from over 70 entries.

AWARDS OF EXCELLENCE

Opportunity and Empowerment Award

Safe Long Beach
City of Long Beach

The vision of Safe Long Beach is that Long Beach residents live in safe families and communities, attend safe schools, and are contributing citizens connected to their community. The plan is oriented towards creating and sustaining conditions of long term safety, rather than simply accepting violence and trying to prevent it. Addressing a broad safety agenda, Safe Long Beach draws upon the City’s many existing assets and forges relationships across disciplines, professions, and neighborhood boundaries while recognizing each neighborhood as unique.

Comprehensive Plan Award, Large Jurisdiction

San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)

San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan is an overarching, comprehensive blueprint for a more sustainable future. At its core, it relies on creating a transportation network that will provide more travel choices, which in turn will protect the environment, create healthy communities, and stimulate economic growth. The Regional Plan was an agency-wide effort that was developed in close partnership with the region’s 18 cities and county government.

Comprehensive Plan Award, Small Jurisdiction

Duarte Town Center Specific Plan
City of Duarte

The Duarte Town Center Specific Plan provides the means to realize a long-time community vision: create a downtown for Duarte, a place that grew up without a true town center. This forward-thinking specific plan provides incentives for new, high-quality development. Zoning regulations give substantial development bonuses if certain requirements are met, such as assembly of identified catalyst sites, development of high-quality and mixed-use projects, constructing parklets and streetscape improvements, and providing desired amenities, such as a restaurant row.

Innovation in Green Community Planning Award

City of Palm Springs Sustainable Master Plan
City of Palm Springs

The Palm Springs Sustainable Master Plan takes a broad and innovative perspective on how we define sustainability and how a community can achieve it. The plan presents a clear vision and specific action steps that work towards a healthy, economically prosperous, socially just, culturally rich, and environmentally sound future. The plan establishes a comprehensive approach to addressing sustainability and climate issues, identifying near-term actions the City should take, performance measures to track progress, and actions that the community can take to live healthier and more sustainable lifestyles.

Economic Planning and Development Award

Small Business Support Program (Wilmington) LA-Mas

The Small Business Support Program is a first-of-its-kind initiative in Los Angeles to transform the local economy of Wilmington by focusing on existing small businesses. This economic development program combines operational and design support for small businesses with the goal of attracting new customers in the community and beyond. Small business owners receive hands-on, customized support to ensure their business products and services serve the local community.

Transportation Planning Award

City of Long Beach - CX3 Pedestrian Plan
City of Long Beach Department of Health and Human Services

The Communities of Excellence in Nutrition, Physical Activity and Obesity Prevention (CX3) Pedestrian Plan in Central and West Long Beach is the result of a three-year project to assess the availability of healthy foods and opportunities for physical activity in ten (10) low-income neighborhoods in Long Beach and a subsequent three year grassroots outreach effort to develop a plan to increase pedestrian access to healthy foods and opportunities for physical activity. The CX3 neighborhood assessments were completed with input and assistance from community volunteers and university students to evaluate the availability of affordable healthy food options, the amount of unhealthy food and drink marketing near elementary schools, and the safety and walkability of each neighborhood.

Best Practices Award

Mission Creek Sea Level Rise Adaptation Study
SPUR

The Mission Creek Sea Level Rise Adaptation Study engages the public, planning officials, and the development community to create strategies that mitigate the effects of sea level rise for one of the most beloved urban waterfronts in the United States. On the heels of Hurricane Sandy, SPUR, in collaboration with The City of San Francisco Planning Department, the Port of San Francisco, the Delta Alliance, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, the Department of Public Works, and the City Administrator for Capital Planning, along with a multidisciplinary team of experts and professionals, looked at potential impacts of sea level rise on a portion of coastal San Francisco.
AWARDS OF EXCELLENCE

Grassroots Initiative Award
Orange Home Grown Farmers & Artisans Market
Orange Home Grown

The Orange Home Grown Farmers and Artisans Market started with a small group of City of Orange neighbors meeting around a kitchen table back in 2009 with a dream of making sustainably and locally grown food more accessible to their community, one with great pride in its agricultural history and “small town” culture. This grassroots dream has proven to be a wild success and a beloved Saturday morning community destination for nourishing the body and soul. The Orange Home Grown Farmers and Artisans Market celebrates its sixth anniversary in May 2017.

Public Outreach Award
Los Angeles Countywide Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment
Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation

In March 2015, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors approved a motion to initiate the Los Angeles Countywide Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment. This represented an unprecedented effort to document existing and to use these data to determine the scope, scale, and location of park need in Los Angeles County. In initiating the Parks Needs Assessment, the Board of Supervisors has affirmed the importance of parks as essential infrastructure in the county.

Planning Advocate Award
Vicki Granowitz

For over twenty-five years, Vicki Granowitz has volunteered as a community organizer and advocate in the areas of historic preservation, parks and open space, law enforcement, homeless and affordable housing issues among other areas of interest. Vicki is a retired psychotherapist with a Bachelor’s in Criminal Justice Administration and a Masters of Social Work. Ms Granowitz chaired the North Park Planning Committee until March, and remains on the City of San Diego’s Consolidated Plan Advisory Board and the De Anza Revitalization Advisory Committee. She has since been appointed to the City of San Diego 7-member Planning Commission.

Emerging Planning and Design Firm Award
City Fabrick

City Fabrick was first established in 2011 as a response to the urban planning and public health needs of Long Beach that could be addressed using urban design strategies that span building, landscape, environmental design, and policy development. Now with over six years of urban design practice, City Fabrick has grown both in the size of its staff as well as its diverse portfolio of projects throughout California.

Advancing Diversity and Social Change in Honor of Paul Davidoff
Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust

From 2013 through September 2016, the Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust led a comprehensive and ultimately successful grassroots advocacy campaign to overhaul the antiquated Quimby Park Fee Ordinance in the City of Los Angeles, a park land dedication and impact fee ordinance originally adopted in 1971. Decades in the making, the passage of the Quimby Park Fee Ordinance was a grassroots advocacy victory that will improve the lives and neighborhoods of low-income, park-poor communities of color in Los Angeles for generations to come.

Academic Award
Midtown Ventura Wellness District Urban Design Concept Plan
City and Regional Planning Department, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo

The Midtown Wellness District Urban Design Concept Plan resulted from a graduate study at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo’s City and Regional Planning Department during a 10-week period, in the 2016 Spring Quarter. The study included seventeen first-year MCRP students, and two undergraduate seniors. At the request and with the support of the City of Ventura’s Planning Department, the team proposed a development scenario and a concept plan for the Midtown that explore the notion of wellness in a holistic manner, and are consistent with the General Plan and the city’s economic strategy.

Communications Initiative Award
Vital Signs - Taking the Pulse of the Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)

As the metropolitan planning organization for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) closely monitors transportation performance and other factors affecting the region’s economic and environmental well-being. Yet just a few years ago, the agency faced a major challenge: performance results were reported sporadically in paper reports and often reflected years-old data. In 2014 and 2015, MTC and its regional partners decided to tackle this challenge head-on. The result was Vital Signs, a brand-new interagency website that displays customizable, interactive data alongside brief, explanatory analyses.

Hard-Won Victories Award
Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
Coachella Valley Conservation Commission

In August 2016, the City of Desert Hot Springs was added to the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan, completing the Plan as originally envisioned when the project began in the early 1990s. Unlike most large regional plans led by consulting firms, the plan was developed by staff of the Coachella Valley Association of Governments and the smallest state agency in California, the Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy. It is also based on biological information supplied by local biologists.
Congratulations to the 2017 APA California Award Winners!

AWARDS OF MERIT

Comprehensive Plan Award, Large Jurisdiction
West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan and Implementing Ordinances
City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning

Together with several other Community Plans citywide, the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan Update was initiated as part of the Department’s New Community Plan Program. As an ambitious update to the previous West Adams Community Plan, last adopted in 1998, this vision and implementation plan was developed through extensive outreach with the diverse populations of the community and represents a truly comprehensive long-range plan whereby all of its components, including its implementing ordinances, have been brought forward together.

Comprehensive Plan Award, Small Jurisdiction
City of Palm Desert General Plan Update 2016
City of Palm Desert

The City of Palm Desert’s comprehensive General Plan Update differs from many other General Plan documents in that it articulates a transformational vision to move Palm Desert from its traditional suburban sprawl and golf course development pattern to a more efficient, balanced, and active model of community. This vision focuses on human-scale design, complete streets, the creation of lively centers, access and connectivity for a range of users and uses, and quality open space.

Implementation Award, Small Jurisdiction
City of West Hollywood Inclusionary Housing Program
City of West Hollywood

Through the inclusionary housing program, the City of West Hollywood has realized a substantial number of affordable housing units, equitably distributed in new projects throughout the city. The program requires a 20% set aside of affordable units in all multi-unit housing projects, in certain instances a fee can be paid in-lieu. Since the loss of redevelopment, the inclusionary housing program has become the main source for affordable housing development in West Hollywood.

Innovation in Green Community Planning Award
Energy and Climate Action Plan
County of Santa Barbara, Planning and Development Department

The County of Santa Barbara has supported and prioritized efforts to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and prepare for climate change since the Board of Supervisors adopted the “Santa Barbara County Climate Change Guiding Principles” in 2009. The Energy and Climate Action Plan (ECAP) is a significant part of Santa Barbara County’s demonstrated commitment to reducing GHG emissions while protecting the aesthetic qualities and unique resources of Santa Barbara County. The county adopted its ECAP in May of 2015 and since then has been actively implementing the Plan through numerous programs and projects, as well as tracking and reporting implementation progress.

Economic Planning and Development Award
The Pruneyard Master Use Permit
City of Campbell

The Pruneyard Shopping Center and Offices (“The Pruneyard”), in the City of Campbell, is a 27 acre multi-use property encompassing three office towers, a DoubleTree by Hilton hotel, a retail shopping center, and a multi-level parking garage. In 2015, the property’s new owner, Ellis Partners submitted a development application to allow for an expansion and renovation of this iconic shopping center. With the assistance of Ellis Partners, Planning staff authored The Pruneyard Master Use Permit (MUP). This novel land use instrument—which required a Zoning Code Amendment to implement—is intended to be a comprehensive vision and decision-making document for The Pruneyard.

Transportation Planning Award
City of Temecula Multi-Use Trails and Bikeways Master Plan Update
City of Temecula

Following its 1989 incorporation, the City of Temecula surveyed its residents and discovered strong support for trails and bikeways as an important quality of life element and that the City needed to develop a community-wide system connecting schools, parks, open space, shopping and employment centers to support both active transportation and recreation. This resulting Multi-Use Trails and Bikeways Master Plan is a comprehensive update that focused on evaluating both previously and newly proposed trails and on-street bicycle facilities using conventional field techniques, geographic information systems (GIS) analysis, and incorporating project public input via community meetings, walking/biking events and additional online surveying.

Best Practices Award
Streamline Riverside Project
City of Riverside

Streamline Riverside is a City of Riverside-initiated program to develop and implement new business practices to improve the city’s development review process and customer experience. The Streamline Riverside program is an on-going program intended to build a culture of continual improvement within the city’s development review departments.

Grassroots Initiative Award
StreetAir

StreetAir is a student science and environmental research project that ended up identifying public health issues near outdoor eating places. The students made a film of their science project (“Columbus Discovers Air Pollution”) that won two film festival awards. The film, along with the student’s presentation of their projects findings, will be used in a community outreach effort prior to the city’s redesign of Columbus Avenue (see bottom of page: http://streetair.net/film.html in San Francisco).
AWARDS OF MERIT

Public Outreach Award
Designing an Addition to Single Family Residence
City of San Jose, PBCE, Planning Division

Permit Center Planners were faced with a burning question, “How can we best respond to the volume and needs of our customers?” In response, they had to address the most frequently asked question of “What are the primary regulations that affect additions onto my home?” In September 2016, the City of San José launched an innovative educational public outreach tool. Through the video tutorial, “Designing an Addition to Your Single-Family Residence,” they are able to convey complex technical information in a user-friendly, easy to grasp, visually graphic format.

Urban Design Award
University of California, Merced - 2020 Campus Development
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill LLP

Distinguished as the first American research university of the 21st Century, University of California, Merced, strives for excellence in teaching, research and service. The 2020 Project is an expansion of the existing campus to support a population of 10,000 students by the year 2020. The project comprises the comprehensive development—including master planning, design, construction, financing, operation and maintenance—of creative, mixed-use buildings, infrastructure, landscape and recreational amenities organized in a compact fabric that supports a walkable environment.

Planning Advocate Award
Jeanette Dinwiddie-Moore, FAICP

For most of Jeanette Dinwiddie-Moore’s more than 40 years in the profession, she has dedicated considerable time and talent to promote better planning and importantly, working for more inclusion of those unrepresented or underrepresented in the planning process, and advocating for planning in communities of color. Her advocacy is present and felt whether she is working as an agent for corporations, developers, non-profits, or governmental agencies, or volunteering for civic, social or professional organizations.

Emerging Planning and Design Firm Award
Estolano LeSar Perez Advisors

Estolano LeSar Perez Advisors (ELP Advisors) is a Los Angeles-based firm that helps clients build better communities. Founded in 2011, they work with clients to craft a strategic vision that is guided by principle, and tempered by pragmatism. ELP Advisors provide fresh solutions to complex problems with our expertise in housing, workforce and economic development, sustainability, transportation, and community engagement. Their clients include public agencies, foundations, nonprofits, business associations, and other stakeholders that are looking to improve their communities.

Advancing Diversity and Social Change in Honor of Paul Davidoff Award
County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning Spanish Planning Committee (SPC)

Los Angeles County has more Hispanic/Latino residents than any other County in the nation, about 4.7 million. Approximately 80 percent of the Hispanic/Latino population of five years or older speak Spanish at home, which means that effective communication and interaction amongst a large portion of the Latino population is conducted in Spanish. The LACDRP created the SPC in response to the high demand for Spanish translation and interpretation services needed during community meetings, field inspections, public hearings, and front counter consultations. The SPC consists of approximately 16 planners who work in various sections within DRP.

Academic Award
East Santa Clara Street Urban Village Planning: Community Assessment Report, San Jose State University

The City of San Jose is planning for most of its future development to take place in about 70 urban villages. One of these locations, on East Santa Clara Street between 6th and 17th Streets, was the focus of a detailed community assessment sponsored by the city’s Planning Division and undertaken by graduate urban planning students at San Jose State University. The General Plan designates East Santa Clara Street as one of the city’s primary growth corridors with approximately 850 new residential units and 800 new jobs expected within the 64-acre urban village.

Communications Initiative Award
City of West Hollywood Communications and Community Engagement Strategic Plan, City of West Hollywood

Although the City of West Hollywood has effectively used traditional media relations and public outreach efforts to communicate with the people who live, work, and play in West Hollywood, the City had never developed a wide-ranging plan for its communications and community engagement initiatives. Recently, the City of West Hollywood’s Communications Department developed a Communications and Community Engagement Strategic Plan for West Hollywood City Hall. The Strategic Plan provides one simple yet informative resource for all City staff to use when developing materials and messaging for the public.

Hard-Won Victories Award
Portside Ventura Harbor Mixed Use Project
City of Ventura, Community Development Department

None of the key stakeholders, Port District, City staff, elected officials, and harbor businesses and adjacent residential neighborhoods, could have imagined the years of process the Portside Ventura Harbor Mixed Use Project would take. The developer team weathered numerous changes to the review process, the local authority review staff and elected officials due to the lengthy review process, and engaged two rounds of Coastal Commission review. The Portside Ventura Mixed-use Project is an excellent example of a vision, dedicated and willing developer, teamed with dedicated and strategic-thinking planning staff can indeed persevere through and complete the regulatory challenges of local agency and state agency permitting to complete important projects such as this one that contributes significant physical improvement as well as economic value to our community development efforts.
Whether it was politics, community organizing, technology, transportation, climate change, women in leadership positions, mixed-use development or planning education, each of the panelists shared their unique stories and experiences that addressed planning challenges and how their personal insights might especially benefit those in the beginning or middle of their planning careers.

The panel organizers and co-hosts were:

- Robert Paternoster, FAICP, past Planning and Building Director and past Director of Queensway Bay project, City of Long Beach and current PEN President
- Nina Idemudia, City Planning Associate for City of Los Angeles
- Leobardo Estrada, Ph.D, Associate Professor of Urban Planning, UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs and recent PEN honoree
- My La, Project Manager of Mobility 2035, Los Angeles Department of City Planning
- Brian Glodney, Urban Designer, Gensler
- Carol Barrett, FAICP, retired Assistant Director of Community Development, City of Burbank and PEN Board Member
- Jessica Medina, Research & Communications Associate at Strategic Concepts

There is a growing concern that people within cities are not actively involved in local planning issues, and many city councils are searching for ways to engage more with their local populations. In order to empower community voices and promote engagement, the panelists discussed the idea that planners embrace more of a facilitator role that encourages inclusivity when interacting with communities and neighborhoods.

The integration of technology in the planning field has provided planners the tools to tackle many issues they were unable to handle before and much more efficiently, especially with access to better data. Planning curricula has changed dramatically to emphasize the application of these tools. Professor Leo Estrada emphasized that while the growing reliance on computers, geographic information systems and social media for planners was recognized as ubiquitous, there is also a caution to remember the key policy issues that make for good action-oriented planning and that technology, by itself, does not solve the major community and regional challenges that we face without critical thinking.
The issue of equity and social and environmental justice was a common theme throughout the event. The panelists and the audience discussed its definition, how it has been pursued over the years, and the importance of striving toward more equitable communities through effective active community outreach and engagement. Several of the NextGen planners, such as Nina Idemudia and Jessica Medina, have been actively engaged in empowering disadvantaged communities as a priority in their work. Also Carol Barrett shared her experience over her varied career about how it has been a challenge for women to attain planning leadership positions; while significant progress has been made, there is still more that needs to be done both in planning education and in the practice of planning to permit women into leadership positions. She also pointed out some of the challenges in the Los Angeles region with cultures that still teach that women should not be allowed to have authority over men.

My La, as project manager of Mobility 2035 with the Los Angeles Department of City Planning, has experienced the ongoing goal of balancing land use demands with transportation systems of all types from auto to transit to bicycles to walking; the PEN panelists noted these same challenges over their careers with the greater awareness today of transit-oriented development, complete streets, healthy cities, and mixed use development concepts. Brian Glodney, an Urban Designer talked about the importance of integrating urban design into our work places, where we live and where we engage on a social level as exemplified by the work he does every day at Gensler.

Looking to the future, it will be a challenge for planners to keep up with the fast changing pace of urbanization; it will be important for planners to draw knowledge from people in various professions in order to remain effective and attain different skills. It was mentioned that there should also be more focus on providing planning education to pre-college populations in order to create more awareness of the planning profession and planning practice early in their education. Hopefully they become strong advocates for good planning.

The panelists also talked about the need to manage idealistic expectations with the reality of the difficulties that often come with the job. All agreed that the education of a planner is not complete once they finish their degree; a planner should consistently strive to learn new things throughout their career that have relevant applications on a day to day basis. Future planners will need to do a better job of defining and marketing what planning is, but also not limit their careers to just one definition—the NextGen planners will likely have more variety of public and private sector job opportunities than PEN planners had over their careers.

Bob Paternoster noted that it is much more difficult today for a young planner to move up in the profession than it was for baby boomers. "There just weren’t many trained planners in those days," he explained. "That’s how someone like me was able to become planning director of a major city (Pittsburgh, PA) by the age of 30."

The shared love of cities and a sustainable environment will continue to challenge us to do better and to strive to achieve our lofty goals; the PEN panelists have seen significant changes over their careers while all agreed that our work is not done. The NextGen panelists expressed their appreciation for what the past can teach us while clearly embracing the current planning challenges with optimism and enthusiasm.

Ashley Atkinson, the LA Section Director, closed the session by thanking our panelists for an informative and productive discussion and thanking the audience for their participation. She saw this as an important dialogue that needs to be continued.

Lena Mik, Policy Planner, City of Los Angeles and Co-Director Young Planners Group, APA Los Angeles. Stan Hoffman, FAICP, Stanley R. Hoffman Associates and Past PEN President.

The CPAT program was launched by the Chapter to provide volunteer professional planning assistance to municipalities and community groups with limited resources throughout California and Baja California. The small Central Valley town of Kingsburg was the first successful applicant for program assistance. A six-member team of professionals spent three and a half days in late April working with stakeholders and community leaders to prepare a revitalization strategy for Kingsburg’s struggling downtown (Click here to review their full 62-page report). The Kingsburg CPAT project will also be presented at a special session of the Sacramento Conference on Sunday, September 24, at 8:15 am.

All APA California members are encouraged to spread the word about this new pro bono planning assistance program to municipalities and community groups who desperately need such assistance. Members are also encouraged to volunteer to participate in a Community Planning Assistance Team. Click here to obtain more information about the program and to obtain a program application and a volunteer form.
Generous Donations Assure Success for Archives Program

As in many things, California has sought to be a leader in planning. To document the many ways Californians have planned their communities, APA California created the California Chapter Archives at California State University Northridge (CSUN) on the Chapter's 50th anniversary in 1998.

The archives contain both organizational records of the Chapter and its affiliated organizations, as well as donations of records by leading professionals; rare and original planning reports across the breadth of California planning practice; and other related documents that tell the story of California planning.

Mark Stover, Ph.D., the Dean of Oviatt Library at CSUN, said, “We are so grateful for this generous gift. The archives are a crucial resource for students and researchers studying the history urban, rural, suburban, and regional planning in California. This donation enables us to provide full access to this wonderful archive.”

This year the archives marked a milestone. We want to thank the many of you who have supported the development of APA California’s archives at California State University, Northridge, as the archives received several generous donations this year. Those donations include funds from:

• The APA California Board of Directors, which generously funded the archives with a $10,000 contribution to facilitate processing of the growing volume of records on file there.
• The California Planning Roundtable, which has provided a $500 challenge grant to help push fundraising forward.
• The California Planning Foundation, which provided an opportunity to do some informal fundraising as part of last year’s CPF auction, and finally;
• Members of APA California, who donated more than $600 in small donations either through the registration portal, or at the conference itself.

We are now working with archival staff to determine how best to proceed as even more donations are being received each year. Thanks to all of you for your contributions, your support, and your efforts to keep us a leader in the nation.

Chapter Historian

This year’s conference will have a host of sessions related to aspects of the state’s planning history at 3:15 pm Monday, September 25. But we particularly invite you to enjoy a romp through the history of the State's biggest planning efforts and what lessons they offer us today.

It’s titled, Make No Little Plans: The Short History of Big Thinking and Big Plans in California (1960-1980). During the 1960s and 1970s, government officials and private citizens crafted several major proposals for providing an overall structure for guiding land use and environmental policy in California. The major proposals included the State Development Plan (1963-68), the California Tomorrow Plan (1972), the Planning and Conservation League’s Land and Environment report (1975), and the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research’s Urban Strategy (1978). These proposals were comprehensive and ambitious. Since the 1980s there have been no similar efforts. This panel will explore the cultural and historical context in California at the time that provided the impetus for these ambitious undertakings, what was learned from these efforts, why there have been no similar efforts in last 30 plus years, and how planning policy has been crafted in recent years without the benefit of a big picture policy framework.

We also encourage you to visit the Chapter Historian exhibit at the conference, being organized by Larry Mintier this year with the assistance of the Sacramento Valley Section and local planners.

LARPHG Colloquium Oct. 28: ‘Adding Voices to the L. A. Story”

“The next colloquium of the Los Angeles Region Planning History Group, has been scheduled for Saturday, October 28, 9 a.m. – 3 p.m., at the Huntington Library in San Marino. The colloquium traces the history of planners and communities of color, women, and LGBTQ members as they have established their voices in Southern California planning. For more information or to register, visit https://larphg.org.

50 Years Ago in California Planning

Fifty years ago, here’s what was happening in California planning:

• CCAIP’s first organized Legislative Advocacy Program issues a series of information releases over four issues between May 4 and November 10, 1967.
• The State Legislature requires cities and counties to begin adopting Housing Elements in their general plans, effective July 1, 1969.
• The planning profession reaches its 50th anniversary with a celebratory conference in Washington D.C. Many of the earliest practitioners and founders of the profession attend together with eminent leaders of other professions.
• In San Diego, following voter rejection of a 1965 general plan, a downscaled “Progress Guide and General Plan” wins approval at the polls; it implements state law requiring comprehensive land-use planning.
• The California Legislature creates the California Council on Intergovernmental Relations.
• USC’s planning program is recognized in September.
• California Chapter’s conference “The Next 50 Years: Growth and Quality of Environment in California,” is held in Monterey, March 16-18; the Chapter issues a 97-page book of conference proceedings. Topics include “Growth in the Metropolitan Region: Time, Space, and Commuting in California.”
End of Session Nearing with Major Bills Still in Play

The 2017 Legislative Session will end on September 15. APA California is continuing to actively lobby bills of concern that are still working their way towards the Governor, and supporting those that APA would like the Governor to sign. Once session ends, all bills that pass will be sent to the Governor—he must sign or veto those bills by October 15. All other bills that don’t pass will become two-year bills and can be brought up again next year. It's important to note that many bills that APA California opposed earlier in the year have already become two-year bills. We expect them to move again next year.

Because this article will be released before the end of session, please make sure to attend the annual Legislative Update Session at the APA California Conference for an update on what happened to important bills.

Housing Package Still Under Discussion

While the Governor didn’t directly include any monies in the 2017-2018 budget for affordable housing, he did ask the Legislature by the end of the year to send him bills to streamline the local approvals of housing. Over 130 housing bills were introduced in January. The Governor recently engaged on all of the major housing bills, and has been working with the Assembly and Senate Leadership and authors on a housing package of bills that will be heard on the floors and then sent quickly to the Governor any day now. APA California has weighed in on many of the big housing bills throughout the session and continue to do so. Additionally, along with our local government association partners, and a coalition of other organizations interested in housing, we have met with the Governor’s office to express concerns with various bills thought to be part of that package.

As you will see (below), the housing package does include funding for housing and planning, but the majority of the bills require substantial new requirements on local governments when approving housing development—the streamlining portion of the package is once again all new city and county mandates. Many of the streamlining bills are substantially less onerous than introduced, a good number as a result of APA-suggested amendments inserted in these measures. But, many of those bills have received last-minute amendments or continue to contain vague new requirements, new terms and processes that conflict with existing planning laws or make local housing approvals and housing element law more difficult to implement, and detailed new requirements that will not result in any new housing but will add substantially to local reporting mandates.

Last Minute SB 35 Amendments Upend General Plan and Zoning Law

SB 35, which would provide a new developer option for ministerial approval of housing based on Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) “compliance”, is an example of both unbalanced and last-minute amendments that have found their way into these housing measures. Authored by Senator Wiener from San Francisco, APA will support if amended, position on the bill. It is currently in the Assembly Rules Committee, and is expected to be a key bill in the Governor’s streamlining portion of the housing package. It requires cities and counties to offer to developers a new ministerial approval process for developments that meet certain conditions, including inclusionary units and prevailing wage, if a local agency does not meet its RHNA by-income level. The bill also adds new requirements to the annual report, including the number of units entitled. Although APA is supportive of streamlined housing approvals, the bill must be amended to allow for a fair and reasonable process. Please contact Senator Wiener’s office and your Senator and Assembly Member in support of APA’s suggested amendments below:

TRIGGER FOR MINISTERIAL REVIEW BASED ON ACTIONS BEYOND CITY OR COUNTY CONTROL: SB 35 unfortunately imposes consequences on a city or county based on actions beyond their control and that can only be completed by the developer. The trigger for the ministerial approval process should be based on the number of entitled and approved applications, a process that local agencies control, rather than building permits, which developers will not pull until they are ready to construct a project entitled by a local government. A local government can’t turn down a building permit except under extremely limited circumstances. This puts the consequences on the local agency even though they can’t control the reason for those consequences.
NEW AMENDMENTS OVERTURN ZONING LAW: New language added to the bill, although designed to re-state existing law, instead completely changes existing zoning law by allowing either the General Plan or zoning to apply to sites, mixing in design standards, and using terms and concepts that are vague and inconsistent with existing Housing Element and Density Bonus law, and the Housing Accountability Act. It’s one thing if the zoning is inconsistent because (for instance) it has not been updated to reflect the General Plan, in which case the General Plan does and should control – that is existing law. But if the standards have been updated and are actively designed to implement the General Plan, this bill should not require local agencies to ignore zoning just because someone deems those zoning standards are somehow “inconsistent” or not “compliant” (a new term) with the plan. “Inconsistent” as meant in existing law does not mean “the same.” The bill must be amended to fix these sections so they are not in conflict with existing law governing zoning, density bonuses, and Housing Element site requirements, while still keeping the goals of the new language. Those amendments are below:

Amend S. 65913.4 (5)(A) to be consistent with the definition of “maximum allowable residential density” in S. 65915 (o)(2) in the Density Bonus Law.

(A) A development shall be deemed consistent with the objective zoning standards related to housing density, as applicable, if the density proposed is compliant with the maximum density allowed within that land use designation, notwithstanding any specified maximum unit allocation that may result in fewer units of housing being permitted, does not exceed the maximum allowable residential density. “Maximum allowable residential density” means the density allowed under the zoning ordinance, or the density allowed under the zoning ordinance if inconsistent with the general plan, the general plan density applicable to the project. For the purpose of this subsection, the “general plan density applicable to the project” means the greater of the density allowed in the land use element or specified in the housing element of the general plan.

Amend S. 65913.4 (5)(B) to be consistent with the Housing Accountability Act S. 65589.5 (d)(5)(A) and Housing Element law.

(B) In the event that objective zoning, general plan, or design review standards are mutually inconsistent, a development shall be deemed consistent with the objective zoning standards pursuant to this subdivision if the development is consistent with the standards set forth in the general plan.

Delete the addition to S. 65913.4 (C) that would allow zoning OR the General Plan designation and make language consistent with above:

(C) A site that is zoned for residential use or residential mixed-use development, development, or designated for residential use or residential mixed-use development in the housing element, or has a general plan designation that allows residential use or a mix of residential and nonresidential uses, with at least two-thirds of the square footage of the development designated for residential use.

How You Can Get Involved
As bills are making their way through hearings, APA California has been sending letters to the author’s in support or opposition of their measures. As always, we would appreciate letters from members or their employers that are consistent with those positions. To review the letters, and for an alert on APA’s position on all of the remaining major legislation, please go to the legislative review section on APA’s website at www.apacalifornia.com.

AB 686 – CA Affirmatively Further Fair Housing Law
Position: Support if Amended – May Be Part of the Governor’s Housing Package
Location: On Senate Floor

This bill provides the Attorney General (AG) with the authority to enforce housing statutes, and allows Housing and Community Development (HCD) to find a jurisdiction in non-compliance with Housing Element Law after initially finding the housing element in compliance. APA supports increased enforcement of housing element laws and other targeted housing statutes, and many of APA’s amendments were inserted into the bill. But, the bill still needs amendments to allow more time to cure (from the short 30 days in their bill to up to 120 days depending on the actions required), and to apply due process and curing requirements to AG enforcement actions similar to those added for HCD at APA’s request.

Position: Oppose

These bills make a number of changes to the Housing Accountability Act (HAA). Originally, both bills (which are now identical) included requirements that local governments would not have been able to meet and would have imposed automatic fines for HAA violations.
without the ability to cure those violations. As now amended, the bill is in better shape. Due to all of the amendments taken by the authors, APA was ready to remove our opposition to the HAA portion of these bills. Unfortunately, as part of the Governor’s Housing Package, new amendments have been inserted that APA opposes and need amendment:

• The new definition of “lower density” “includes conditions that have the same effect or impact on the ability of the project to provide housing.” This requirement isn’t clear. Instead, it should read: “lower density” includes conditions that have the effect of lowering density.

• The ability of a judge to increase fines if a city or county fails to make “progress in meeting its target RHNA” should be changed to instead allow increased fees based on an accounting of applications received and applications approved/entitled. There is no requirement for a city or county to build housing to meet the RHNA.

AB 879 – New Housing Element Mandates
Position: Oppose Unless Amended – May Be Part of the Governor’s Housing Package
Location: On Senate Floor

Recent amendments to Assembly Bill (AB) 879 have moved our position from support to oppose. They should be removed:

• Requires mitigation fees to be substantially reduced through a new HCD report without providing other funding for services and infrastructure to serve new development, and undermines a US Supreme Court Decision. California’s existing Mitigation Fee Act implements the US Supreme Court’s requirement that local infrastructure fees must be based on the impact of a project and only cover the cost of the infrastructure necessary to serve the project. This bill will undermine that US Supreme Court decision. Additionally, a blanket statement for HCD to complete a report to “substantially” reduce fees—a conclusion before the report is even begun—will not fund infrastructure and services needed to serve new housing.

• Adds substantial analysis to the housing element by requiring the analysis of governmental constraints in the housing element to include any ordinances that directly impact the cost and supply of residential development. All ordinances could be determined to impact the cost of housing including critical ordinances like utility infrastructure such as sewer and water connection fees not under the control of local governments; drought requirements; building and fire code requirements like fire sprinklers; lighting; fencing; and, road and other infrastructure improvements. If there is something of specific concern, that should be addressed directly rather than requiring a review of every single local ordinance.

• Imposes an unfunded mandate to be paid by fees imposed on new housing projects.

AB 1397 – Restrictions on Adequate Sites in Housing Element
Position: Oppose Unless Amended – May Be Part of the Governor’s Housing Package
Location: On Senate Floor

This bill would place restrictions on the ability of cities and counties to designate non-vacant sites as suitable for housing development and would require all designated sites to have water, sewer, and utilities available and accessible to support housing development during the planning period. Many of the most onerous requirements for these sites in the original versions of the bill have already been removed. However, many remain and would make finding adequate sites extremely difficult in future planning periods. APA is requesting the following amendments:

• Ensure that built-out cities are able to identify adequate sites, as the bill places severe restrictions on the designation of sites to be redeveloped.

• Clarify that utility requirements can be determined based upon the information provided to the city and county by the utility provider.

• Eliminate a new amendment requiring cities and counties to demonstrate local efforts to remove “non-governmental constraints” over which they have no control, including the cost of land or rental rates.

AB 1505/SB 277 – Restoration of Inclusionary Housing Authority for Rental Units
Position: Support – May Be Part of the Governor’s Housing Package
Location: On Senate Floor/On Assembly Floor

These bills clarify the Legislature’s intent to supersede the holding in the Palmer/Sixth Street Properties L.P. v. City of Los Angeles decision, to the extent that the decision conflicts with a local jurisdiction’s authority to impose inclusionary housing ordinances on rental projects. As inclusionary requirements are one of the few options cities and counties have to increase affordable rental housing, this is an important clarification. Unfortunately, the Governor has expressed concerns that this bill could increase the cost of housing and has not yet decided if they should be included in his final housing package.

AB 1515 – Deemed Consistent Standard for General Plan and Zoning Determinations in HAA
Position: Oppose – May Be Part of the Governor’s Housing Package
Location: On Senate Floor

This bill specifies that a housing development project or emergency shelter is “deemed consistent, compliant, and in conformity with an applicable plan, program, policy, ordinance, standard, requirement, or other similar provision” if there is substantial evidence that would allow a reasonable person to conclude that the housing development project or emergency shelter is consistent, compliant, or in conformity, pursuant to the HAA. APA has no problem with the “reasonable person” portion of this new standard. However, the “deemed consistent” automatic approval should be deleted—it goes too far and upends the accountability for local land use decision-making. AB 1515 will allow the applicant, rather than the local agency or a judge, to determine consistency of a development with the General Plan and zoning by allowing the applicant to provide contrary reasons why the project is consistent. As a result, the issue will be whether a “reasonable person” could conclude that the project is consistent—not whether the city or county had substantial evidence to back up its conclusion.

SB 2 – Permanent Source of Affordable Housing Funding and Funding for
Planning through Document Fee on Non-Housing Real Estate

Position: Support – Part of the Funding

Portion of the Governor’s Housing Package

Location: On Assembly Floor

This bill would provide a permanent source of funding of about $225 million per year for affordable housing, a portion of which will be available to use for local planning to accelerate housing production.

SB 3 – Housing Bond for Affordable Housing

Position: Support – Part of the Funding

Portion of the Governor’s Housing Package

Location: On Assembly Floor

This measure would authorize a $4 billion general obligation bond for housing, which would go to voters for approval in 2018.

SB 166 – Expansion of No-Net Loss to Loss of Affordability

Position: Support if Amended – May Be Part of the Governor’s Housing Package

Location: On Assembly Floor

This bill would make it illegal for cities and counties to implement a rolling adequate sites and rezoning requirement by income level, rather than total units. Although APA agrees that no jurisdiction should be left with only a few or no sites that can accommodate affordable housing by the end of the housing element planning period, the remedy of continuous rezonings is an extremely onerous requirement for cities and counties—there aren’t enough subsidies to build on 100 percent of sites designated for affordable housing and the HAA prevents jurisdictions from denying a market-rate housing project proposed on a site that is designated for affordable housing—a Catch 22. We have asked for two amendments:

- **Provide the option of less onerous alternatives to the continuous rezonings** by allowing cities and counties to rezone sites designated as suitable for affordable housing just once in the planning period; in year four, if the number of sites that can accommodate affordable housing goes below 50 percent of the RHNA, or require market rate multi-family housing approved on affordable sites to include an inclusionary requirement similar to that in former RDA law.

- **For rezonings that are subject to CEQA, the 180-day rezoning time limit should be extended** by the number of days, if any, required by CEQA. The 180-day time period to complete the rezoning is too short to accommodate any necessary review of CEQA.

SB 649 – Small Cell Wireless Infrastructure Permitting and Mandatory Leasing

Position: Oppose

Location: On Assembly Floor

This bill effectively eliminates public input and full local environmental and design review of “small cells,” mandates the leasing of publicly owned infrastructure for small cells infrastructure, and eliminates the ability for local governments to negotiate leases or any public benefit for the installation of small cell equipment on taxpayer funded property. Specifics of the bill are as follows:

- Discretionary approval of small cell permits is only allowed in the coastal zone and in historic districts. All other areas must process these permits through either a building or encroachment permit.

- There is limited ability to apply design standards for property in the right of way, and those provisions are conflicting and difficult to interpret.

- Small cell dimensions defined in the bill are still very large and don’t include all associated equipment needed to support the small cells.

- Mandatory leasing of public property at prescribed fees is required. Fees for leasing of public property would be set by using a formula for attachments to PUC poles, plus an additional $250 for the time to set up the fee structure. After applying the formula, those fees would likely barely cover maintenance costs.

APA California believes SB 649 will set a dangerous precedent for other private industries to seek similar treatment. APA California, along with other local government associations and many cities/counties continue to remain opposed. While many amendments have been made to the bill since its introduction, they have not addressed issues raised by the opposition and many have been so ambiguous and vague they have raised additional concerns. This bill should be made a two-year bill to allow more time for a meaningful discussion on the issues and a fair local process.

Some Cities have put forward proposed amendments to the bill, all of which have been refused by the sponsors of the bill. The coalition of local government opposition continues to grow, the Teamsters and the Labor Federation are now also opposed, and the list of individual cities and counties registering opposition has increased substantially in recent months. The Department of Finance recently took an opposing position on the bill and meetings have been held with the Governor and his staff to discuss the bill’s detrimental impacts. The bill has also been heavily covered by the press, with nearly every major editorial board coming out in opposition to the bill. With this substantial opposition, we are continuing to actively lobby against the bill and will be asking the Governor to veto SB 649 should it reach his desk.

Other Important Hot Bills:

**AB 73–New Housing Sustainability Districts**

Position: Support

Location: Senate Floor

**AB 352–Efficiency unit requirements**

Position: Support

Location: Assembly Floor

**AB 494–Assessor’s dwelling unit clean up**

Position: Watching for substantive amendments

Location: Senate Floor

**AB 565–Alternative building standards for artists**

Position: Watch

Location: Two-Year Bill

**AB 865–Amnesty for non-compliant live/work buildings**

Position: Oppose

Location: Two-Year Bill

Like Us!

If you haven’t noticed, we’ve relaunched 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.
APA California Legislative Update

AB 1250–County Personal Services Contracts Restrictions
Position: Oppose
Location: Senate Rules Committee

AB 1404–CEQA infill exemption
Position: Support
Location: Two-Year Bill

AB 1414–Solar energy system permitting
Position: Oppose
Location: Senate Floor

AB 1521–Notice of Loss of Assisted Housing Developments
Position: Support
Location: Senate Floor

AB 1568–New sales tax option and streamlining for Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts
Position: Support
Location: Senate Floor

SB 80–CEQA Notices
Position: Watch
Location: Assembly Floor

SB 229–Assessorly dwelling unit clean up
Position: Watching for substantive amendments
Location: Assembly Floor

SB 431–Assessorly dwelling code compliance for permitting
Position: Concerns
Location: Two-Year Bill

SB 540–Workforce Housing Opportunity Zones
Position: Support
Location: Assembly Floor

SB 697–Development impact fee reporting and restrictions
Position: Opposed
Location: Two-Year Bill

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.

APA California Launches Public YouTube Channel

As our Chapter communications and educational opportunities evolve we are pleased to announce the public opening of the APA California YouTube Channel. The Chapter already uses YouTube to make available recently recorded conference sessions for AICP CM credits. The videos are accessible by obtaining a direct private link, which you receive upon registering and payment of a small fee. This service will continue as we look forward to offering several new titles from the upcoming Sacramento conference.

What’s new is that you can visit the Chapter YouTube Channel and find a complete library of recorded webinars and sessions for immediate viewing without any fees. Most are from conferences and section events held more than a year ago, but also included are recent webinars originally offered at no cost. If you missed the recent webinars on the California Legislative Update or the Wireless Communication Facilities (hosted by APA Northern Section)—just go to the Chapter YouTube Channel.

https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCq_urfgh23Xq9T9PCwogp6w

That’s just the start. The Chapter YouTube Channel allows us to showcase any recordings produced by the Chapter or the sections. These can be made available publically or by private link as a revenue generating opportunity. The best part about the Chapter YouTube Channel is that you can access it with a smartphone, tablet, or laptop—anywhere, anytime. YouTube has a smartphone app that gives you one-click access to your favorite YouTube channels and videos. Now you can expand your planning education while you’re walking, travelling, or just relaxing in your living room. Add Chrome casting and enjoy the full theater experience. Try it and see for yourself!

Our recording efforts are continuing to improve. The earliest recordings were on a par with typical webinars—mostly audio combined with PowerPoint slides. With the next generation, we were able to add short video clips of session speakers followed by the PowerPoint slides. In future videos we plan to use real time editing to intersperse session speakers with the PowerPoint slides or show both together. With the Chapter YouTube Channel we also have the capability of livestreaming events. It’s in the works. Look for it! GK
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 myplanning@live.com.
For additional contact information, please go to www.apacalifornia.org
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Keep Updated

Keep up to date with all the Chapter news, activities, programming and professional education as well as the State Conference by visiting the APA California website and the Chapter’s Facebook page. Discussion group. Also, remember your local Section’s website and other media platforms are an additional resource.
THE START IS ALMOST HERE!

Run, walk, bike, ride, drive, or fly to Sacramento for the exciting 2017 APA California Conference. Arrive Saturday to check out the first conference sessions and Diversity Summit and then explore the City of Trees with our Night on the Town. On Sunday night, enjoy Sacramento’s farm-to-fork cuisine at the Opening Reception held in beautiful Capitol Park. Monday will feature a joint workshop hosted by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research and Strategic Growth Council, and will be capped off by the consultant’s reception, CPF auction, and other events.

Late Online Registration Closes September 22!