TO: APA California Chapter Board
FROM: Virginia Viado, Vice President of Administration
       Miroo Desai, AICP, Membership Inclusion Coordinator – North
       Anna Vidal, Membership Inclusion Coordinator – South
DATE: January 11, 2013
SUBJECT: Membership Inclusion Program Update

Recommended Action:
Receive and file the report prepared by the Membership Inclusion Coordinators.

Background:
The 2012 Diversity Summit at the 2012 State Conference was well attended and included guest speakers Mitch Silver, AICP, APA National President and Dr. Leobardo Estrada, PhD, Associate Professor of Urban Planning at the UCLA School of Public Affairs, Department of Urban Planning. The attached information provides a summary of the event and presentation materials from the panel.

Fiscal Impact:
None identified.

Attachments:
2012 Diversity Summit Summary and Presentation materials.
This year’s APACA Diversity Summit was held on Sunday, October 21, 2012, the first day of the annual planning conference held in Rancho Mirage, CA. We had over 100 conference attendees attended the event.

**Agenda**

**Census Trends for Planning and Policy: Diversity Summit 2012**

APA California Chapter Conference
Rancho Mirage, California
Sunday, October 21
4:30-6:00 P.M.

**ABSTRACT:** This year’s California Chapter Diversity Summit deepen planners’ understanding of statewide demographic trends to inform local land use planning and public policy, with particular emphasis on underserved communities, communities of color, and the planners who work in those communities. This session goal was to provide guidance for California planners on how to translate the Census 2010 data into everyday project, program, and policy guidance, providing relevant case studies and resources. Sample areas of focus had included effective public engagement strategies for communities with shifting demographics and navigating the changing fiscal resource landscape. The Summit featured American Planning Association President Mitchell Silver as the opening speaker, setting the national demographic context. The Summit keynote provided by Dr. Leobardo Estrada, PhD, focusing on California’s unique planning and policy landscape. Dr. Estrada is Associate Professor of Urban Planning at the UCLA School of Public Affairs, Department of Urban Planning. State Membership Inclusion Directors Connie Galambos Malloy and Anna M. Vidal provided a brief overview of current Chapter diversity initiatives, trends, and opportunities for members to engage at the Section level.

**4:30-4:35**

**Welcome & Overview - Connie Malloy, CCAPA Membership Inclusion Director – Northern**
4:35-4:50
Opening – Mitchell Silver, APA National President
• National context for demographic change that shapes planning & public policy and APA’s Diversity efforts.

4:55-5:30
Keynote - Leobardo Estrada, Professor of Urban Planning, UC Los Angeles
• The U.S. Census in California – what did we expect? What emerged as surprises?
• Analysis of five key statewide planning & public policy issues
• Navigating demographic, community, municipal, and political change

5:30-5:50
Moderated Reactions & Reflections - Mitchell Silver, APA National President

5:50-6:00
Diversity Summit Wrap-up - Anna Vidal, CCAPA Membership Inclusion Director – Southern

Notes
After a brief welcome, Connie Malloy introduced APA President Mitchell Silver, AICP, who then began by calling out APA President-Elect Bill Anderson, AICP, and APA Executive Director Paul Farmer from the audience. Mr. Silver then explained that social equity and fairness have been an integral part of urban planning since the profession's inception, as evidenced by their inclusion in APA's past and present principles. Mr. Silver then asked the audience "what is the new normal?", and answered that demographic trends show the rise of the inclusive community, and that while planners are "on the front lines" and are "guardians of the future," APA membership and AICP certification does not currently reflect the new normal. Mr. Silver further elaborated that there are indeed consequences for no action, and that planners should avoid even mentioning sustainability if equity, one of sustainability's three E's, is not seriously considered, a phenomenon he referred to as "equity washing." APA has and continues to address this, according to Mr. Silver, through the Changes Faces of America track at the last national conference, as well as through the Ambassadors Program. Mr. Silver then introduced Dr. Leobardo Estrada, PhD, Associate Professor of Urban Planning at the UCLA School of Public Affairs, Department of Urban Planning.

Dr. Estrada began his keynote presentation with the idea of California as a "great experiment," and shared personal anecdotes of how outside observers are fascinated with how relatively conflict-free this experiment has been. Between the 2000 and 2010 Census in California, Asians and Latinos have increased in population and in "momentum," while Whites and Blacks have decreased in both. There is also a growing elderly population in California, as well as significant changes in household types and homeownership. California also has the highest percentage of foreign-born people in the US, yet that has been the case since the 1860 Census; this poses a tremendous challenge to crisis coordinators and managers, for example, who often must urgently communicate in languages other than English. Part of the great experiment is the lack of programs for immigrant integration, resulting in a "sink or swim"
situation. As for planning implications, current projections show an increase in property values, building permits, and government employment, all resulting in increases in staffing that should reflect the diverse community, as well as increased revenues that should then be spent on development that reflects the diverse community's values. Furthermore, the language and cultural barriers must be considered in public participation and in public safety and crisis planning. The most important takeaway from all of this, according to Dr. Estrada, is simply the need for "understanding" of this diversity - racial, generational, and otherwise - by the planning profession; Mr. Silver had previously explained that diversity is the valuing of different perspectives.

After the keynote presentation, the summit was opened for question/comment-and-answer.

1. The first question was simply how should we move forward to ensure that planners reflect the community, to which Mr. Silver replied that planning is for tomorrow and for the younger generations, for which extra work is needed to ensure that public comment has the proper representation, which includes more use of social media.

2. A Los Angeles County planner then asked how can planners best address the educational and generational gap; Mr. Silver answered that planners need to sell schools and education as economic development in order to change prevailing attitudes, as planners play a role in making our cities competitive in our global economy.

3. The third question was on how to break down the silos within the profession and the community at large, to which Dr. Estrada spoke of the differences in expectations from planning between the first, second, and third generations of immigrants and their varying degrees of exposure to the US system. Mr. Silver elaborated that the mature generations often plan for their own needs, even though it is the younger generations that will implement the plans.

4. APA President-Elect Bill Anderson then asked how to best deal with the trend of people relocating back to the cities, eventually leading to a surplus of single-family housing stock, to which Dr. Estrada explained that different generations have different norms when it comes to density; the demand for sprawl may in fact decline, and thus density must be presented differently.

5. The fifth question was how are business dealing with the demographic trends presented by Dr. Estrada, to which Mr. Silver replied that planners were five years ahead of realtors in predicting higher demand for smaller units and higher densities without necessarily going vertical. Mr. Silver also warned of the ticking time bomb of housing stock quality, as many of the homes built in the recent housing boom are of much lesser quality than those built shortly after World War II. Dr. Estrada then explained that aging-in-place has not been addressed on a large scale, for which the allowance of granny flats/accessory dwelling units can address.

6. The next comment from the audience was on the need to rethink homeownership as a proxy for stability; Mr. Silver shared the results of a bipartisan study that younger generations prefer to rent over owning a home. Dr. Estrada then explained that there is still a correlation between
home ownership and other quality of life factors such as crime, yet this correlation may decrease over time.

7. What about gated communities, asked the next audience member, to which Mr. Silver expressed bewilderment that such communities were allowed in California, as they are not permitted in Raleigh, NC due to the false sense of security. Dr. Estrada explained that gated communities have in fact created a new conflict: HOAs.

8. The next question was on whether second and third generations of immigrants learning English and assimilating still occurs, to which Dr. Estrada explained that this process still continues but is decelerating, since for example, a second or third generation immigrant can live in San Francisco’s Chinatown and get by just fine without English.

9. The next three questions were answered in rapid-fire style. First, what resources are available from the California Chapter on this topic, for which past California Chapter President Kurt Christiansen suggested a partnership with AARP.

10. How do planners address the lack of awareness in the value of planning, especially among college students, for which Mr. Silver suggested marketing to the general public planning and economic development as one.

11. Moreover, how do planners address the lack of interest in joining APA within the profession, again especially among college students, for which Anna Vidal expressed the need for strong advocacy for students. Ms. Vidal also announced that the APA website will soon be revamped to include additional resources.

After the Q&A, Ms. Vidal thanked everyone for attending, and wished everyone a productive conference.

**Conclusion**
We have concluded that since we had a huge success by adding Ethics credits, we will continue the tradition next year. We are researching future topics for the Diversity Summit 2013 and one of the ideas is Food Systems. We will be having a conference call with the Section Membership Inclusion Directors on January 15, 2013, to beginning brainstorming for the 2013 Diversity Summit.
Appendix
A – Welcome & Opening Power Point Presentation
B – Mitchell Silver, Power Point Presentation
C – Leo Estrada’s Presentation
Census Trends for Planning & Policy

Diversity Summit
October 21, 2012
4:30 - 6:00 PM
Diversity Summit Agenda

- Overview – Connie Malloy, CCAPA Board
- Opening – Mitchell Silver, AICP
- Keynote – Dr. Leobardo Estrada, Ph.D.
- Reflections – Audience
- Next steps – Anna Vidal, CCAPA Board
Diversity Summit History

- 2006  Adding Color to the Profession
- 2007  Crossing Borders and Breaking Barriers
- 2008  Top 10 Planning Issues for Communities of Color
- 2009  Diversity in Planning
- 2010  Plan to Thrive, not just Survive
- 2011  California’s Changing Face
- 2012  Census Trends for Planning & Policy

*Today marks our seventh summit!*
California Sets the Trend
CA Membership Demographics

- White: 48%
- Not Specified: 38%
- Latino: 5%
- API: 6%
- Other: 1%
- Black: 2%

Source: APA National 2011
Section Membership Inclusion Directors

- Monique Acosta, Los Angeles
- Connery Cepeda, San Diego
- Miroo Desai, Northern
- William Hoose, Orange
- Nelson Miller, Inland Empire
- Lilly Okamura, Central Coast
- Derek Wong, Sacramento
Diversity Summit Contacts

California Chapter
Membership Inclusion
Co-Directors

Anna Vidal
(818) 374-5043
Anna.Vidal@lacity.org

Connie Malloy, Commissioner
(510) 717-3775
cmalloy@irvine.org

Section Directors

Northern
Miroo Desai, AICP
(510) 596-3785
mdesai@ci.emeryville.ca.us

Central Coast
Lilly Okamura, AICP
(805) 654-7758
lokamura@cityofventura.net

Los Angeles
Monique Acosta
(213) 978-1173
monique.acosta@lacity.org

Orange
William Hoose
(714) 750-7275
William.Hoose@atkinsglobal.com

Sacramento Valley
Derek Wong, AICP
(530) 601-2508
dwong@pmcworld.com

Inland Empire
Nelson Miller
(951) 787-9222
nmiller@hogleireland.com

San Diego
Connery Cepeda
(619) 688-6003
connery_cepeda@dot.ca.gov

Mitchell Silver, AICP
APA National President
City of Raleigh, NC
(919) 996.2625
Mitchell.Silver@raleighnc.gov

Dr. Leobardo Estrada
UCLA School of Public Affairs
Department of Urban Planning
(310) 825-6574
leobard@ucla.edu
UNDERSTANDING CALIFORNIA’S NEW DEMOGRAPHIC TERRAIN: IMPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING

Leo Estrada, PhD
Luskin School of Public Affairs
UCLA
CALIFORNIA DEMOGRAPHICS
A Look at the State
What we Expected

- California’s population will continue to grow although at lower rates than in the past
  - 20 Million in 1970 to 37.2 Million in 2010
- Continued higher growth of Hispanics and Asians
  - 2.4 Million in 1970 to 14 Million in 2010
  - 1.5 Million in 1970 to 4.9 Million in 2010
  - Hispanic growth in 3,000 of 3,141 counties
- The Inland Empire, Sacramento region and San Joaquin Valley grew the most in the last decade
## Demographic Change: California 2000 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Hispanic Origin</th>
<th>Numerical Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, All Races</td>
<td>3,382,308</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>3,047,163</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-860,537</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-18,122</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Indian</td>
<td>-16,734</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1,126,210</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>28,841</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other Race</td>
<td>13,906</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more Race</td>
<td>65,581</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, 2012
Births by Race/Ethnicity in CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>527,020</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>146,402</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>31,090</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Ind.</td>
<td>2,412</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>67,736</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>270,236</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>9,144</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deaths by Race/Ethnicity in CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>228,622</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>141,060</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>16,232</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14,403</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Ind.</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>31,321</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24,691</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California Department of Public Health, [http://www.cdph.ca.gov/data/statistics/Pages/DeathStatisticalDataTables.aspx](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/data/statistics/Pages/DeathStatisticalDataTables.aspx)
What we Expected

• With a decline births and in-migration of younger populations, the median age of California populations is increasing
# Change in 60+ Population: California 2000 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Hispanic Origin</th>
<th>Numerical Change</th>
<th>Change in Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, All Races</td>
<td>1,987,068</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>718,821</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>603,357</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>110,393</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Indian</td>
<td>11,411</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>530,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>10,131</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other Race</td>
<td>2,791</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more Race</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, 2012
California’s elderly population will increase from 3.7 million in 1990 to 10.1 million in 2040.
What did we not expect

• Strong decline in family households
  • Female households with children
  • Living alone

• Increases in owner occupied housing units
  • Especially for Asians, but also for Hispanics and Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders
## Change in Household Type: California 2000 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Hispanic Origin</th>
<th>Family Households</th>
<th>Family Households with Children</th>
<th>Female Households, no Husband</th>
<th>Living Alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, All Races</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>-15.3%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>-12.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Indian</td>
<td>-8.1%</td>
<td>-22.8%</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other Race</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more Race</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Changes in Owner/Renter Status: California 2000 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Hispanic Origin</th>
<th>Occupied Housing Units</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Renter Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, All Races</td>
<td>1,074,628</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>818,488</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-189,225</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>31,331</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Indian</td>
<td>-2,975</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>413,241</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/PI</td>
<td>7,986</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other Race</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more Race</td>
<td>-5,948</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we Expected

- Continued immigration from abroad but at a lower rate than in the past
- California remains the State with the highest proportion of foreign born (27%)
- Continued diversity from all over the globe
% Foreign Born 1860-2010

California
United States
States by Percent Foreign Born

% Foreign Born

United States 12
Rhode Island 12
Maryland 12
Connecticut 13
Illinois 13
Arizona 13
Massachusetts 14
Texas 16
Hawaii 17
Nevada 19
Florida 18
New Jersey 21
New York 22
California 27
## Immigrants to California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>El Salvador</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>U. Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Panama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

US Bureau of the Census, ACS, 2006-2010
## Language Use in Selected Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language other than English Spoken in the Home</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County, CA</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County, CA</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County, CA</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County, CA</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside County, CA</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino County, CA</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern County, CA</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THREE-PART DEFINITION

IMPROVED ECONOMIC MOBILITY

RECEIVING SOCIETY OPENNESS

ENHANCED CIVIC PARTICIPATION

INDICATOR CATEGORIES

ECONOMIC SNAPSHOT

ECONOMIC TRAJECTORY

WARMTH OF WELCOME

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT
What we Expected

• California has no majority population
California Population by Race and Ethnicity, 2000
California Population by Race and Ethnicity, 2010

- White
- Latino
- Black
- Asian/Other
California Population by Race and Ethnicity, 2020

- White
- Latino
- Black
- Asian/Other
California Population by Race and Ethnicity, 2030
CALIFORNIA 1990

- Other (42%)
- White (58%)
WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING?

Looking ahead or Looking away?
What can we expect from this new demographic terrain?

Is this a time to be pessimistic or optimistic about California’s future?

Most indicators point to an upswing in California’s future

- Personal and Disposable Income
- Total Property Valuation
- Building Parts
- Local Government Employment
Personal and Disposable Income
California 2008 to 2014

California Department of Finance: Economic Estimates, 2012
Total Property Valuation

California Department of Finance: Economic Estimates, 2012
Building Permits

California Department of Finance: Economic Estimates, 2012
Local Government Employment

California Department of Finance: Economic Estimates, 2012
Implications for Cities

- **Revenue**—upswing coming
- **Infrastructure**—growth will put continued pressure on infrastructure
- **Land Use**—no major issues here
- **Community Participation**—Language
- **Public Safety and Crisis Planning**—Language and community relations
- **Staffing**—need to look toward future needs