Successful downtowns are distinctive and unique.

Still, many communities seeking to improve their downtowns hold a set of beliefs about problems and solutions which may - or may not - be consistent with the way their specific downtowns function.

One dozen myths about downtown redevelopment are so persistent that they regularly reappear. By examining them, it’s possible to ferret out what can be truly useful in downtown development. Moreover, it’s possible to discern that approaches to revitalization that are impulsive, emotional, or copied from other successful downtowns have very limited application.

**Myth #1: What We Need is a Film Festival**

Some downtown advocates take the Silver Bullet approach to revitalization. They base an entire revitalization effort on landing a department store, baseball team, library, or major event like a film festival. This approach is a house of cards because if that one thing doesn’t come downtown, the rest of the plan doesn’t work.

The most successful revitalizations are the result of partnerships between the community, city government, and local developers.
Letter from the PRESIDENT

By Jeri Ram, AICP, CCAPA President

Wow – it has been an exciting first year as your President! The California Chapter has accomplished so much during this last year including:

- An incredible National Conference in San Francisco organized by Northern Section.
- A State Conference organized by Central Section in what has to be one of the most majestic environments in the world - Yosemite.
- An incredible press conference in Sacramento on our Legislative Agenda that was televised and carried on many local stations throughout the State.
- Participation in Planners Day on the Hill.
- Our new website released by the State Board — check it out at CCAPA.org.

I want to thank and say goodbye to our outgoing Board members, including Collette Morse, Past President; Linda Tatum, California Planning Foundation President; Jeanette Dinwiddie-Moore, V.P. for Administration; Steve Silverman, V.P. for Public Information; and Kurt Christiansen, Los Angeles Section Director. It has been an honor and a pleasure to work with these professionals. At the time of preparing this article, the State elections have not been finalized – so I will welcome the new officers in the next Newsletter.

The State Board meeting will be in February; at this meeting, the Board will discuss goals for the coming year. We are waiting to hold our annual press conference until after announcements on some key bills at the State. Watch for our press release sometime in late January or February.

At the State Conference in Yosemite, we held a leadership reception. I was very pleased with the turnout of members who wanted to become more involved in the California Chapter of the American Planning Association. I urge all of you to follow up on this interest this year and contact your local Section Director. Volunteer to serve – I am sure you will find it rewarding and interesting.

Let us all hope that this year will be one that will bring us all peace...
Letter from the EDITOR

So Long, Farewell, Aufwiedersehen, Goodbye

By Stephen Silverman, AICP

Since my term as Vice President of Public Information has come to an end, I’ll no longer oversee CalPlanner nor sit on the CCAPA Board. So let me leave with a few thoughts that come from hours of listening to professionals and talking about our profession, the Chapter’s role and mission, and just where the State Board should focus.

1. Public vs Private remains a perplexing issue.

No matter how intently we’d wish they would go away, differences between the interests of the public and private sectors in planning remain. Most often, public sector concerns trump those of the private sector. While that’s not necessarily a bad thing, it can become too easy of a habit, too spontaneous of a response. What’s especially of concern is that differences between the two sectors are rarely discussed – the topic has all the appeal of a conversation about religion, politics, or the NRA. Nonetheless, there’s a tacit assumption that whatever the reigning pubic sector position is, well, that automatically equates to “the public interest.” Obviously, it ain’t necessarily so.

2. State legislation has morphed into the Holy Grail.

Much of CCAPA’s time and budget is spent on state legislative matters. That’s been the case for a number of years, and it’s certainly beginning to pay off for the organization. Legislators are now coming to CCAPA and asking us to co-sponsor or support bills. Yet, the question that hasn’t been asked in a good, long time is this one: Is spending on state legislation the best use of CCAPA dollars? Other good government groups lobby on the side of the angels. Are we duplicating that effort? Are there other things that we could be spending money on that would yield desirable benefits for our members? Maybe we should just talk about it.

3. Words mean less and less.

I discovered as a parent that it doesn’t make an iota of difference what you tell (or preach at) your kids. What counts is how you behave. Professionally, you can talk all you want about ethics, civility, rationalism, honesty, integrity, equity, and openness, but unless you live that way – unless you model the behavior – you end up teaching something else entirely. Once again, we’re dealing with an obvious notion, but it’s also astonishing how many in our ranks think it applies only to others.

4. Risk aversion is rife.

In a conversation long ago with the head of a UC planning school, I was told that what increasingly characterized planning students was risk-aversion. In the decades since, those planning students have grown up to represent much of the profession. They’ve also carried forward their anti-risk sentiments. Risk aversion is an attitude that so dominates planning, planners, and public discussions of planning that new ideas are often treated like unexploded ordnance. Nobody wants to come close, nor even be in the same room, with anything that sounds chancy. Risk aversion has become one of the defining elements of our profession, notwithstanding our rhetoric to the contrary (see #3 above).

5. Dissent gets dressed as disloyalty.

We live in an age of the Patriot Act, and, taken alongside our slouching toward Political Correctness, the two influences combine: we grow monolithic and singular in our attitudes. The presumption is that there is only one perspective that’s right or wrong, black or white, friendly or not. Nowadays, people seem to know with an alarming degree of confidence what the appropriate way of behaving, expressing opposition, or taking a stand is. (See # 4 above.)

6. Merrily we go along.

For all the issues that constantly confront an organization like CCAPA, the fact is that we are not merely persevering; we are actually prospering. It’s both a blessing and darn good fortune that thoughtful people continue to volunteer and work diligently on the Board. Whether their interests are public or private, legislative or not, risky or conservative, passive or opinionated, the principal focus of them all is the betterment of planning. That’s a noble goal and a dedicated corps.
Many communities have proven this myth by actually attracting the Film Festival or department store and then thinking that their revitalization work was done. They waited for customers and investors to return. And they waited for customers and investors to return. And they waited.

Unfortunately, these communities discovered that attracting one major user does not result in renewed downtown vitality. Instead, the lesson to be learned is that a Silver Bullet only works when it’s in conjunction with economic, design, and other promotional elements to support revitalization.

Myth #2: Zone for Vertical Mixed Use

Think of this as Silver Bullet, Part Deux. It’s a revitalization strategy based on the notion that one type of land use solves everything.

Due in part to California’s housing shortage, new urbanists think that mixed use is the new panacea. Mixed use can be good for a downtown if it isn’t forced into areas where it may have never been historically.

A downtown without mixed use is not predetermined to die. There are several successful downtowns without mixed use zoning in place. This occurs primarily where there is single-story retail on Main Street, and housing is in close proximity. Typically, if residential uses are allowed close to Main Street, then introducing vertical mixed use for the sake of nostalgia can be a controversial forced effort. What’s critical is to have a local residential populace within walking distance, say within four or five blocks.

Myth #3: Get a Theme

The Disneyfication approach to downtown revitalization is rarely successful. Downtowns are a reflection of a community’s past, and the past can be translated into a variety of architectural building styles. People consistently return to what’s real, to areas with a sense of place and scale, not thematic shopping centers with franchises and plastic signs erected and finished in an eight-month construction span.

Of course, downtown merchants sometimes equate the economic success of suburban malls and lifestyle centers with thematic architecture and consistent sign programs. They believe that if a place has order and control, then all they need do to sit back and reap the benefits.

Two notable downtowns have used the theme approach successfully, and both are principally tourist stops. One is Solvang, California, and the other is Leavenworth, Washington. One is Bavarian, and the other is Danish. It has to be the pastry!

Myth #4: Parking is the Problem

Every downtown likes to blame its woes on parking. Frequently, people perceive that there is a parking problem if they cannot park directly in front or behind the actual business that they are visiting. Often, the supply of parking in downtown is adequate; yet, the directional signage to the parking is non-existent. In those instances, it is only the savviest of residents who know where the best parking spots are.

This circumstance surely makes the case for better downtown parking management, consistent clear signage, and enforcement of parking regulations. It’s almost never about more spaces.

Myth #5: McDonald’s Will Ruin Our Quaintness

This attitude is another version of David v. Goliath: if we keep Goliath out, we’ll be fine! Turns out that quite the contrary is true.

Franchise businesses weigh their location selections very carefully before committing to an area. The fact that a reputable franchise wants to make its home in your downtown should be viewed as a very positive economic indicator. What your downtown has to do is make sure that the franchise storefront fits with the architectural character of its location. You certainly don’t want your downtown transformed into a row of gaudy plastic signs, false mansard roofs, and illuminated blue awnings. You have the right to control it.

So how does a downtown stay true to its unique character, retain local business, and be successful?

Downtown Coronado, California is a National Main Street “Best Downtown.” It has adopted zoning regulations limiting the number of franchise establishments allowed in its downtown. Coronado’s approach was to allow enough franchises to show a healthy economic picture, but not so many as to homogenize the flavor of local entrepreneurial establishments. Coronado adopted design guidelines and standards that essentially prohibit the corporate look of chain stores.

Myth #6: Everyone Should Open During the Same Hours

During the last ten years, downtowns across the country have attempted to standardize the hours of operation kept by retailers. Think about it for a minute.
Legislative UPDATE

By Sande George, Stefan/George Associates, CCAPA Legislative Advocate

2006: Planning at Forefront of Legislative and Statewide Initiatives and Legislation

Planning issues will be front and center in 2006 in the Legislature and on the ballot. Here are the BIG FOUR:

If you would like a copy of any of these bills, or an analysis of the measures, just go to the CCAPA website legislative page at www.calapa.org.

1. EMINENT DOMAIN INITIATIVES FILED FOR STATEWIDE BALLOT AND STILL CIRCULATING IN THE LEGISLATURE

Two initiative measures were filed in December for the 2006 ballot that would severely restrict the use of eminent domain in California, and one other initiative is being considered. If the sponsors are able to gather enough signatures by mid-May, these initiatives could appear on the November 2006 statewide ballot. The measures were both sponsored by Senator Tom McClintock, Orange County Supervisor Chris Norby, and Jon Coupal, President of the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association.

Both measures would eliminate the use of eminent domain for any property that would not be owned and used by a public entity, which will essentially eliminate the use of eminent domain for redevelopment projects according to the California Redevelopment Association.

To review the text of the initiatives, use: www.ca.gov/elections/elections_j.htm, Initiatives Pending with the Attorney General, California Property Owner Protection Act and The Homeowners & Private Property Protection Act of 2006.

The “California Property Owners Protection Act” states that:

State and local governments may use their powers to take and regulate private property only for public uses, like roads, parks, and public facilities, for land-use planning and zoning, or to preserve the health and safety of their citizens.

If the state or local government takes or regulates private property for public uses, the initiative would require that the owner receive just compensation for what has been taken “or damaged.” If the owner and government are unable to agree on a fair price, the owner would be entitled to a “fair and efficient judicial process” to decide the amount as determined by a jury. It would also require that if the public agency abandons the stated public use within five years of the taking, the property must be offered for sale to the private owner from which the property was taken, at the current fair market value, and taxed at its pre-condemnation value.

The “Homeowners & Private Property Protection Act of 2006” would allow state and local governments to use their powers to take private property only for public uses, such as roads, schools, parks, and public facilities. It also states: “Private property must not be taken from one owner and given to another private owner for any reason unless the original owner is a willing seller.”

It would additionally require the government to give right of first refusal to the original owner if the property ceases to be used or fails to be used for the original public purpose within 10 years.

The Legislature will also continue its efforts to find a legislative proposal to address the actual issues raised in the US Supreme Court decision Kelo v. City of New London. In that case, the concern was the use of eminent domain in a redevelopment area to take a private residence and transfer that property to a private developer – a much narrower issue than the initiatives address.

2. 20-YEAR PLANNING FOR HOUSING – 10-YEAR ZONING FOR HOUSING

CCAPA has been participating in the Business, Transportation & Housing and Resources Agencies’ Housing Task Force for the last few months. This is an ongoing effort, spearheaded by BT&H Secretary Sunne McPeak and Resources Secretary Mike Chrisman to increase the supply of land made available for housing. Below is the basic “Summary of Recommendations” for your review. CCAPA plans on putting together a more detailed proposal to address the key goals of this ambitious housing agenda in the next few months, working with the League and CSAC.

Concurrent proposals are being developed as part of this BT&H/Resources effort as well as to provide seed money and ongoing funding for planning, infrastructure, and housing; new changes to the RHNA process, including amending or eliminating the CCAPA-supported requirement now in law for the COGs to consider city and county planning factors in developing the RHNA; changes to CEQA to encourage infill and housing; a new “QPP” process to ensure resources and ag lands are protected; and a public education component to encourage the public to support housing.

continued on page 6
Legislative Update

BTHI Resources Advisory Group – Housing Task Force – Summary of Recommendations

Goal:

- Increase the supply of housing (consistently 225,000 per year);
- Increase housing choices (apartments, condominiums, single-family);
- For the full population (all income levels and those with special housing needs, e.g., the elderly and homeless); and
- In the right places (protecting farmland and natural resources).

Draft Proposals:

1. To ensure the market can operate effectively and efficiently and to get at the root cause of the housing supply and affordability crisis: Amend land use and housing element law to require planning for a 20-year housing need. Local governments must designate sufficient land for housing to cover a 20-year period and zone land for a 10-year housing need. Improve the regional housing need process to ensure planning for housing and jobs for a 20-year horizon.

2. Provide local governments with relief from comprehensively updating their housing elements every 5 years: Updates would be required only every 10 years, with land availability and performance reviews at the 5-year midpoint.

3. Provide development certainty: Require that multifamily sites be provided “by-right” without further discretionary local review, to meet half of the 10-year housing need.

4. Promote the efficient use of land: Require a certain percentage of sites be provided at minimum densities to encourage vertical development.

5. Promote development within already urbanized areas: Require local governments to include specific programs and policies to encourage infill development, the efficient use of land including mixed use development (e.g., housing and retail); and housing along transit corridors. In addition, the State should develop models and tools to assist local governments in accommodating more infill housing, including:
   - Develop and maintain a statewide inventory of potential sites;
   - Develop model mixed-use, form-based zoning code and model urban specific plan;
   - Develop and maintain clearinghouse of tools and resources for infill, Transit Oriented Development, and mixed use.

6. Reduce regulatory barriers to housing development: Strengthen existing law prohibiting down zoning and limiting growth controls which reduce housing construction.

3. SHOW ME THE FLOOD PROTECTION

Assembly Member Wolk has also spearheaded a working group this fall to deal with flood issues, and concerns that California is potentially the next New Orleans. No written recommendations have yet been developed, but being discussed are new requirements for General Plans, individual projects, and CEQA to ensure that a new 200-year flood standard for levees and watershed areas are provided. Taking a cue from the SB 221 mandate to ensure water is available to serve a project before projects are approved, similar flood protection assurances would have to be provided before projects could be approved.

Also on the table are:

- Who would sign off that flood protection for a project or a levee or a flood plain or a general plan meets the new standards.
- Whether there should be different flood standards in urban and rural areas.
- What entity would be liable in the future in the event of a flood in spite of such assurances.
- Whether mandatory insurance and new building standards would be required in any area designated as being in a 200-year flood plain.

CCAPA will continue participating in these discussions and keep members posted on recommendations and legislation.

4. GOODS MOVEMENT AND LAND USE IMPLICATIONS

No doubt you’ve all heard that the Governor has organized a working group of key stakeholders to address goods movement, transportation infrastructure, and environmental mitigation. That working group will be continuing through June 2006 to discuss recommendations and priority projects that will receive funding in a new bond measure. It is unclear at this point how much money will be in the final bond, or what specific infrastructure will be included in the final bond package. That will be worked out between the Governor and Legislature over the course of this year, and then, it will have to be approved by the voters before any bond funds are released.

So far, bond funding is being considered to pay for transportation infrastructure, housing, planning, flood protection, schools, and goods movement infrastructure and environmental mitigation. The Governor and both the Senate and Assembly will be submitting their own proposals for a bond measure, estimated to provide between $10 billion to $30 billion for these purposes.

Of major interest to planners, land use decisions and how they impact goods movement, air pollution, and congestion have been part of this goods movement discussion. A recent goods movement draft report lists:

- three trends of land use decision-making that have contributed to the current transportation difficulties impacting goods movement and Californians in general: 1) lack of coordination between local, regional and state transportation planners; 2) single use zoning that isolates housing, service, retail and employment; 3) low density land use (urban sprawl) resulting in higher transportation infrastructure connectivity costs.

Problems resulting when goods movement facilities (ports, rail yards, distribution centers) are near incompatible land
We reside in the State of Change. In terms of rapid population growth, the State of California beats out other top tier growth regions, bypassing Texas, Florida, Georgia, Arizona, Washington, North Carolina, and Colorado. The constant parade of subdivision plans, tentative maps, condominium conversions, and density increases on an all too regular basis spells change.

But the fact is that we need to change even more. We need to change differently, too. We need to develop communities — land uses, buildings, and services — that meet the needs of our new population, not just the current ones. At least that’s the challenge put forward by Dr. Leobardo Estrada, Associate Professor of Urban Planning at UCLA.

Professor Estrada is a sociologist who specializes in ethnic and racial demographic trends, inner city redevelopment, and social policy analysis. Speaking to elected and appointed officials at the League of California Cities Leaders Workshop, Dr. Estrada surprised many with his insights and forecasts.

Rather than address the planning needs of those we know, the professor suggests we instead think like the typical “California consumer.” Through his studies, Estrada concludes that consumers in California are uneasy about their future. They face uncertainty and often feel the “Good Old Days” are gone. Consumers are most likely influenced by scare scenarios, and they have an underlying fear, especially of change. Purchasers are positive about the tangible, but they distrust the system.

While Estrada’s research was based on consumer consumption, the parallels to land use planning are uncanny. We’ve again entered an era of self-reliance, and it has profound effects on land use planning.

Consumers want choice. They value efficiency, and they value privacy. In his talk, Dr. Estrada characterized the consumer with four phrases:
1. “Recognize me” – I’m unique.
2. “Relate to me” – Know what I like.
3. “Reward me” – I’ll be loyal to you if you are to me.
4. “Anticipate me” – I’m changing; figure out where I am going, and be there for me.

It’s easy to see how this is applied to consumer research, as manufacturers create cars, toys, apparel, food, or other commodities to address the changing consumer. It’s also possible to see how homebuilders apply the same concept to housing product type.

But how is this applied to land use planning?
First and foremost, if we only respond to crisis, we fail the citizen “consumer” and escalate distrust. The need for strong leadership is even more critical now, as citizens say “Anticipate Me” and ask to be brought along in the process.

Second, we must recognize the demographics of today will not be the demographics of tomorrow. A General Plan written for the year 1990 population may very well address a different city than we have become in the 21st Century. Changes in ethnicity, lifestyles, and family units have a profound effect on typical single-family land use allocations. Those changes should lead us to question whether we’re promoting options for a future population that may not hold the same values we’ve assumed.

Third, it is time to change our planning process. Rather than be on the defense, we must evolve to the offense. Planning Commissioners are for the most part reactionary — we review projects and make findings. But what if we were to be part of the influence? Research tells us that infrastructure and transportation will be the defining issues for the next few election cycles in California. Ask yourself, “As Commissioners, what can we do to promote an infrastructure and mobility system that supports our quality of life?”

We should not wait until the inevitable becomes reality.

We can lead change by asking pertinent questions, encouraging our elected officials to think broadly, and supporting the citizen “consumer” who is the real future of California — the future of change. As Dr. Estrada observes, we can “recognize, relate, reward and anticipate” our constituents and lead the unavoidable change.

Or we can be left behind.

Kathy Garcia, FASLA can be contacted at 619.696.9303 or kgarcia@SD.wtdesign.com.
Debunking Time

Myth #8: Brighter is Better

While an unsafe downtown is bad for business, making streets as bright as a prison yard is certainly not the answer either. There is a fine line between providing an adequate amount of light and giving the appearance of solving a crime problem.

The approach to lighting public spaces has to consider two elements.

First, lighting sources must be varied. Simply providing streetlights is not enough, and streetlights alone are often not attractive to pedestrians. The warmest type of light is reflected off building surfaces. This light is more sensual and avoids overly bright hot spots. Look for alternative light sources such as storefronts, bollards, and architectural wall wash lighting.

Second, the brightness and color of the light must be correctly matched to the public space. Super bright streetlights with a yellow tinge make pedestrians cringe and give off the wrong message about a place.

Myth #9: Downtown Will Re-emerge as the Community’s Retail Heart

It is time we all start admitting that for most downtowns, reestablishing or becoming the retail heart of the community is unattainable. Once the malls opened and then the big box Costcos and Walmarts moved in, the game was pretty much over for most small independent retailers who sold similar goods and didn’t offer extraordinary service.

Some downtown organizations are just too stubborn; they refuse to see the writing on the wall. The fact is that unless the small, independent downtown retailer offers unique product lines or superior customer service, the big retailers maintain a huge price point advantage. While we all like to think we “buy downtown,” we still go to K-Mart to buy anti-freeze for our car.

Americans love our big boxes. They give us discounted prices, easy parking, and endless retail choices. Making matters worse is that many of us are now shopping online.

Turning our downtowns into cultural/entertainment or specialty retail areas will dominate the restructuring of our inner cities, and create a truly thriving destination for communities. Also, housing in and around an urban center has suddenly become vogue. Empty nesters, young urban professionals, and two-income couples will stabilize the market for downtowns. Inner cities that cater to this market segment can provide entertainment, government, specialty retail, culture and restaurants that are interesting and upbeat.

Myth #10: Design Controls Scare Developers Off

Pure nonsense. In fact, quality developers prefer to do business in communities that demand quality projects. By using design guidelines, they know their investment will be protected. Developers do not want to create a beautiful building design if they suspect that the vacant lot next door is going to be an architectural atrocity.

The most successful revitalizations are the result of partnerships between the community, city government, and local developers. These partnerships can be highly successful in providing a quality project for the community and an economically successful project for the developer. The essential ingredient for making the partnership work is attitude. All parties in the partnership must agree to cooperate, so that a mutually beneficial project derives from all the hard work.

Myth #11: Don’t Do Anything Until We Have a Market Study

While this myth presumes “A Technical Study Will Protect Us,” it’s more like a CYA approach. Instead of first performing a market study, downtown stakeholders should envision what types of uses they want. This serves two purposes. First, it
shortens the list of potential targets the economist will study, and it also avoids having the economist report to the downtown association that a Costco, Home Depot, or auto dealership shows real promise in downtown. Yikes!

Keep in mind that it is the mix of retail uses that is most important in making a downtown successful. An economist can rarely pinpoint the actual uses that are specifically needed for a successful downtown district. What an economist does is report the market segments that could be fulfilled within the city limits. The economist can suggest business sectors that are saturated, neutral, or needed. So, figure out what mix of uses you want in your downtown, and then hire an economist to ascertain if the market will support that mix.

Myth #12: Downtown Needs Drive-By Traffic

This is the largest myth out there! It presumes that the more cars that drive by a business, the better retail sales are. This is the highway strip approach to downtown revitalization. This premise is partially true but for only a few select market sectors, such as convenience stores or gas stations.

What is important is to have cars that have downtown as their destination, not a place they drive through to get to another place. Pedestrian-friendly downtowns need walkable, human-scale streets, with easy parking, not two-lane mini highways.

Countless cities across the United States have state highways running through the heart of their downtowns. In most places, the highway commercial uses that originally located along the state highway have relocated outside of downtown.

And in Conclusion . . .

Myths are exactly that – myths – and are not real solutions. A collaborative solution between planners, designers, the community, and public agency decision-makers is the answer to a community’s needs. Communication throughout the process is the key to a successful downtown revitalization effort.

Though solutions to any downtown revitalization are as varied as the downtowns that implement them, it is critical for each downtown to start with an open and honest dialogue about its strengths and weaknesses. Adopting solutions that may have been right in Timbuktu are foreign to your community’s environment.

Remember, by engaging downtown stakeholders to find local answers, the community is less likely to fall prey to the most common pitfalls.

Mark Brodeur FIUD is Director of Urban Revitalization with DOWNTOWN SOLUTIONS, a specialized urban revitalization practice located in California. Contact him at 949.489.1442 or brodeur@downtownsolutions.com.

Waterfront Coalition Wins International Award!

Representing the Vallejo Waterfront Coalition, Marti Brown and Stephanie Gomes accepted the Clearwater Award in Savannah, Georgia in November for grassroots citizen efforts in waterfront planning.

The Coalition was one of 14 groups honored as part of the 19th “Excellence on the Waterfront” program. The nine-member Vallejo Waterfront Coalition Steering Committee was saluted by the Waterfront Center for being vocal advocates of good planning, urban design, and architecture.

Anne Breen, Co-Executive Director of the Waterfront Center said, “This kind of effort highlights the importance of citizens caring about the waterfront and committing their precious time. This dedicated, grassroots citizen effort is substantial and is bound to importantly increase community awareness about the issues and increase dialogue.”

Solano County Supervisor Barbara Kondylis, who nominated the group for this award, reacted to the news: “This is community activism at its best, and to get rewarded for the effort is phenomenal!”

“Accepting this award in Savannah was my last official act as Chair of the Vallejo Waterfront Coalition. I have resigned my position as chair after being elected to the City Council — but what an honorable way to step down! I am proud of this group and everything we have accomplished.”

Moving forward, Marti Brown and Katy Miessner will be the new co-chairs of the Vallejo Waterfront Coalition.

Brown said, “This award is a validation of all the community’s hard work. Being in Savannah and seeing all the remarkable possibilities for waterfront development around the world reinforces our commitment to excellent waterfront development and our dedication to making sure that it happens in Vallejo.”

The Vallejo Waterfront Coalition Steering Committee consists of Marti Brown, Katy Miessner, Diana Lang, Debbie Surani, Kim White, Mark Hutchins, Robert Boyce, and Elena DuCharme.
Booth Exhibitors
Cost: $3,000 each, booths # 1 - 35
• Includes 8’ x 10’ pipe and draped booth
• One 6’ table and 2 chairs
• 1/2 page ad in conference program

Table Top Exhibitors
Cost: $1,500 each, booths # 1 - 8
• One 6’ table and 2 chairs
• 1/4 page ad in conference program

All Exhibitor Packages include the following:
• Booth signage
• Your company name listed in conference program
• Your company name listed on conference website
• Pre-conference attendee list (available 3 weeks prior to conference with name, company and, addresses ONLY)

Conference registration is not included in booth cost. All exhibitors must register for the conference in order to exhibit. Exhibitors must pay conference registration or for meal tickets in order to be registered for the conference.

Exhibitor Booths and Table Tops
• One 6’ x 10’ booth, two chairs, ID signage, wastebasket, pipe, and drape will be provided on a non-carpeted surface at each booth space. Please note: Only 6’ x 10’ booths are permitted, and the CCAPA Committee will not permit blockage of any other exhibitors’ space. Please do not exceed these requirements. Poster displays on easels are permitted as long as they do not block other exhibitors’ space.
• Exhibit space set-up is on October 22, 2006 between 12:00 noon and 5:00 pm.
• Tear-down is on October 25, 2006 between 11:00 am and 2:30 pm.

Note: Exhibitors are required to remain set-up until October 25, 2006, 11:00 am.
Electricity, easels, carpet, and additional exhibit needs will be provided through the CCAPA conference decorator at an additional charge. Exhibit packets will be emailed after receipt of payment. Shipping information will also be provided in exhibit packets and will be handled through conference decorator ONLY. No shipping of exhibits or materials will be accepted at any of the CCAPA 2006 Conference lodging facilities in Orange County.

Exhibitor Registration
Exhibits are for the support of the conference and promotion of your product, service, or program and have been created for flexibility in price and level of exposure. Exhibit locations are on a first-come, first-serve, first-pay basis and do not include conference registration. All exhibitors must register for the conference in order to exhibit.

Exhibitor Cancellation Policy
If written cancellation of exhibitor space is received by June 15, 2006, a full refund will be made. If written cancellation of exhibitor space is received by July 15, 2006 an 80% refund will be made. No refunds or cancellations accepted after August 15, 2006.

Exhibitor Questions
Questions about your sponsorship should be made to the CCAPA 2006 Conference Office:
Lynne C. Bynder, CMP, CCAPA 2006 Conference Planner
Email: lbynder@meetingsxceptional.com
Phone: 760.799.2740 • Fax: 760.674.2479

Conference information online at www.calapa.org

CCAPA 2006 Conference Exhibitor Registration
Please make checks payable to CCAPA and fax or mail to the attention of:
Lynne C. Bynder, CMP—CCAPA 2006 Conference Office: c/o Meetings Xceptional-40747 Baranda Court, Palm Desert, CA 92260
Phone: 760.799.2740 Fax: 760.674.2479 Email: lbynder@meetingsxceptional.com

Booth locations are on a first-come, first-serve and first-pay basis.

Exhibitor Registration and Payment Deadline: June 15, 2006

Name ___________________________ Company ___________________________
Address ______________________________________________________________
City ___________________________ State ______ Zip ______
Phone ___________________________ Fax ___________________________ Email ___________________________

Conference registration is not included in booth cost. All exhibitors must register for the conference in order to exhibit. Exhibitors must pay conference registration or for meal tickets in order to be registered for the conference.
APA Election Process Begins

Submitted By Stephen Preston, FAICP

The APA Nominating Committee met in November to select the following slated candidates for the 2006 elections:

- **APA President-elect**
  - Robert Hunter, FAICP
  - Sarah More, AICP
- **Board Director, Region I**
  - David Woods, AICP
  *(The other slated candidate has withdrawn; a replacement will be nominated shortly.)*
- **Board Director, Region V**
  - Leo Asuncion, AICP
  - Kelli Sertich, AICP
- **Board Director, Region VI**
  - Mike Harper, FAICP
  - Jeff Lambert, AICP
- **Board Director, At-large**
  - Mitch Silver, AICP
  - William Harris, FAICP
- **Board Director, At-large (Planning Commissioner-focused)**
  - Patricia Sheffels
  - Debra March

The candidates will be announced in the upcoming edition of *Interact*, and their statements will be posted on the website. Only those candidates who submitted to the Nominating Committees, but were not nominated, are eligible to run by petition. Petition procedures will be posted on the website when the candidates above are announced to the membership.

2005 - 2006 APA/AICP Election Schedule

**December 2005**

- Nominees announced on APA website, *Interact*; announcement of petition procedures.
- APA website publishes nominated candidates’ names, background and position statements, and optional photograph; petition procedures published.
- Posting of nominated candidates’ names, background and position statements and announcement of petition process on APA website, *Interact*.
- Petition candidate packet available from staff and website.
- APA President appoints Teller Committee.

**2006**

- **February 15** – Firm deadline for filing of petition candidates’ petitions, background/experience, and position statements.
- **February 20** – Teller Committee to meet in Chicago Office.
- **February 25** – Staff e-mails petition candidates’ position statements to all nominated candidates.
- **February 28** – Posting of all candidate position statements in the January Leadership e-Letter, APA website, and *Interact* to the membership.
- **February** – Ad in *Interact* reminding members to vote.
- **March 11** – Ballots mailed to all members.
- **April 13** – Firm deadline for receipt of ballots from membership.
- **April 17** – Teller Committee certifies election results.
- **April 24** – Election results announced at the APA Annual Meeting in San Antonio.

Candidates will be notified prior to this meeting as to who the winners are, so that they have the option of attending.

- **April 25** – Orientation for new APA Board of Directors and AICP Commission.
- **April 30** – Teller Committee Report to Board of Directors.
- **May** – Teller Committee to meet within three weeks of adjournment of Annual Meeting to certify election results.
- **June 5** – Newly elected APA Board of Directors and AICP Commission take office.
- **June/July** – Election results published in *Planning* magazine and on APA website.

**Legislative Update**

uses, particularly housing, have also been the focus of the working groups. The draft report suggests that smart growth principles be adopted to deal with these trends, and to ensure that incompatible uses do not encroach on goods movement facilities and corridors in the future or endanger the health of residents. Specific strategies to ensure compatible uses or to mitigate health and environmental impacts of goods movement have been limited so far. But several issues have been on the table: whether there should be a buffer zone between housing and ports, rail yards, major highways and distribution centers; whether new limitations should be imposed on the ability of local agencies to restrict the hours of operation for delivery of goods to encourage trucks to use highways in off-peak hours; and whether general plans and amendments should be circulated for comment to goods movement facilities.

CCAPA will be closely monitoring and participating in these BIG FOUR initiatives and will keep members posted.

January/February 2006
This full-day workshop is designed to provide you with the tools to manage the most challenging CEQA issues. The program consists of curriculum developed specifically for professionals in all segments of the environmental industry, including consultants, planners, and staff of state and local government and regulatory agencies. Renowned CEQA practitioners will present up-to-the-minute information in a panel format with time for audience questions and answers.

Topics include discussion of Year 2005 CEQA court decisions, recent CEQA Guidelines changes, updates on recent legislation, and practical applications.

To further supplement the program, registration includes a custom workbook containing the course outline and materials.

Program Outline

Registration & Introductions 8:30 - 8:45 AM

Session I 8:45 - 10:00 AM
Year 2005 Guidelines Revisions.
Year 2005 CEQA Case Law.
Mid-Morning break 10:00 - 10:15 AM

Session II 10:15 - 11:45 AM
Year 2005 CEQA Case Law (continued).
Year 2005 CEQA Legislative Update.
Lunch Break* 11:45 AM - 1:00 PM
*Lunch arrangements vary by location. Details will be provided upon registration.

Session III 1:00 - 2:30 PM
Practical applications.
Discussion of focus topics important to the CEQA administrator and practitioner.
Mid-Afternoon Break 2:30 - 2:45 PM

Session IV 2:45 - 4:30 PM
Practical applications.
Discussion of focus topics important to the CEQA administrator and practitioner.

Wrap Up and Conclusion 4:30 PM

Learn About the Latest CEQA Trends

This is an excellent opportunity to augment your CEQA skills with the most current information available.

AEP's Spring 2006 CEQA Workshop Series qualifies for AICP and MCLE (pending) continuing education credit. For more information, log on to AEP's web page or call 916.737.AEP1 (2371).

2006 Spring CEQA WORKSHOP SERIES

REGISTRATION

Please Check Desired Location

- Oakland  . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Tuesday, February 28, 2006
- Irvine  . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Wednesday, March 1, 2006
- San Luis Obispo  . . . . . . . . . . . Thursday, March 2, 2006
- Riverside  . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Thursday, March 2, 2006
- Santa Rosa  . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Thursday, March 2, 2006
- Sacramento  . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Tuesday, March 7, 2006
- Santa Clara  . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Tuesday, March 7, 2006
- San Diego  . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Thursday, March 9, 2006

General Information

Name
AEP member? Yes No Public Private
Title
Organization
Address City State Zip Code
Daytime Phone FAX
E-mail

Registration Fees Enclosed

Registration is limited on a first served basis. Pre-registration by mail or fax will be accepted up to one day prior to the workshop event with payment at door subject to availability. Fees must be paid in advance or at the door via check or cash; purchase orders will not be accepted. Fees include registration materials and handouts. On-site registrations will be accepted if space is available, with an added fee of $25.00. Substitutions are permitted.

AEP Member or Sponsor Member . . . . . . . . . . . $120.00 
Non-AEP Member . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $160.00 
Agency Rate (per person for groups of 3 or more) . . . . . . $130.00 
New AEP Membership ($120.) + Workshop ($120.) . . . $240.00 
Student AEP Member . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $30.00 
New Student AEP Membership ($20.) + Workshop ($30.) . . $50.00 

TOTAL ENCLOSED $
Marc P. Bierdzinski, AICP, is the new Planning Director for the City of Buellton. He was formerly the Planning Division Manager for the City of Santa Maria.

Scott T. Edmondson, AICP, has left his position as a Senior Planner with the San Francisco Planning Department to pursue an independent practice in research, writing, and consulting on the critical path challenges of sustainable development and planning, as well as environmental review consulting. He can be reached at scotte@sustainabilitysolutions2030.com

Diane Eidam, former Executive Director of the California Transportation Commission, has joined the staff of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) as the agency’s Chief Deputy Executive Director.

Eric Parfrey, AICP recently joined Yolo County Planning, Resources and Public Works Department as a Principal Planner. He was previously senior planner with BASELINE Environmental Consulting, and with San Joaquin and Contra Costa Counties. He can be reached at eparfrey@yolocounty.org or 530.666.8043.

Harriet Lai Ross recently relocated to EIP’s Sacramento office from their Los Angeles branch. A senior planner with over seven years of experience in land use and environmental planning, she manages both planning projects and environmental documents under CEQA and NEPA. Vance Jones, formerly with the City of Roseville, has joined EIP as a senior planner. Tracey Ferguson, formerly with Parsons Corporation, has joined the team as an associate planner.

CCAPA Broadcasts Information
CCAPA will be broadcasting important information to your e-mail address. So that you don’t miss out on these important messages, please check your e-mail address with National APA. You can review and update your membership information online at planning.org. On the home page go to the Member Services drop-down list and choose the Membership Database link. You will need your membership number which is located on your Planning Magazine label or your dues renewal invoice. Please call 916.736.2434 for further information.

We’ve Got You Covered
Cotton/Bridges/Associates completed its transition into P&D Consultants, a TCB company under the AECOM family banner. We are now fully integrated into a talent pool of 200 regional planners, scientists and engineers alongside a worldwide staff of 18,000. Have a unique challenge? Partner with P&D – with all the talent on hand, we’ve got you covered.

• Urban Planning
• Environmental Regulatory Compliance
• Natural Resources Protection & Restoration
• Environmental Data Management

Offices located throughout California: Sacramento, Pasadena, San Diego, and Orange Corporate (Orange): 714.835.4447 www tcb.aecom.com
Job OPPORTUNITIES

City of Moreno Valley
Assistant/Associate Planner
(Community Development)
Salary: $3,620 - $5,561DOQ/mo; excellent benefit package worth $9,580, plus 2% of salary/yr, and city paid PERS.

This position will perform professional duties in the Community Development Department, prepare staff reports, assist developers with plan reviews, make oral presentations, and perform technical work including reviewing developmental plans and proposals.
Qualifications include a Bachelor’s Degree in Public or Business Administration, Finance, Urban Planning, Geography, or related field.

ASSISTANT PLANNER - two years of related planning experience, including related intern work.

ASSISTANT PLANNER – three years of related professional experience which included one year of municipal planning experience in a public or private firm. This position is open until filled.

To apply, submit a completed City of Moreno Valley application to the Human Resources Division at 14177 Frederick St., P.O. Box 88005, Moreno Valley, CA 92552-0805. For more information, call 951.413.3045, or visit our website at www.moreno-valley.ca.us

Santa Barbara County - Planning and Development Director
Seeking strong leader and manager for department responsible for administration, comprehensive planning, development review, building and safety, and energy. 150 FTE positions. Requires professional handling of diverse interests relating to environment, agriculture, housing, commercial and residential development, and private property while maintaining Santa Barbara quality. Ability to develop creative vision for the future, using education and experience in land use and zoning in dealing with community groups, other governmental agencies and special interest groups is important. Development of management systems and a strong customer service approach to the work of the department is essential. Significant planning and management experience required. Appointed by CEO. Compensation DOQ; excellent benefits. Please send letter indicating your interest in the position and resume including employment and salary history by email to search@managementpartners.com, or by mail to Management Partners, Inc., 2107 North First Street, Suite 470, San Jose, CA 95131; brochure at www.managementpartners.com. Open until filled.
EOE/M/F

RBF Positions
Since 1944, RBF’s reputation and success have been fueled by the high caliber and enthusiasm of our people, and on our commitment to quality, professionalism, and continuing innovation. When you join the RBF team, you will collaborate with over 900 professionals and experts throughout more than a dozen offices in California, Arizona, and Nevada on a variety of urban design, redevelopment, brownfield, and smart-growth projects. We currently have the following planning opportunities available:

- Environmental Analysts
- Environmental Planners
- Project Managers
- Environmental Planning Managers
- Urban Designers
- Landscape Architects
- Project Coordinators

RBF provides a vibrant, family-oriented environment and a team-based culture in which we are each other’s greatest resource. RBF offers excellent compensation and benefits packages, including 401(k), profit sharing and bonus plans, relocation assistance and ownership opportunity. We invite you to join our team, build your career with us, and make a difference! Please visit our website www.RBF.com and send your resume to:
RBF Consulting
14725 Alton Parkway, Irvine, CA 92618
Fax: (949) 855-7060
Email: hrmail@rbf.com
EOE M/F/D/V
WHERE EXCEPTIONAL PEOPLE ARE THE RULE!

Alan Voorhees Passes Away

Alan M. Voorhees, passed away December 18 at a hotel he built and owned in Richmond, Berkeley Hotel. He celebrated his 83rd birthday the day before. Voorhees apparently died of a stroke.
Voorhees contributed to urban planning, transportation projects, and a variety of disciplines.

He had a diverse career, ranging from collecting historic maps, helping entrepreneurs, planning interstate highway systems and subway systems, establishing a berry farm and preserve as well as funding buildings and programs on campuses.

Alan Manners Voorhees was born Dec. 17, 1922, in Highland Park.

Source: Washington Post
Mickey Cafagna Re-elected as SANDAG Chairman of Board of Directors

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Board of Directors voted to re-elect Poway Mayor Mickey Cafagna as chairman, and Lemon Grove Mayor Mary Teresa Sessom as first vice chair for one-year terms.

In addition, Escondido Mayor Lori Holt Pfeiler was elected to the position of second vice chair. As a SANDAG Board member, Mayor Pfeiler was instrumental in the creation of the agency’s Regional Comprehensive Plan in 2004.

“Mayors Cafagna, Sessom, and Pfeiler have built solid reputations among locally elected officials throughout the county,” said SANDAG executive director Gary Gallegos. “They have been able to forge regional solutions among their colleagues for many of this region’s most vexing challenges such as traffic congestion, housing and public safety.”

A copy of the Board of Directors Agenda is available on the SANDAG website.

Planning Library Created

Local planners donate city planning resources to library

The Central Coast Section of the California Chapter of the American Planning Association (APA) donated a collection of 32 books and documents valued at $1,000 to local libraries. The new collection provides educational and informative land use planning resources to the public, as well as practicing planners, planning commissioners, elected officials, and students. The planning library collection is intended to serve broad as well as specialized professional interests in land use and environmental planning. The organization hopes to expand the planning library collection with donations from local planning professionals, interested citizens, and government agencies.

Michael Boswell, Chair of the San Luis Obispo City Planning Commission and Associate Professor of City and Regional Planning at CalPoly, supports the new collection. “Citizen participation in planning is a key expression of the democratic ideal.” This collection will help ensure that Central Coast citizens can make informed and meaningful contributions to the future of our communities.

The planning library collection was donated to the San Luis Obispo City-County Library in November. San Luis Obispo County Supervisor Shirley Bianchi, City of San Luis Obispo Mayor Dave Romero, Librarian Brian Reynolds, and representatives from local planning commissions accepted the donation.

Jim Lopes, representing the APA’s Central Coast Board, said that, “We are grateful to Tammy Seale, a planner in San Luis Obispo, who encouraged us to add planning resources to the library system, which has gaps in this type of information. We are very interested in people having the knowledge and skill to deal with growth, land use changes and the whole process of planning.”

The planning library will be accessible to residents of San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura counties through the inter-library loan system known as Black Gold, once it is catalogued. Additionally, for the convenience of students at Cal Poly, the Robert E. Kennedy Library collection has been augmented to provide the same 32 titles. APA anticipates similar coordination with UCSB’s library. A list and brief descriptions of the books and other materials, such as CD-ROM training packages, will be available at the library and online at http://www.centralcoastapa.org.

Register now – Discounted registration ends Feb 15!

9th Annual US/ICOMOS International Symposium

April 19 - 23, 2006
Newport, Rhode Island

“From World Heritage to Your Heritage”

The World Heritage List as a rich source of models for the protection and management of heritage sites with a particular focus on World Heritage cities.

Speakers from:
Argentina • Canada • Italy • India
Peru • Russia • Sri Lanka • Turkey
United States

Representatives from:
UNESCO World Heritage Centre
Organization of World Heritage Cities
U.S. Delegation to the World Heritage Committee

Hosted and Co-Sponsored by:
Honorable Lincoln Chafee, Senator from Rhode Island, and the Newport World Heritage Committee

Institutional Support from:
Cultural Site Research and Management
Heritage Landscapes
Historic New Harmony
Robins Kaplan Miller & Ciresi
Robinson & Associates, Inc.
Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area
Wank Adams Slavin Associates LLP
White House Historical Association
World Monuments Fund

For more information, go to http://www.icomos.org/usicomos or contact Donald G. Jones, Ph.D.
USICOMOS Director of Programs
Ph 202-842-1866 • Fax 202-842-1861
don.jones@usicomos.org
Over 750 Planners attended a fun-filled, relaxing and educational few days in Yosemite at the CCAPA 2006 Conference, October 30 - November 2, 2005. Highlights included the Opening Reception at the beautiful Historic Ahwahnee Hotel, The Consultants Reception and CPF Live and Silent Auctions, which raised more than $17,000! The Awards Reception was a huge success as planners and students were honored. Over 70 sessions were presented, 8 Mobile Workshops and Keynote Speakers Royal Robbins, Carol Whiteside, Lee Stetson & Alan Sutterfield had attendees on their feet!

All and all, everyone took away something from the CCAPA 2005 Conference. Whether it was education, spending time with colleagues and peers or the relaxed, spiritual environment of Yosemite, the conference was huge success!

Many thanks for the support from all the Exhibitors and Sponsors. Without their continuous contribution and participation, the conference would not be the success it is today.

Congratulations to the 2005 Conference Committee (Gary Conte, AICP Brian R. Smith, AICP, Bill King, AICP, Bruce O’Neal, AICP, Cindy Van Empel, Deborah Kruse, Lorelei Oviatt, Randy Bynder, AICP) and the 2005 volunteers for all their time and efforts!