



CAL Planner

MAY - JUNE 2008

**For program
information -
www.calapa.org**



**APACA Conference
September 21 - 24, 2008
Renaissance Hollywood Hotel**

Inside This Issue . . .

Remembering Melville C. Branch	2
Interview With the Editor: Gail Goldberg	3
Commissioner's Corner	4
APACA Legislative Update	6
Job Opportunity	7
APACA Conference	9
Planners On The Move	12
Competing Initiatives Qualify for June Ballot	13
California Planners Tally Four of Nine APA Awards	16

Remembering Melville C. Branch

By Professor David Sloane

Melville C. Branch, who died February 11, 2008, was the quintessential modern planner. Branch held the first doctorate in regional planning in the United States. His research applied scientific principles and technologies of the modern age to the age-old process of planning. Branch's published work is a testament to the development of the modern planning practice by mid-twentieth century generation of planners, and presages the increasing reliance on technologies, such as geographic information systems, today.

As reported by Mary Rourke in the *Los Angeles Times*, Branch was born in Richmond, Virginia, on February 16, 1913. He was a graduate of Princeton University and earned a master's degree from the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in France in 1934. After service in the war in the Naval Reserve, he returned to his pursuit of academics. He spent a year at the Cranbrook Academy of Art before entering the doctoral program in regional planning at Harvard, from which he earned his doctorate in 1949.

The next year, he left for Los Angeles, where he first worked at TRW, then taught at UCLA, before spending the remainder of his career at USC. His employment at TRW, a pioneering giant in the aerospace industry, fit nicely with his belief in the power of the airplane in modern planning. His first book, published the year before he received his doctorate, was on the use of aerial photography in planning.

He returned to an aerial perspective with his 1997 *Atlas of Rare City Maps: Comparative Urban Design, 1830-1842*. The companion set presented a series of fascinating maps of nineteenth century European, Asian, and American cities. While not aerial photographs, they presented the cities in remarkable detail,

providing not only a visually stunning but also an informative view of the cities.

In his 20-plus books and numerous articles, Branch often analyzed the intersection of planning with science and technology. His 1997 book on simulation and planning examined a wide range of applications of the concept in society, while his 1994 book on "telepower" questioned the role of television and broader media communication. He also wrote important texts on comprehensive planning as well as planning theory.

Branch was not just a theoretician; he was also a practitioner. He served on the Los Angeles Planning Commission for nine years, including a term as president. He was recognized for his service to the profession when he was inducted into the College of Fellows of AICP in 2000.

His effort to develop and test a rational system of planning exemplified the belief of his generation in the human ability to organize and act, and he clearly believed that planning was critical to the survival and prosperity of society.

He married his surviving spouse, Hilda Rollman-Branch, in 1951. Along with his wife, he is survived by a stepdaughter, Veronica Kaufman of Sacramento, and several nieces and nephews.

A memorial service is planned for later in the year.

*David C. Sloane, Professor and Director,
USC Urban Planning Program*



CALIFORNIA CHAPTER
AMERICAN PLANNING
ASSOCIATION

Chapter Officers

President

Vince Bertoni, AICP; 310.285.1123

President-Elect

Kurt Christiansen, AICP; 714.961.7131

V.P., Policy & Legislation

Pete Parkinson, AICP; 707.565.1925

V.P., Public Information

Lance Schulte, AICP; 760.966.6683

V.P., Professional Development

Kimberly Christensen, AICP; 310.524.2340

V.P., Administration

Hing Wong, AICP; 510.464.7966

CPF President

Linda Tatum, AICP; 310.268.8132

Planning Commission Representative

Kathleen Garcia, FASLA; 619.696.9303

Student Representative

Kennetha Gaines, 415.730.0520

APA Board Representative

Jeffrey Lambert, AICP; 818.605.1506

AICP Representative

Collette Morse, AICP; 949.855.3653

National Policy & Legislation Representative

John E. Bridges, FAICP; 619.291.1347

Marketing Director

Vacant

State Awards Coordinator

Jessie Barkley, 310.268.8132

Information Technology Director

Dev Vrat, AICP; 213.996.2250

Chapter Historian

Betty Croly, FAICP; 510.841.0249

Planner Emeritus Network President

Donald Cotton, AICP; 626.304.0102

Membership Inclusion Director

Hing Wong, AICP; 510.464.7966

Legal Counsel

Marcos A. Martinez; 949.263.2600

California Planner

The *California Planner* is the official publication of the California Chapter of the American Planning Association (APACA). Each APACA member receives a subscription as part of chapter dues. Additional subscriptions may be purchased for \$22 per year. Send editorial submissions and queries to APACA c/o Karen Roberts, GranDesigns, 916 Avenal Way, Beaumont CA 92223 or e-mail them to karen@firerose.us.

Rates for job announcements, display and calling card advertisements can be obtained by contacting APACA c/o Stefan/George Associates, 1333 36th Street, Sacramento, CA 95816, 916.736.2434.

Section Directors

Central

Mike Waiczis, AICP; 559.434.8637

Central Coast

Jay Higgins, AICP; 805.637.6670

Inland Empire

Charles Rangel; 760.327.9042

Los Angeles

Kevin Keller, AICP; 213.978.1211

Northern

Juan Borrelli, AICP; 408.535.7709

Orange

Kimberly Brandt, AICP; 714.754.5604

Sacramento

Julia Lave Johnston; 916.324.4002

San Diego

William B. Chopyk, AICP; 619.667.1187

APA Websites

California Chapter www.calapa.org
National APA www.planning.org
California Planning Foundation www.californiapanningfoundation.org
CA Planning Roundtable www.cproundtable.org

Interview With the EDITOR — Gail Goldberg

By Lance Schulte, AICP, Vice President, Public Information



Gail Goldberg is Planning Director for the City of Los Angeles. In 2006, she moved to LA from her position as Planning

Director for the City of San Diego. Gail's leadership in planning the future for these major and sprawling cities provides insight into the challenges we planners face in the era of increasing population, global warming, shifting economies, smart growth, expensive gas, long commutes, a desire for community, and the political challenges of working within a complex, diverse, and time-consuming planning environment. We interviewed Gail to get her impressions of the present and visions of the future for planners.

Gail, you left San Diego to take a challenge in planning the second largest city in the country. What did you see as the great opportunities for planning in Los Angeles?

Los Angeles is simply one of the most exciting cities in the world — the size, the diversity of the population, and the dynamic political environment. Los Angeles presents almost every planning challenge imaginable, but also, there is such a sense of possibilities. It is a great time to be planning in Los Angeles. Who wouldn't want to be here?

What are the similarities and differences between Los Angeles and San Diego from a planning perspective?

Both cities are struggling with accommodating their projected growth in a way that will maintain or (even better) enhance the quality of life. One

of the major growth challenges facing both cities is increased traffic congestion and the need for more public transit. The scale of the challenge in Los Angeles is just so much greater. How does one even begin to have meaningful public engagement of 4 million people? It is made even more difficult because Los Angeles has not had a structure in place for community dialogue. The Neighborhood Council system in Los Angeles (now approaching 100 councils) has only been in place a few years, while San Diego has more than a 40-year history with their 44 Community Planning Groups (each overseeing one community plan).

In San Diego, the City of Villages concept was developed. Can you explain the basics of that concept and its applicability to planning in Los Angeles?

San Diego adopted a city-wide growth strategy that directs future growth to regional, community, and neighborhood centers. The Plan also directs new growth along transit corridors with most of the new density around transit stops. The San Diego plan was created through an extensive community planning process and was adopted with a strong action plan to assure its implementation.

Los Angeles had already adopted a very similar growth strategy but without the extensive public outreach and the strong implementation focus. Our challenge in Los Angeles is the "process" of planning and building public trust in implementation.

One thing you've stressed is the overarching importance of the General Plan as a framework for land use decision making. How are you looking to better integrate the land use element for Los Angeles over the diverse geography of the city?

continued on page 8

CalPlanner Production Schedule

Issue	Articles Submitted	Mailed*
July/Aug.	May 5	June 16
Sept./Oct.	July 7	August 18
Nov./Dec.	September 8	October 20

* Membership will receive magazine within 10 working days after this date, on average. Dates subject to change without notice.

Commissioner's CORNER

What A Difference A Tree Makes

By Kathy Garcia, FASLA



Sometimes, it takes an “out of this world” experience to put our daily life occurrences in perspective. That is what I felt like as I was standing on the corner of Avenida 9

de Julio in Buenos Aires, perpetrated to be the widest street in the world. Usually, I don’t think twice about crossing a street — just wait for the light, walk, and don’t look back.

Faced with crossing a street 140 meters wide (460 feet), I thought twice and then stopped and thought again. As pedestrians, we had to negotiate 12 travel lanes and 2 frontage roads of 3 lanes each, each filled with rapidly moving cars.

Pausing to recognize the challenge, we noticed something that we probably would never notice about our streets at home: this street had a much going on. Sure, there were more taxi cabs in two blocks than there appear to be in all of Manhattan. However, we realized that with only 10 percent of the cars being private vehicles, that meant less demand for parking in the dense urban core, more “shared use” of the cars on the road, and a better efficiency (most taxis had two to three people in addition to the driver) — carpooling at its best.

Then we noticed the medians. When the two frontage roads and the main street were combined, there were three medians. These were wide (I’m estimating 50 feet and greater), safe havens for pedestrians. They offered interest, directional signage, and a respite

from the traffic. Each median was heavily planted and combined paved areas with green space and benches. The medians had their own sidewalk system, so we could also walk along the median’s centerline, far from the traffic. In actuality, they appeared to be more like parks than medians.

When we stopped in these medians, we realized the scale of the surrounding

I am promoting more active thought about our street sections, what we propose, and what we approve.

buildings. Commensurate with a gigantic street, they also were very large. Many of the structures soared 20 or more stories above

the avenue, but strangely, they didn’t look out of place. Their scale was proportionate to the resultant gap; the buildings did not cast shade across the entire street, and they did not appear to dwarf their surroundings.

Then, we realized the civic nature to the street. These large medians and resultant “roundabouts” were the perfect location for sculptures, monuments, and other commemorative features. The most famous is El Obelisco, the 220-foot high Obelisk in the center of the Plaza de la República. As one of the city’s major icons, it is also the location for cultural events, especially celebrating the national football team’s wins. One of the city’s major plazas is smack dab in the middle of the widest street. This was no ordinary street.

Then, there were the trees; I couldn’t believe the trees. The street and all the medians were lined with gigantic flowering Jacarandas and Tipu trees, whose bright purple and yellow flowers livened up the streetscape. Each trunk was probably three feet across, and the

continued on page 5

Send Your Articles and Photo Essays for *California Planner*

Karen Roberts

California Planner Managing Editor

GranDesigns

916 Avenal Way

Beaumont, CA 92223

Telephone: 951.845.0174

Fax: 951.769.3917

E-mail: Karen@FireRose.us

OR

Lance Schulte, AICP

APACA Vice President, Public Information

North County Transit District

810 Mission Avenue

Oceanside, CA 92054-2825

Telephone: 760.966.6683

Fax: 760.967.2001

E-Mail: lschulte@nctd.org

Commissioner's Corner

(continued from page 4)

*Buenos Aires Ave 9 de Julio*

canopy soared 60 to 90 feet above us. Their lacy branches interlocked, creating a beautifully dappled effect on the street and sidewalk, and the riot of color did not let these trees fade into the background.

Now, I'm surely not advocating wide streets. There was tremendous controversy when Avenida 9 de Julio was widened at the expense of historic structures and substantial displacement. Local urban planners are now studying how they can underground portions of the conduit, à la Boston's Central Artery. However, I am promoting more active thought about our street sections, what we propose, and what we approve.

We often allow four- and six-lane streets in our neighborhoods, and sometimes even eight-lane streets. Is the resultant width appropriate for the surrounding density and scale of the buildings? Do we really treat the pedestrian as the priority? Are we creating safe havens for those who may cross a tad slower than the rest of us? Do our streets contribute to the civic nature of our cities? Do they offer the pedestrian and the driver something more than a travel conduit? Do they have focal points, places of interest, and park-like characteristics as well as mobility?

What about those trees? The mature tree canopy brings a pedestrian scale to even the widest street in the world. Leaves absorb carbon dioxide, and permeable tree wells filter polluted runoff. What a difference a tree makes!

It took us five cycles of pedestrian crossing signals to traverse Avenida 9 de Julio. We enjoyed the park-like medians, photographed the Obelisk and marveled at the trees. Typical rapidly walking pedestrians can cross the Avenida in two signals, we later found out. But then, they probably aren't thinking twice about the street they just crossed.

Kathy Garcia, FASLA can be contacted at 619.696.9303 or kgarcia@SD.wrttdesign.com.

APACA Broadcasts Information

APACA 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 www.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 if you need assistance or further information.

Legislative UPDATE

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



APACA Legislative Update –

As of March 24, 2008

Below is the list of the most important planning bills introduced and still active in 2008. The APACA Legislative Review Teams reviewed each of the bills recently. The APACA position is listed for your information. Please watch the APACA website for more information on these measures, in addition to APACA letters sent to the authors of the bills explaining our position. For copies of the bills, go to the APACA website or www.leginfo.ca.gov, “Bill Information” button. “A” means the bill has been amended recently (the most recent amended date follows); “I” means the bill has just been introduced and has not yet been heard in its first committee.

AB 724, Benoit, Sober living homes. A-05/15/2007 WATCH

AB 842, Jones, Regional plans: Traffic reduction. A-01/17/2008 WATCH

AB 887, De La Torre, Redevelopment: Eminent domain: Relocation assistance.
A-07/18/2007 SUPPORT

AB 1017, Ma, California Environmental Quality Act: Appeal to local lead agency's
elected decisionmaking body. A-01/07/2008 SUPP IF AM

AB 1065, Lieber, Public resources: Building standards: Greenhouse gas.
A-03/04/2008 SUPP IF AM

AB 1574, Houston, Real property: Transfer fees. A-07/05/2007 SUPPORT

AB 1777, Houston, Land use: Subdivision maps. I-01/15/2008 NEUTRAL

AB 1836, Feuer, Infrastructure Financing Districts: Voter approval: Repeal.
I-01/24/2008 SUPPORT

AB 1875, Huff, Residential care facilities: Overconcentration: Licensure applications:
Local notification. I-02/04/2008 OPPOSE

AB 1985, Strickland, Sidewalks: Repairs. A-03/06/2008 OPPOSE

AB 1991, Mullin, Subdivisions: Tentative maps. I-02/14/2008 WATCH

AB 2000, Mendoza, General plan: Housing element. I-02/15/2008 OPP UNLESS
AM

AB 2030, Lieu, Energy: Building standards. I-02/15/2008 SUPP IF AM

AB 2045, De La Torre, California Urban Forestry Act of 1978. I-02/15/2008
SUPPORT

AB 2069, Jones, Local planning: Residential development. I-02/19/2008 SUPPORT

AB 2093, Jones, General plan: Mandatory elements. I-02/19/2008 SUPP IF AM

AB 2112, Saldana, Energy: Building standards. I-02/20/2008 SUPP IF AM

AB 2182, Caballero, Local land use planning. A-03/12/2008 SUPP IF AM

AB 2219, Parra, Subdivisions: Water supply. I-02/20/2008 OPP UNLESS AM

AB 2230, La Malfa, California Environmental Quality Act: Filing fees and
exemptions. I-02/20/2008 SUPP IF AM

AB 2280, Saldana, Density bonus. (APACA is co-sponsoring this measure)
I-02/21/2008 SUPPORT

AB 2339, Solorio, Advertising displays. I-02/21/2008 OPPOSE

AB 2367, Fuentes, Local government: Local agency formation commissions.
I-02/21/2008 OPPOSE

AB 2432, Laird, State Energy Resources Conservation and Development
Commission: Coastal planning. I-02/21/2008 SUPPORT

AB 2447, Jones, Subdivision maps: Disapproval. I-02/21/2008 SUPP IF AM

AB 2520, Walters, Land use: Subdivision maps. I-02/21/2008 REVIEW

AB 2558, Feuer, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority:
Climate change mitigation and adaptation fee. I-02/22/2008 NEUTRAL

AB 2585, Jeffries, Local government: General plan: Amendments.
I-02/22/2008 OPPOSE

AB 2596, Jones, California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: Cities and
counties: Projected emissions. I-02/22/2008 WATCH

AB 2604, Torrico, Developer fees. I-02/22/2008 OPPOSE

APACA “QUICK LEG INFO”

Feature Now on APACA Website Homepage

APACA has added a quick legislative information feature — members can now quickly and easily access key information right from the home page, without signing in. Under the new QUICK LEG INFO feature (under the Consultant Directory link), just click on the “Hot Bill List” link. That link connects members to reports on the hot bills, APACA positions, and the status of each measure.

Please take the time to review this time-saving new feature.

Legislative Update

(continued from page 6)

- AB 2744, Huffman, Metropolitan Transportation Commission: Fee: Motor vehicle fuel. I-02/22/2008 NEUTRAL
- AB 2789, Blakeslee, Small wind energy systems. I-02/22/2008 SUPPORT
- AB 2870, DeSaulnier, Land use: Environmental quality. I-02/22/2008 WATCH
- AB 2903, Huffman, Alcohol and drug abuse treatment facilities. I-02/22/2008 SUPPORT
- AB 3005, Jones, Community development: Emergency housing and assistance.
I-02/22/2008 OPP UNLESS AM
- SB 375, Steinberg, Transportation planning: Travel demand models: Sustainable communities strategy:
Environmental review. A-01/28/2008 SUPP IF AM
- SB 1165, Kuehl, Environment: environmental impact report. I-02/07/2008 OPP UNLESS AM
- SB 1185, Lowenthal, Land use: Subdivision maps. I-02/12/2008 NEUTRAL
- SB 1237, Cox, Subdivision Map Act: Lot line adjustments: Designated remainders and omitted parcels:
Dedications for public purposes. I-02/14/2008 OPP UNLESS AM
- SB 1310, Negrete McLeod, Outdoor advertising. I-02/20/2008 OPPOSE
- SB 1360, Machado, Flood protection. I-02/20/2008 NEUTRAL
- SB 1433, Wyland, Land use planning: Housing element: Mobilehome parks.
I-02/21/2008 OPPOSE
- SB 1436, Ducheny, Protected species: Accidental take: Agricultural activities.
I-02/21/2008 NEUTRAL
- SB 1468, Oropeza, Local planning: School siting: Freeways. I-02/21/2008 WATCH
- SB 1500, Kehoe, Environment: CEQA: Fire hazards. I-02/21/2008 SUPP IF AM
- SB 1617, Kehoe, Public resources: Fire protection: Fuels management.
I-02/22/2008 WATCH
- SB 1618, Hollingsworth, Public resources: Defensible space. I-02/22/2008 OPPOSE
- SB 1724, Maldonado, Global warming: Carbon credits. I-02/22/2008 WATCH

Job OPPORTUNITY

Housing Development Officer, City of Santa Clara

The City of Santa Clara is seeking a Housing Development Officer. This is a managerial position in the Unclassified Service responsible for developing and implementing effective public/private partnerships designed to stimulate the development of affordable housing, as well as those services needed to support such developments.

The position requires a combination of education and experience equivalent to graduation from an accredited college or university with a degree in Urban Planning, Public Administration, Environmental Studies, or related field; and at least five (5) years of progressively responsible public or private experience in urban planning, business/public administration, housing finance and development, or redevelopment; with some supervisory experience. A Master's degree from an accredited college or university in one of the above fields may be substituted for one year of the required experience. Experience working in the Housing Division of a public sector Planning and Inspection Department is desirable.

The annual salary is normally appointed at 85% of Control Point, which is approximately \$84,936. Hiring above that amount may be considered, based on qualifications and years of experience, up to the normal top of the range Control Point of \$99,924. To receive first consideration for the screening process, the Human Resources Department must receive completed resume packets no later than 5:00 p.m., by the preferred filing date of Friday, May 30, 2008. Resume Packets must include a "Letter of Interest and Intent," a detailed resume, and recent salary history and current major fringe benefit history. You may send resume packets by mail to City of Santa Clara Human Resources, 1500 Warburton Ave., Santa Clara, CA 95050, FAX to 408.247.5627 or e-mail to humanresources@santacalaraca.gov

Interview with Gail Goldberg

(continued from page 3)

We have initiated the most aggressive community planning program in LA's history. The Planning Department is actively working on 12 of the City's 36 community plans — each with a three-year completion schedule. We have the commitment of the mayor and City Council to continue an ongoing rotation, so that the Department is ALWAYS working on 12 plans, and each plan will be updated every 9-10 years.

Supporting infill development that allows communities to grow and improve can be very difficult on many levels. What are ways that help communities better understand infill development and make planning for infill more positive? Is CEQA a major barrier to infill development planning?

For those of us working in cities that are essentially built out, our inclination is to think of infill and redevelopment as a way to accommodate new growth. We need to expand our thinking to also see infill as an opportunity to “complete” an existing neighborhood — bringing in missing uses or amenities that can make services more accessible or neighborhoods more livable. Achieving those dual objectives requires up-front planning and attention to both land use decisions and the scale and character of our neighborhoods. In Los Angeles, as in many cities, our strength is in the diversity of our neighborhoods. We need to be sensitive to the pride our citizens take in the unique character of their neighborhoods.

What advice can you provide in communicating to citizens, businesses, and decision makers the value of the planning process?

Planners need to keep the message simple. The value of good planning is essentially two-fold. First, the “process” of planning provides a place for folks to talk about the future, to exchange ideas, and to, hopefully, reach a consensus vision for their collective future. Second, once a plan is adopted, it provides predictability, a comfort level that we're

not going to be surprised. Sell the consensus vision and the predictability!

For Los Angeles, you developed a statement of basic principles for planners. Can you explain the principles and how they have been used and have helped planning in the City?

During my first six months as director, staff and managers worked together to create our own strategic plan for the department. We tried to keep it simple and basic. We developed four strategic initiatives:

1. Do “Real” Planning
2. Build an Efficient and Effective Department
3. Develop Innovative Solutions
4. Engage the Public

Our first initiative, “Do Real Planning,” generated the most discussion. It was, first, an acknowledgment of the deficiencies in past planning in Los Angeles. To further articulate what “real” planning means, a set of principles was developed:

1. Demand a Walkable City
2. Offer Basic Design Standards
3. Require Density Around Transit
4. Eliminate Department Bottlenecks
5. Advance Homes for Every Income
6. Locate Jobs Near Housing
7. Produce Green Buildings
8. Landscape in Abundance
9. Arrest Visual Blight
10. Neutralize Mansionization
11. Nurture Planning Leadership
12. Identify Smart Parking Requirements
13. Narrow Road Widenings
14. Give Project Input Early

(continued on page 12)

How to Login for the First Time

APACA members are now able to login to gain access to Members-Only capabilities. To login for the first time, click on the link “Forgot your Password?” in the lower left area of the web page; type in the email address APACA has on file for you, and login with the information emailed instantly to your email account.

REGISTRATION



SEPTEMBER 21 - 24, 2008
RENAISSANCE
HOLLYWOOD
HOTEL

PLEASE REGISTER EARLY TO SAVE MONEY! *All information must be complete for your registration to be processed.
Your name as it will appear on badge

First Name _____ Last Name _____

Company _____ Title _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____ Fax _____ Email _____

Dietary Requirements ☐ Vegetarian ☐ Other _____

APA MEMBER VERIFICATION: Please provide your APA or APACA Member No. _____

STUDENT VERIFICATION: I certify that I am currently enrolled full-time. Student picture ID will be required for conference badge pick-up.

Student Signature _____

School _____ Date _____

LIFE MEMBER: Year you became a member of APACA _____ (must be a member for 25 years and minimum age 65)

AICP: ☐ YES ☐ NO

SPOUSE/GUEST NAME (if registered)

REGISTRATION FEES

Full Conference registration includes ALL events & meals EXCEPT for mobile workshops. One Day registration includes ALL meals on day registered.

Registration fees postmarked or registered online	Entire Conference			One Day Only			Total	
	By 7/15/08	By 8/15/08	After 8/15/08 or onsite	By 7/15/08	By 8/15/08	After 8/15/08 or onsite		
APA/APACA Member	\$450	\$475	\$500	\$250	\$275	\$300	\$	
Non-Member	\$525	\$550	\$575	\$325	\$350	\$375	\$	
Student	\$200	\$225	\$250	\$125	\$150	\$175	\$	
Life Member	\$200	\$225	\$250	\$125	\$150	\$175	\$	
Speaker (Member or Non-Member)	\$450	\$450	\$450	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$	
				Circle day:	Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.

Add processing fee for EACH non-online registrations (Processing fee can be avoided by registering with check or credit card online at www.calapa.org) **\$ 30**

Not a member yet? Become a APACA Chapter-Only member today for \$115 and pay the APA/APACA member rate above. **\$ 115**

SUBTOTAL REGISTRATION FEES:

MOBILE WORKSHOPS, SPECIAL SESSIONS AND EVENTS

Mobile Workshops: Sunday, September 21

- ☐ MW #1: Runyon Canyon Hike & Tour \$20 \$
- ☐ MW #2: Griffith Observatory & Park Tour \$40 \$

Mobile Workshops: Monday, September 22

- ☐ MW #3: Public Art Tour via the Redline \$20 \$
- ☐ MW #4: Los Angeles Port Waterfront & Harbor Boat Tour \$60 \$
- ☐ MW #5: Playa Vista Mixed Use Devp. & Habitat Rest. Tour \$60 \$
- ☐ MW #6: LA LIVE/Downtown LA Lofts Tour \$40 \$
- ☐ MW #7: West Hollywood City Tour \$60 \$

Mobile Workshops: Tuesday, September 23

- ☐ MW #8: Mulholland Open Space & Overlook Tour \$40 \$
- ☐ MW #9: LEED-Certified/Green Buildings in Santa Monica & West LA \$60 \$
- ☐ MW #10: Universal Studios Backstage & Future Land Use Plan Tour \$60 \$
- ☐ MW #11: Neon Lights Party Bus Tour \$60 \$

SPECIAL SESSIONS AND EVENTS

Extra Tickets (Full Conference includes meals)

Opening Reception (Sun.)	\$95	\$
Breakfast (Circle: Mon. Tues.)	\$30	\$
Lunch (Circle: Mon. Tues.)	\$45	\$
Evening Reception (Circle: Mon. Tues.)	\$60	\$
Brunch (Wed.)	\$40	\$

SPECIAL TOURS

Walking tours and other fun activities are being offered. Check the website for information. Payment will taken on-site. Prices vary.

COMPLIMENTARY Events, please check if attending

- ☐ Student "COMPLIMENTARY" Day (Sun.)
- ☐ Diversity Summit

SUBTOTAL OTHER FEES:

TOTAL REGISTRATION AND OTHER:

PAYMENT

☐ Check payable to **CCAPA Conference** enclosed. Please charge \$_____ to my ☐ Mastercard ☐ Visa Exp. Date _____

Card Number _____ # on back of card _____ Signature _____

Cardholder must sign here for us to process payment.

REGISTRATION INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete the form in blue or black ink. Use a separate form for each registrant. For inquiries regarding registration, please contact APA at sgassoc@msn.com. **CANCELLATION POLICY:** Cancellations received by 8/15/08 will be fully refunded minus a \$50 processing fee. **NO REFUNDS AFTER 8/15/08.**

SUBMIT YOUR REGISTRATION: To avoid double billing, please use only one of the following registration methods. Make checks payable to **CCAPA Conference**.

1. **On the Web,** by completing our online form at www.calapa.org and using your credit card or check. **Save \$30 processing fee when you register online!**

2. **By Mail, by credit card or check to CCAPA Conference,** 1333 36th St., Sacramento, CA 95816. Additional \$30 processing fee applies with this method of payment. (See above).

3. **By Fax** with credit card to 760.674.2479. Additional \$30 processing fee applies with this method of payment. (See above).

4. **No purchase orders will be accepted.**

Other important registration information:

- Faxed or mailed registration with payment will not be accepted after 9/12/08.
- Online registration will remain open until 9/16/08 at 5:00 pm.
- All registrations after 9/16/08 must be done onsite.
- No shows without payment will be billed.
- All faxed, mailed or online registrations where payment has not been received by 9/16/08 will be cancelled, and attendee will need to re-register onsite.



2008 APACA Conference Sponsor Opportunities

Submission & Payment Deadline: August 15, 2008

Opening Night

9/21/08

Anticipated attendance - 900 people

Six sponsorships available

Cost: \$3,000 each

- Full page ad and sponsorship listing in the conference program
- Pre-conference recognition on the APACA and Southern CA Section websites
- APACA podium recognition
- Company name prominently displayed at the event and during the conference
- Promotional materials displayed at the event
- Four tickets to Opening Reception
- Pre-conference attendee list (available 3 weeks prior to conference with name, company and address ONLY)

Opening Plenary Session

9/22/08

Anticipated attendance - 900 people

Six sponsorships available

Cost: \$2,500 each

- Full page ad and sponsorship listing in the conference program
- Pre-conference recognition on the APACA and Southern CA Section websites
- APACA podium recognition
- Company name prominently displayed at the event and during the conference
- Promotional materials displayed at the event
- Two tickets to Breakfast/Plenary Session
- Pre-conference attendee list (available 3 weeks prior to conference with name, company and address ONLY)

The California Chapter of the American Planning Association (APACA) is pleased to offer you the opportunity to market your services, products, and programs to planners and others at this annual, well-attended conference. The following is a brief description of conference sponsorship opportunities. You are welcome to sponsor more than one event, and multiple organizations may sponsor the same event.

Please note: Event sponsorship does not include conference registration.

Keynote Luncheon

Anticipated attendance - 900 people, Six sponsorships available, Cost: \$2,500 each

- Full page ad and sponsorship listing in the conference program
- Pre-conference recognition on the APACA and Southern CA Section websites
- APACA podium recognition
- Company name prominently displayed at the event and during the conference
- Promotional materials displayed at the event
- Two tickets to Keynote Luncheon
- Pre-conference attendee list (available 3 weeks prior to conference with name, company and address ONLY)

Awards Luncheon

Anticipated attendance - 800 people, Six sponsorships available, Cost: \$2,500 each

- Full page ad and sponsorship listing in the conference program
- Pre-conference recognition on the APACA and Southern CA Section websites
- APACA podium recognition
- Company name prominently displayed at the event and during the conference
- Promotional materials displayed at the event
- Two tickets to Awards Program
- Pre-conference attendee list (available 3 weeks prior to conference with name, company and address ONLY)

Student Scholarship Luncheon - 9/21/08 or Diversity Event

Anticipated attendance - 800 people, Eight sponsorships available, Cost: \$1,500

- APACA recognition and representation from your company
- Company name displayed at the Luncheon or Diversity Event
- Quarter page ad in the conference program
- Promotional materials displayed at sponsor table
- Two tickets to the Luncheon or Diversity Event. Pre-conference attendee list (available 3 weeks prior to conference with name, company and address ONLY)

Sponsorship Cancellation Policy

If written cancellation of sponsorship is received by 8/15/08, a full refund will be made. If written cancellation of sponsorship is received by 8/31/08, an 80% refund will be made. No refunds or cancellations accepted after 8/31/08.

Sponsorship Questions

Questions about your sponsorship should be made to the APACA 2008 Conference Office: Lynne C. Bynder, CMP, CCAPA 2008 Conference Planner. Email: lbynder@meetingsxceptional.com • Phone: 760.799.2740 • Fax: 760.674.2479

FOR MORE INFORMATION PLEASE VISIT: www.calapa.org or www.la-apa.org

Continental Breakfasts or Afternoon Breaks

9/22/08 and 9/23/08

Anticipated attendance – 800 people for each breakfast or break

Eight sponsorships available, Cost: \$1,000 each

- APACA recognition and representation from your company
- Company name displayed at the breakfast or afternoon breaks
- Quarter page ad in the conference program
- Promotional materials displayed at sponsor table
- Two tickets to the breakfast or afternoon break
- Pre-conference attendee list (available 3 weeks prior to conference with name, company and address ONLY)

Mobile Workshops

9/22/08 and 9/23/08

Anticipated attendance – approximately 50 people each for mobile workshops

Twelve sponsorships available

Cost: \$1,000 each (for sponsorship of THREE mobile workshops)

- APACA recognition and representation from your company
- Company name displayed at the three mobile workshops of your choice (note that each mobile workshop may have a maximum of three sponsors)
- Quarter page ad in the conference program
- Promotional materials handed out at the mobile workshop
- One ticket each to the three mobile workshops of your sponsorship (total of three tickets)
- Pre-conference attendee list (available 3 weeks prior to conference with name, company and address ONLY)

CPF Reception - 9/22/08

Anticipated attendance – 800 people, Six sponsorships available

Cost: \$2,000

- Full page ad and sponsorship listing in the conference program
- Pre-conference recognition on the APACA and Southern CA Section websites
- APACA podium recognition
- Company name prominently displayed at the event and during the conference
- Promotional materials displayed at the event
- Two tickets to CPF Reception
- Pre-conference attendee list (available 3 weeks prior to conference with name, company and address ONLY)

SPECIAL PRICED PACKAGES

Director's Package - \$20,000

(a savings of \$500)

- Booth \$3,000
- Large Event Sponsorship \$15,000
- Full Page Ad \$1,600
- 2 Full Conference Registrations \$900

Producer's Package - \$12,000

(a savings of \$300)

- Booth \$3,000
- Small Event Sponsorship \$8,000
- 1/2 Page Ad \$850
- 1 Full Conference Registration \$450

Actor's Package - \$6,000

(a savings of \$300)

- Booth \$3,000
- Partial Event Sponsorship \$2,000
- 1/2 Page Ad \$850
- 1 Full Conference Registration \$450

APACA 2008 Conference Sponsorship Submission

Please make checks payable to **CCAPA Conference**: 1333 36th Street, Sacramento, CA 95816

Please fax sponsorship submission form to 760.674.2479 Questions: Lynne Bynder at lbynder@meetingsexceptional.com

SPONSORSHIP SUBMITTAL DEADLINE: AUGUST 15, 2008

Name _____ Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____ Fax _____ Email _____

☐ I would like to sponsor (name of event) _____ amount \$ _____

☐ I would like to provide a cash donation in the amount of \$ _____

☐ I would like to donate an item for the conference registration bag.

Item _____ (ie: pens, notepads, mints, magnets, lapel pins, etc)

☐ I would like to donate an item for the California Planning Foundation silent auction.

Item _____

(Note: Conference Committee approval required for conference bag and silent auction items).

Planners On The MOVE

Carol D. Barrett, FAICP, has been named the new Planning Manager of the Community Development Department for the City of San Gabriel.

Jennifer Davis has joined the city as Economic Development Manager.

Joel Ellinwood has joined Best Best & Krieger LLP's (BB&K) Sacramento office as of counsel in the firm's environmental law & natural resources, municipal and redevelopment law, and litigation practice groups.

Craig Ewing, AICP, was elected to the Board of Directors of the Desert Water Agency. The DWA is a special district (www.dwa.org) that supplies water to the City of Palm Springs, the City of Desert Hot Springs, portions of Cathedral City and surrounding unincorporated areas of Riverside County. Ewing serves as the Palm Springs Director of Planning Services.

Lynette Dias, former Principal with LSA, recently joined RRM Design Group to lead the Sausalito office as a Principal.

Environmental Science Associates (ESA) announced that **Jennifer Johnson, J.D.** has been promoted to the position of Manager of ESA's San Francisco Bay Area Region Energy Group.

Patrick Kelly has joined the PMC team as a new senior planner/project manager.

Meléndrez Planners

Rebecca Finn and **Jennifer Miller** are now Associates.

Lori Silverman has joined Meléndrez as a senior Project Manager.

Melani Smith, Partner and Principal at Meléndrez, has been named a Planning Commissioner in the City of Long Beach.

Jennie Miller has been promoted to Associate Planner at TPG Consulting, Inc. Miller will continue to work on transit, planning and environmental projects.

Interview with Gail Goldberg

(continued from page 8)

These 14 principles are meant to be a checklist of issues that planners and decision makers should keep in mind as we plan and evaluate projects. It keeps us focused on what's really important.

What advice would you give planners to make their careers as productive, fulfilling, and meaningful as possible?

Stay in touch with the core values that brought you to planning. Listen at least as much as you talk. When you feel defensive, don't act defensively. Acknowledge the new things you learn every day. Know that you'll never learn everything. Ask for help and give it. Celebrate your successes. Be generous in your definition of success. Be kind to people who fear you. Understand that lots of people fear you. Don't take yourself too seriously. Be grateful every day that you have a job that has meaning. Have fun!

CCAPA Website User Manual

The CCAPA Website User Manual is online at the following address:
<http://www.insitemanager.com/InSiteManagerManual/>.

Please bookmark this link for future reference.

We appreciate any feedback on ease of use, additional helpful sections, errors or inconsistencies.

Competing Initiatives Qualify for June Ballot

By Bryan W. Wenter, AICP

California's continuing experiment with "direct democracy" has come a long way since 1911, when Governor Hiram Johnson and his Progressive Party championed the initiative, referendum, and recall. The essence of Governor Johnson's vision was to restore sovereignty to the people and away from the special interests that were controlling state government, by placing legislative authority directly in the hands of voters. In recent years, however, direct democracy has been turned on its head, hijacked to a significant extent by special interests and wealthy out-of-state activists. Once a somewhat infrequently used power, last year, 103 initiatives were filed — many by the types of special interests that motivated Governor Johnson to arm the people with the powers of initiative, referendum, and recall — including several efforts to "reform" eminent domain by amending the state constitution.

Proposition 90 and the Continuing Reaction to Kelo

The latest efforts to change California's eminent domain laws by way of the ballot initiative come on the heels of the voters' narrow rejection of Proposition 90 in 2006. The initiative was funded by libertarian political activist Howard Rich from New York, and promoted as an effort to restrict government's use of the power of eminent domain. As planners will recall, Proposition 90 would also have significantly changed state law on regulatory takings, and in so doing, would have severely impaired the ability of government agencies to protect and advance the public welfare.

Proposition 90 was ostensibly motivated by the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Kelo v. City of New London*. In a decision that merely affirmed the power of local governments to use eminent domain for redevelopment, the Court concluded that the city's decision to take private property for the purpose of economic development satisfies the "public use" requirement of the Fifth Amendment.

Various property rights and anti-government groups have exploited the opportunity presented by the negative reaction to *Kelo* to promote severe restrictions on the power of eminent domain, along with other, more radical, changes that the groups almost invariably attempt to conceal or deemphasize. Because of those efforts, Californians will consider two competing eminent domain ballot initiatives in the upcoming state primary election this June.

Proposition 98

Proposition 98, dubbed the "California Property Owners and Farmland Protection Act," is sponsored by a coalition that includes the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association and the California Farm Bureau Federation. More than 65 percent of the money raised in support of Proposition 98 has, however, come from firms that own mobile home parks and rental apartments because the measure's sweeping effect would include elimination of rent control and a wide variety of tenant protections.

Styled as a response to *Kelo*, Proposition 98's supporters regularly attempt to minimize the range of sweeping changes it would bring about. In a July 11, 2007, article for the *Daily*

continued on page 14

Competing Initiatives Qualify for June Ballot*(continued from page 13)*

Journal, the president of the taxpayers group asserted that Proposition 98 “is simple and provides real property-rights protections for all.” However, like Proposition 90 before it, Proposition 98 is actually a complex initiative that would do much more than respond to the perceived abuses of *Kelo*.

Proposition 98 would add new language to the state constitution that says “[p]rivate property may not be taken or damaged for private use.” The initiative also seeks to add substantial new language to the same section of the constitution, including definitions of the terms “taken,” “public use,” and “private use.” The proposed constitutional provisions are written in broad and ambiguous terms that would lead to extensive litigation with real potential to prevent or reverse broad categories of public welfare regulations.

The proponents acknowledge that Proposition 98 would eliminate rent control because it would define “taken” to include limiting the price a private owner may charge another person to purchase, occupy, or use real property. The imprecise definition could also, however, be interpreted to require public agencies to pay for exactions for public improvements and facilities needed to accommodate new growth, such as streets, parks, and schools. The initiative could also be interpreted to prohibit inclusionary zoning ordinances.

Proposition 98 would define the term “public use” to restrict the use of eminent domain to a stated public use and to prohibit condemnation for a private use under any circumstances. If adopted, the initiative would prevent a wide variety of redevelopment projects and public-private partnerships that California communities have undertaken to stimulate revitalization of downtowns and brownfields. Coupled with other provisions relating to eminent domain, the initiative would also expand the categories for which just compensation must be paid, expand public agency

liability for attorney’s fees and costs, and expand the landowner’s right to repurchase the property before it may be put to any use that is substantially different from the stated public use or convey the property to another person or agency.

Perhaps most critically, Proposition 98 would expansively define the term “private use” to include regulations that transfer an economic benefit to private parties. Such expansion could undermine numerous land use and environmental regulatory protections intended to protect the public health, safety, and welfare, including zoning regulations, growth control measures, water supply and quality protections, and farm land preservation requirements. Many traditional planning and zoning measures that seek to make a community a pleasant place to live and work could be weakened or overturned.

Because the initiative prohibits the taking of private property for a private use, and defines “private use” to include public agency takings of private property “for the consumption of natural resources,” Proposition 98 could limit the government’s ability to undertake public water projects.

Proposition 99

To address voters’ concerns about the use of eminent domain that arose after the *Kelo* decision, a coalition led by the League of California Cities and the League of Conservation Voters sponsored Proposition 99, the “Homeowners and Private Property Protection Act.” The initiative is narrowly tailored; Proposition 99 provides that “[s]tate and local governments are prohibited from acquiring by eminent domain an owner-occupied residence for the purpose of conveying it to a private person.” The initiative provides definitions for all of the key terms contained in that prohibition.

continued on page 15

Competing Initiatives Qualify for June Ballot

(continued from page 14)

Proposition 99 would protect single-family residences such as detached homes, condominiums, and townhouses that are owner-occupied for at least one year before an agency's initial written purchase offer. The initiative would not apply to renters, business owners, farms, or churches. Proposition 99 contains exceptions for protecting public health and safety; preventing serious, repeated criminal activity; responding to an emergency, and remedying environmental contamination. Proposition 99 also contains a "poison pill" under which the initiative would supersede Proposition 98 if it receives the greater number of votes. Even if both initiatives pass, Proposition 99 would become law if it receives more votes.

What's the Big Deal?

Before voting this June, Californian's would do well to consider the lessons recently learned by Oregonians in the face of the "pay or waive" scheme created in that state's Measure 37. Publicized as a way to "compensate suffering landowners" by allowing individuals and families to build a few houses on their land, Measure 37 requires state or local governments either to pay compensation or waive any land use regulation that restricts the use of private property and reduces its value.

Soon after adopting Measure 37, Oregonians cried foul, claiming that they had been suckered into supporting an initiative that threatened to unravel the state's land use highly regarded and widely supported planning program. Within two years of the initiative's adoption, 7,500 claims were made that would have resulted in more than 750,000 acres of new residential, commercial, and industrial development. In the face of nearly \$20 billion in claimed compensation, and no funding source, most local governments waived the regulations. Oregonians have since responded by overwhelmingly adopting

Measure 49, which closes the "loopholes" in Measure 37 by only allowing small-scale residential development.

Propositions 98 and 99 would have dramatically different effects on the powers of public agencies to exercise the power of eminent domain and to regulate for the protection and advancement of the public health, safety, and welfare. Unfortunately, Proposition 98 — like Proposition 90 before it — seeks to dramatically change the very nature of our democratic system by undermining powers that are considered inherent in organized governments. As the U.S. Supreme Court recognized in *Keystone Bituminous v. DeBenedictis*,

[u]nder our system of government, one of the State's primary ways of preserving the public weal is restricting the uses individuals can make of their property. While each of us is burdened somewhat by such restrictions, we, in turn, benefit greatly from the restrictions that are placed on others.

The California Supreme Court made a similar observation in *Hernandez v. City of Hanford*, writing that "land use and planning decisions cannot be made in any community without some impact on the economy of the community."

Given that such spillover effects are likely, it would be possible for litigation to occur over almost any project, since Proposition 98 flat-out prohibits regulations that transfer economic benefits to private persons at the expense of the property owner. Californians have the choice between an initiative that might benefit a narrow band of interest groups by impairing the system of land use and environmental protections upon which we all rely, or an initiative that responds directly to *Kelo* by prohibiting the condemnation of single-family homes for economic development.

Bryan W. Wenter, AICP, is a land use attorney with Morgan Miller Blair in Walnut Creek.

An expanded version of this article appeared in the March issue of Northern News, available online at www.norcalapa.org.

APACA is a member of the Coalition. For more information about who else is opposing Prop. 98 and to download fact sheets and a window sign, visit the campaign website at <http://www.no98yes99.com>.

California Planners Tally Four of Nine National APA Awards

California planners and planning departments won nearly half of the American Planning Association's (APA) 2008 National Planning Excellence, Achievement and Leadership Awards, earning four of the nine awards that honor outstanding efforts in planning and planning leadership.

The National Planning Awards, the profession's highest honor, recognize cutting edge achievements and planning under difficult or adverse circumstances. Award winners showcase the planning profession's leaders who help to create great communities and demonstrate the beneficial changes that can take place when planners and community members and leaders work together.

The California award winners were a diverse group that included city and county governments as well as a community-based grassroots organization and a college professor and long-time advocate for planning.

"It is no secret that California leads the nation in innovative and thoughtful planning at a variety of levels," said Vince Bertoni, president of the American Planning Association, California Chapter. "Our chapter is proud of the accomplishments of our colleagues who provide the vision and leadership that fosters better planning for California."

The National Planning Award winners from California were:

- County of Marin Planning Department for the Marin County Sustainability Program
Award: National Planning Excellence Award for Implementation
Marin County's Sustainability Program provides cities and towns across America with a progressive model for incorporating sustainability into all aspects of a community. The program addresses a spectrum of issues, including habitat restoration; locally provided food supplies; green building, green business, and energy standards; climate change emissions reduction strategies; and affordable housing.
- Central City Neighborhood Partners for the Central City Community Transportation Plan
Award: National Planning Excellence Award Grassroots Initiative
Central City Neighborhood Partners took a non-traditional, but remarkably simple, approach to increasing community access to transportation in the Westlake

community and the surrounding neighborhoods. Using a community-based planning process to fully engage residents from the affected areas, the program has led to numerous improvements and follow-up projects, including development of a new transit village that will break ground in April 2008.

- City of Newport Beach for the Newport Beach General Plan

Award: National Planning Achievement Award for Hard-Won Victories

The City of Newport Beach faced many hurdles to revise a 30-year-old General Plan, including a formidable opposition campaign that continued for several years and involved both legal challenges and a ballot initiative. The city conducted extensive public outreach and education activities involving city staff, city council members, and thousands of residents. Eventually, these efforts and those of residents who supported the plan succeeded.

- Dave Brown, Professor, Los Angeles Valley College

Award: Leadership Award for a Planning Advocate

Citizen activist and educator Dave Brown has been a tireless and effective advocate for reasonable planning and sound growth practices around Los Angeles for more than three decades. His efforts as a dedicated advocate, volunteer, and teacher have complemented and enhanced the effectiveness and benefits of planning in countless ways. For example, as a member of the Citizen Advisory Committee of the State of California Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy for more than 22 years, he reviewed and commented on the acquisition of 60,000 acres and creation of 114 parks throughout the greater Los Angeles region.

Each of the award recipients was recognized and received the respective honor at a luncheon ceremony on April 30 in Las Vegas during APA's National Planning Conference.

Accomplishments of the award recipients were also highlighted in the April 2008 issue of *Planning* magazine and on the APA website. For a list of all of the APA 2008 National Planning Excellence, Achievement, and Leadership Award recipients, visit www.planning.org/awards/2008winners.htm.