San Francisco’s Better Streets Plan: A Model for Street Design & Delivery
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After four years of planning and over 100 community meetings, San Francisco adopted its landmark “Better Streets Plan” in December 2010. Since its completion, the Better Streets Plan has won numerous planning awards, including the 2011 Best Practices Award from APA California, and a 2011 Charter Award from the Congress for the New Urbanism.

The Better Streets Plan represents a once-in-a-generation comprehensive update to the City’s street design standards and guidelines. The Plan seeks to balance the needs of all street users, with a particular focus on the pedestrian environment and how streets can be used as public space. It reflects the understanding that the pedestrian environment is about much more than just transportation – that streets serve a multitude of social, recreational, and ecological needs that must be considered when deciding on the most appropriate design.

Since the Plan’s adoption, the City has been working to institutionalize the Plan’s vision into all City projects and decisions about street design and management. The City has made great strides in improving its process and guidance for complete street design, yet there is significant work ahead.

Plan Origins

Streets make up over 25% of San Francisco’s limited land area – more space than is in the City’s parks and open space. But the city’s streets have been a vastly underutilized resource. Street design and management in San Francisco has
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The Better Streets Plan sought to change this approach by bringing agencies together to comprehensively plan for streets. Following the City’s “Better Streets Policy,” the Plan calls on all City agencies to work together to realize the multiple goals that streets afford.

What’s in the Plan

The Better Streets Plan provides guidelines for all aspects of the pedestrian environment, including pedestrian amenities, landscaping, stormwater management features, traffic calming, and more.

Recognizing that different streets play different roles, the Plan created a framework of street types based on adjacent land use and transportation characteristics, and described appropriate sidewalk widths, sidewalk zones, and streetscape elements for each street type.

Innovative ideas in the Plan included “extension zones” for sidewalk amenities, using the parking lane for public space use; shared public ways that create pedestrian-priority space on alleys and small streets; and guidelines for multi-way boulevards.

The legislation that adopted the Better Streets Plan set consistent requirements for private development to build street improvements adjacent to their development, and requires all City projects to conform to the Better Streets Plan guidelines.

Successes and Lessons Learned

Lessons learned from the Better Streets Plan include:

• All agencies with jurisdiction over City streets should be involved throughout the process. The project included a significant agency ‘in-reach’ or coordination program to get all agencies on board with

traditionally been fragmented among numerous public agencies. Each agency has jurisdiction over specific aspects of the street, each with their own set of goals, capital plans, and design standards, resulting in streets that are designed to efficiently move traffic but fail to create a gracious pedestrian environment. According to a report by the San Francisco Controller’s Office:

Although departments do coordinate, no formal framework exists to allow and encourage City departments to negotiate project design components and make necessary compromises (at the department level) to support citywide goals. Without a formal framework and clear guidance, City departments move forward on projects independently, which can result in different outcomes and has been a reported source of tension among departments and delays.

1Better Streets Plan: Recommendations for Improved Streetscape Project Planning, Design, Review and Approval, City and County of San Francisco Office of the Controller – City Services Auditor, January 19, 2010
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the concepts being discussed, including a core multi-agency team and a Technical Advisory Committee composed of over 50 staff from 15 agencies to drill down on specific technical issues and develop creative design solutions. As a result, the Project achieved a broad consensus from all parties – including traffic engineers, landscape architects, and urban designers – about innovative street design concepts.

• There is “market demand” for improved streets across all demographics and geographies. The project included a substantial public outreach process, including over 100 public events to promote a community dialogue and build public support. Events included interactive community workshops, walking tours, street-side tabling events, and more. As a result, the Plan was unanimously adopted by the City’s approval bodies.

• A citywide plan must include flexible street design guidance rather than “one-size-fits-all” solutions. The Project includes a ‘kit-of-parts’ approach to street design that identifies key elements and standards for good street design, but that can be variably adapted to particular contexts throughout the city, from downtown commercial streets to neighborhood residential streets.

• The development community is a key provider of street improvements: Developers have considerable impact over the provision of public realm improvements associated with their development project. The Better Streets Plan legislation included requirements for new development to provide streetscape enhancements.

Carrying the Plan’s Vision Forward

The Better Streets Plan process brought together all City agencies with responsibility over street design and management to plan for street improvements in San Francisco. But extensive challenges remain to ensure that the Plan’s vision actually gets built. City staff continues to work on improving the City’s process for delivering street improvements, including:

• Coordination of street improvements at the early planning stages to realize project completeness and cost efficiencies

• Creation of resources to create Better Streets, including a user-friendly “one-stop shop” website for all information pertaining to making street improvements in San Francisco

• Creation of life-cycle cost model and triple-bottom line analysis for assessing the long-term costs and benefits of different street design choices
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Election Results Announced

As incoming President and chair of the 2012 Nominations and Elections Committees, I am excited to announce the results of the election for the open APA California Board of Directors positions for the 2013-2014 years. This election cycle, we were fortunate to have had a competitive and talented slate of candidates. APA California depends heavily on its volunteer leaders who are so giving of their time and so deeply committed to advancing our planning profession. Please join me in thanking and congratulating all of those individuals who have offered their time in service to our association and welcoming our newest officers. The successful candidates in the 2012 election are as follows:

Vice President for Conferences
Kurt Christensen, AICP, City of Azusa (Los Angeles)

Vice President for Policy and Legislation
David Snow, AICP, Richards Watson Gershon (Los Angeles)

Vice President for Professional Development
Betsy McCullough, AICP, City of San Diego (San Diego)

Commission and Board Representative
Marc Yeber, City of West Hollywood (Los Angeles)

California Planning Foundation Board Members
Wendy Grant, AICP, The Planning Center | DC&E (Orange)
Kelly Main, Ph.D, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo (Central Coast)

We look forward to serving you in 2013!
Brooke Peterson, AICP
APA California, President

CONGRATULATIONS
Preparation for the 2013 APA California Conference Under Way

The APA California Board and the Central Section Host Committee ask that you save the date of October 6 - 9, 2013 for the annual APA California Conference. This conference will be located in the San Joaquin Valley while using the facilities of the Visalia Marriott Hotel and the Visalia Convention Center.

The conference will include a unique, walkable downtown experience. Those attending the conference will enjoy numerous social venues, informative sessions and evocative keynote speakers.

We are looking forward to your attendance in 2013. You can also consider participating as a volunteer or session presenter. The Call for Presentations has been extended to February 15, 2013. Those interested can make a presentation submittal online via www.apacalifornia.com.

Additional information regarding the 2013 Conference will be posted in future Cal Planner issues. Stay tuned for the list of sessions, mobile tours, and informative and interesting articles.

Volunteers

Be a volunteer at the 2013 Conference. Have fun and meet new people. Please contact David Bryant, Volunteer Chair at (559) 624 -7130 or dbryant@co.tulare.ca.us.

Mark Your Calendar Now
October 6-9, 2013

For additional information go to: www.APACalifornia.org
Call for Presentations
Session Proposals
Submission Deadline: February 15, 2013

The 2013 Conference Committee is seeking Session Proposals. Submit your Plans, Projects or Programs for consideration. They may include but are not limited to the following:

PLANS:
- General Plans
- Community Plans
- Specific Plans
- Sustainability
- Energy
- New Urbanism
- Regional Blueprints
- Air Quality
- Climate Action Plans
- Transportation
- Water Quality Management
- Historical Preservation
- Resource Conservation
- TOD’s
- Smart Growth
- Housing
- Safe Routes

PROJECTS:
- Solar
- Wind
- Mixed Use Development
- Affordable Housing
- Sustainability
- Recreation

PROGRAMS:
- Healthy Living
- Planning Ethics
- Property Rights
- Public Participation

STATE LAW UPDATES:
- Land Use
- CEQA
- Subdivisions
- SMARA

Presenter’s Information and Formats:
Sessions will be 75 or 90 minutes in length. Formats other than traditional presentations are welcome such as:
- Point/Counterpoint debate
- Workshops with audience participation
- Round table
- “Talk-show” style
Contact us should you have an alternative format. Include such information in your submittal and we will do our best to accommodate your request.

APA California Chapter will only provide an LCD projector/screen and microphones in the session meeting space. Moderators and presenters must provide their own laptops. APA California Chapter is not responsible for handouts, shipping, handling or storage of materials at the hotel. APA California Chapter is not held responsible for any lost or stolen materials or equipment.

APA California Chapter does not provide a complimentary registration in exchange for presenting at the conference. Full and one-day Speaker registration is offered at a 10% discount which includes meal functions. We encourage all of our speakers to attend the conference. However, if you are only available to present at your session, a Speaker Session Only badge will be provided to grant you access.

Proposal Contents:
Proposals must provide the following information:
• Session or workshop title: A brief title that accurately reflects the focus of the session.
• Summary of Session: A short description of the session to be used in the conference program, not exceeding 50 words.
• Abstract: A short description of the session and relevance to conference topic, not exceeding 200 words.
• Each presenter’s contact information and short biography not exceeding 50 words.
• On-line submittal form is for sessions only. All Mobile Workshops have been selected.

ALL SUBMISSIONS MUST BE MADE ON-LINE AT
www.APACalifornia.com
Submission Deadline – Friday, February 15, 2013
Faxed or mail submissions will not be accepted. Only proposals correctly submitted with the above contents will be accepted.

For additional information regarding proposal submissions, please contact:
Julie Phillips, AICP, Community Development Manager
City of Porterville 291 N. Main Street Porterville, CA 93257
jphillips@ci.porterville.ca.us • 559-782-7460

www.APACalifornia.org
Diversity Summit at the 2012 Conference

The Diversity Summit during the APA California 2012 Conference was on census trends based on recently released 2010 Census data. Connie Galambos Malloy, APA California Membership Inclusion Director for Northern California, opened the summit and welcomed the 100+ conference attendees. The speakers were APA President, Mitchell Silver, AICP, and Dr. Leobardo Estrada of the UCLA School of Public Affairs, Department of Urban Planning. Mr. Silver explained that social equity and fairness have been an integral part of urban planning since the profession's inception, as evidenced by their inclusion in APA's past and present principles. He elaborated that the "new normal" of demographic trends show the rise of inclusiveness. While planners are "on the front lines" and are "guardians of the future," APA membership and AICP certification does not necessarily reflect this new normal. However, APA has and continues to address this issue, according to Mr. Silver, through the Changes Faces of America track at the last national conference, as well as through the Ambassadors Program. Diversity is an ongoing topic that Membership Inclusion Directors from each of the eight APA California Sections will continue to bring to the Diversity Summits along with programs within the local Sections.

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

After the keynote presentations, the summit concluded with a questions-and-answers period. Both Mr. Silver and Dr. Estrada answered questions from the audience. Anna M. Vidal, APA California Membership Inclusion Director for Southern California, closed the summit by thanking everyone for attending. We proudly welcome Miroo Desai, AICP, who will be taking over for Connie as she steps down as the APA California Membership Inclusion Director for Northern California. We also sincerely thank Connie for her years of Board service and wish her well.
Balancing Development with Environmental Conservation: One Agency’s Innovative Approach

By Keith Greer

Most planners in California agree that preserving natural resources is essential to maintaining quality of life. The question for them is how to build and sustain an open space preservation program that offsets the impacts of development while maximizing the protection of dwindling habitat and endangered species.

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has met that challenge head on and developed a model program. In October, APA California honored SANDAG with the Best Practices Award for its TransNet Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP). The program protects and promotes a regional open space system which can also benefit transportation infrastructure development.

The EMP is multi-faceted and has four key components:

• It funds open space acquisitions to meet future mitigation requirements for a Regional Transportation Plan.

• It promotes the development of a regional system of interconnected open space by strategically acquiring land within areas identified for conservation under the state’s Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) program.

• It provides grants for land management and field research to develop best land management practices.

• It supports regional monitoring to evaluate the health of sensitive species to determine whether they warrant special status listing.

Coordination and Collaboration

At the heart of the program, there is a deep commitment to regional coordination and collaboration. SANDAG partners with local, state, and federal agencies, as well as private groups like The Nature Conservancy, to leverage funding to acquire larger parcels at lower cost and take advantage of economy of scale. The EMP is advised by a working group made up of federal, state and local agencies, as well as nonprofit organizations. The group meets periodically to discuss mutual opportunities and challenges.

Each land purchase by SANDAG is done with an eye toward regional conservation plans developed under the NCCP and adopted by SANDAG member agencies. SANDAG land purchases complement efforts by other agencies and contribute to the expansion of an open space system designed to create continuous wildlife corridors throughout the region.

Since launching the EMP in 2008, SANDAG has invested about $100 million and leveraged another $23 million from partner agencies to further conservation efforts. So far 23 properties, totaling more than 3,300 acres, have been preserved in perpetuity. The land set aside is more than six times the size of the Disneyland Resort in Orange County.

Hidden Valley: Filling in the Gaps

Hidden Valley, which encompasses 1,905 acres, is located between the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge and the State of California’s Jamul Ecological Reserve. This land was slated for a housing subdivision, which would have fragmented wildlife habitat.

In June 2012, SANDAG partnered with The Nature Conservancy and the U.S. Department of the Interior to buy the property to offset the effects of a long list of regional transportation improvements. Had SANDAG bought the land piecemeal to meet mitigation requirements, it would have cost an estimated $58 million. By teaming up with public and private partners, it saved taxpayers $48 million.

An agreement reached between SANDAG and federal and state governments allows the title of the property to be transferred to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which owns and manages the National Wildlife Refuge. The USFWS will manage Hidden Valley at no direct cost to SANDAG.

Equestrians at Hidden Valley

Hidden Valley
Advance Mitigation

A stable revenue stream is a key factor in the program’s success. TransNet, a half-cent sales tax for transportation approved by San Diego County voters, sets aside $850 million over 40 years (until 2048) to buy land, restore habitat, and monitor wildlife as offsets to disturbance caused by transportation projects.

Having this dedicated funding source has allowed SANDAG to proactively identify and pursue cost-effective mitigation opportunities. (See side bar on how the agency has mitigated for multiple infrastructure projects in advance of actual need with the large acquisition of Hidden Valley.)

The traditional approach to mitigation is to buy land in small pieces to satisfy requirements on a project-by-project basis; typically land is bought only when mitigation is needed and funding becomes available, not necessarily during the most favorable market conditions. Often, there is a lack of coordination with other agencies to maximize conservation.

In contrast, SANDAG is able to buy land early—at lower costs and in larger parcels—and bank it for future mitigation needs. This concept, known as advance mitigation, has been embraced by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)\(^1\), as well as the federal government’s Eco-Logical program\(^2\), to promote an early, ecosystem approach in infrastructure planning.

Advance mitigation has saved SANDAG millions of dollars. During tough economic times, when other agencies and nonprofits have scaled back conservation efforts, SANDAG has been able to snap up good deals. The average cost per acre paid by the EMP is just under $30,000, roughly half the original estimate.

Beyond saving tax dollars, the EMP plays a critical role in expediting projects. As SANDAG and its partner agencies seek permits to construct projects over the next several decades, land purchased earlier will be used as mitigation. The risk of projects being delayed due to unmet mitigation requirements is virtually eliminated.

The environmental benefits are just as important. The EMP has not just compensated for habitat loss, it has produced net environmental benefits—above and beyond what is legally required.

Scientific Research

Through the EMP, SANDAG is playing a role in funding cutting-edge scientific research as well.

With financial support from the agency, the U.S. Geological Survey has established an extensive network of monitoring cameras to document the use of wildlife undercrossings. This groundbreaking research will lead to better design of crossings. In addition, the USGS has been working to restore one of only six remaining southwestern pond turtle populations in San Diego County. Early results are promising. For the first time in more than a decade, there are signs of successful turtle breeding in southern San Diego County.

Other conservation efforts funded by the EMP include: the installation of steel barriers to keep illegal off-road vehicles from infringing on vernal pools; the mapping and removal of invasive plant species; a multi-year study to restore optimal habitat conditions for the severely declining Western burrowing owl; and a project to increase the Least Tern population by improving its nesting sites.

All the expenditures related to the EMP are overseen by an independent taxpayer oversight committee to ensure fiscal accountability. To learn more about the EMP, visit KeepSanDiegoMoving.com.

---


“Let’s make 2013 a year that changed the face of the Inland Empire Section”. That was the punch line from Aaron Pfannenstiel’s candidate statement for the Inland Empire Section of the American Planning Association (IES/APA) Director’s seat. And guess what? He got elected and now he leads the IES/APA in the midst of insurmountable challenges our profession continues to battle as a consequence of countless externalities resulting from the great recession. I concur with his view that in spite of gloomy indicators affecting our profession, there are “still a lot of opportunities out there and a strong demand for learning and expanding”.

There is no certainty that changing “the face” will be a slam dunk for Aaron and the Board of Directors, but what is true is that the work that was done under the Immediate Past Director Leisa Lukes has certainly paved the way for this vision to sprout. Hosting the successful APA California 2012 Conference in Rancho Mirage was the most significant accomplishment for the IES/APA Board last year. It provided an opportunity to reinvigorate our professional essence, to learn new trends, reaffirm great planning practices and for networking amongst our peers. Aside from this “once in a blue moon” opportunity to make an impact, the real work at the IES/APA Section level is what matters the most, however. Our Board has dedicated countless of volunteer hours to address the most pressing needs for our members. Knowing that planners have also been victims of the recession’ s collateral damage and that disposable income to pay for planning training or workshops has gone down for many of them, our Board began to explore creative approaches to assist. Collaboration with our professional connections has been a key component to deliver FREE of charge high quality training, including Certification Maintenance accredited workshops for planners who are members of the American Institute of Certified Planners. One of the Board’s major partners is the Riverside County Department of Public Health. This organization, which the IES/APA Board recognized with three awards of excellence last year, has provided an avenue for our members to explore one of the most important and exciting emerging trends in our profession: Healthy Communities. This partnership has brought other organizations together to develop relevant sessions designed for the whole range of our planning hierarchy. They include The California Endowment, the Local Government Commission, the Prevention Institute, the Advancement Project, the Western Riverside Council of Governments, the Riverside County Health Coalition, the Cities of Coachella and Moreno Valley and private sector firms such as Raimi+Associates and Fehr and Peers to name a few. Our Board is very grateful to the amazing array of dynamic and knowledgeable speakers who have contributed with numerous pro-bono presentations.

We also provided events at reasonable cost which were conducted in partnership with organizations such as the California Planning Roundtable, the American Public Works Association, the Association of Environmental Professionals, the US Green Building Council and the Coachella Valley Association of Governments. A major partnership with Loma Linda University has begun through the University’s “Healthy Communities by Design” annual conference. Members of our Board actively participated in organizing the 2012 two-day event and secured 11.5 CM AICP credits for all the sessions. All in all, the IES/APA provided opportunities to earn nearly 32 CM credits for its ACIP members in the past year (not including APA California 2012 Conference sessions). An astonishing accomplishment!

The Planning Commissioners’ workshop was one of the most well attended events in 2012. I should mention here that Board Member Matt Burris, AICP LEED AP was recently appointed to the City of Jurupa Valley’s Planning...
Changing the Face of the Inland Empire Section in 2013
Continued from page 9

Commission (the newest City in California!). We are very proud of his success and we look forward to continue to work with him as he has moved from the position of IES/APA Professional Development Officer to IES/APA Planning Commission Representative.

Speaking of changes in the IES/APA Board’s faces, we are very pleased to announce that the IES/APA Section now has a fully staffed Board. We want to acknowledge our diverse new leaders who have stepped up to the plate to build capacity among our fellow planners for no other reward than garnering sense of service and accomplishment:

- Julie Rock, a seasoned planner has assumed the elected position of Professional Development Officer,
- Karen Peterson with the City of Upland has been appointed as Vice Chair of Awards Program,
- Leila Namvar with the City of Indio is the new Membership Coordinator,
- Gustavo Gonzalez from the City of Riverside is the new Section’s Historian,
- H.P. Kang with Hogle-Ireland is now the California Planning Foundation Liaison,
- Miguel Gonzales with the City of Pomona will lead the Young Planners Group and
- Linda Huynh with the City of Santa Monica is the new Student Representative.

That is not all what is happening in the Inland Empire Section, though. This fabulous 2013 brought us the news that two award nominations from our section garnered APA National Awards of Excellence:

- National Planning Excellence Award for a Grassroots Initiative: Cathedral City’s Environmental Conservation Division (ECD) Kids & Community Program — Cathedral City, California.
- National Planning Excellence Award for a Planning Advocate, Michael Osur, Deputy Director, Riverside County Department of Public Health, California.

We are very proud of these accomplishments.

Finally, as the immediate past IES/APA Section Historian, I want to express my gratitude for the opportunity to serve in that capacity. Instituting and organizing the annual historical symposia has been an amazing and rewarding experience that I believe has influenced our membership to consider pre-history and history as a path to create a sense of place, a sense of belonging, and a sense of identity when conducting planning activities. I look forward to supporting Gustavo Gonzales in his efforts to continue this important work. As the appointed Art VULUPS liaison, I will continue to be engaged and exercise creativity as an essential ingredient to promote our profession while demystifying its complexities.

Wherever you are, you can help Aaron and our Board to change the face of the Inland Empire Section of the American Planning Association by providing ideas, networking avenues, attending our events and most importantly, by volunteering your time and sharing your own capacities with the rest of our fellow planners and communities.
President’s Message

By Brooke E Peterson, AICP, President, brooke.e.peterson@gmail.com

It is a new year and with it comes your new leadership at APA California! I am excited to begin my term as the President of the California Chapter of the American Planning Association and look forward being part of the team that will serve you in 2013 and 2014. This is my inaugural article in the Cal Planner and I am delighted to bring you highlights of where we have been and the ambitious agenda the Board has identified for where we want to go.

I first want to take the opportunity to thank our outgoing President, Kevin Keller, AICP, for all his excellent work over the past two years. Kevin tackled a number difficult challenges, including building stronger consensus on the Board and implementing a comprehensive financial plan to ensure the long-term solvency of the organization. I would like to commend him on his effective leadership and paving the way for what needs to happen next. I would also like to give a warm welcome the newest elected officers to the APA California Board.

Kurt Christiansen, AICP, Vice President for Conferences
William Hoose, AICP, Vice President for Marketing and Membership
Betsy McCullough, AICP, Vice President for Professional Development
David M Snow, AICP, Vice President for Policy and Legislation
Marc Yeber, Commission and Board Representative

APA California depends heavily on its volunteer leaders and we are grateful for those who are so giving of their time and so deeply committed to advancing our planning profession.

Before we look ahead to 2013, I would like to note two significant changes we made to the organization’s procedures in 2012 to strengthen and improve operational processes and ultimately service to you, our members.

• In January the Board of Directors approved the addition of a new elected position, Vice President for Marketing and Membership. You can find more details including the list of roles and responsibilities for the new Vice President of Marketing and Membership position in our Bylaws. I have appointed William Hoose to serve as the inaugural Vice President in this position and am excited to see what his enthusiasm and commitment in this capacity brings. Look for changes and new programs related to marketing and membership support this coming year!

• In June the Board of Directors adopted a Standard Contracting Protocol for the purposes of establishing, reviewing, evaluating, and as applicable, re-bidding contracts. This is a much needed tool that will equip us to more effectively maximize contractor performance and ensure they are providing the highest quality and most cost-effective services to the organization and its members. All contracts will now be reviewed on a regular basis according to a prioritized schedule.

Continued on page 12
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APA California will also now conduct an annual member satisfaction survey to gather input from you regarding the quality of services and level of benefit the organization is providing.

So where are we going in the coming year and beyond? The Board of Directors held its Annual Board Retreat in San Diego on January 11-12 and we focused on identifying strategic initiatives for the next two years and designating an action plan to accomplish those initiatives. There have been many changes over the last couple of years as APA California responds to the effects of the economic climate, member feedback, and as the organization takes strategic steps to keep pace with regulatory changes, technological advancement, and trends. There is still much work to be done and key decisions made to maximize the potential and effectiveness of APA California as an organization and to improve the quality of its service and benefits available to you as a member. We recognize that we need to increase the transparency of APA California’s administration so that members better understand what the Board and staff are doing. We recognize that our programs, website, publications, media communications, and other information outlets need to be greatly enhanced to increase the visibility of the organization and provide more real-time and relevant information. Lastly, we know that new strategies must be implemented above what we already do to improve and expand our capacity to serve you. Business as usual is not acceptable! Therefore, as we head into 2013 and 2014, our top initiatives will be to:

**PROMOTE PLANNING’S VALUE**
Promote a message that focuses on the value of planning.

**COMMUNICATION**
Embed better communication to our members and to the public in everything we do.

**LEADERSHIP FOR CHANGE**
Equip our members to be leaders in change management. Be innovators and risk takers.

Our core purpose in adopting these initiatives is to maximize the quality of services and value of membership to you, our members. We recognize that you look to APA California to serve as a clearinghouse for professional development opportunities and to provide relevant information regarding what is happening within APA, across the planning profession, in our communities, and beyond. You are why the organization exists and we strive to reflect that in all we do. We hope you will stay engaged in what is happening throughout the coming year.

I invite you to partner with us as we endeavor to advance the value and quality of planning in California and our local communities. To get more involved in any of these initiatives, please drop me an email at brooke.e.peterson@gmail.com or contact any APA California Section Director or State Board Member for more information.
Beyond Buildings: Century Villages at Cabrillo

By Wendy Grant, AICP Senior Planner, The Planning Center | DC&E

As planning professionals, much of our time is spent thinking about how people live and how we can shape the design of the built environment to produce positive experiences for the people who inhabit them. It is the hope of many planners that best planning practices have been carefully interwoven into the community fabric to help craft places that thrive. An elevated societal awareness of healthier living habits into our daily routines (Blue Zones, Vitality Cities, walking groups, etc.) and choices to minimize the impact our routines have on the environment (as demonstrated through the adoption of sustainable communities and greenhouse gas reduction strategies) is in some ways, less tangible than the physical environment, but it touches upon the need to go beyond buildings to generate a sense of social interconnectedness with place that becomes essential to a community’s ability to prosper.

It could be said that, in some ways, planners regulate how people live by regulating the design of the built environment. Social networks and programs available in any community are attractive qualities for new residents who are looking for more than shelter; they value the experiences that can be had in close proximity to the places they reside. It will be an ongoing challenge for planners to mandate a new community or neighborhood to integrate social programs as a part of project approval simply because implementation of social programs cannot be as easily regulated as an explicitly defined setback - can you picture a Social Code Enforcement Officer issuing a violation to a neighborhood for not coordinating a bitty soccer program? The importance of social networks to residents will certainly continue to influence how we plan, reaching beyond the three-dimensional realm and encompassing the physical, environmental, and social elements of place.

Such is the case for Century Villages at Cabrillo (CVC), a 26-acre affordable housing community established on a former US Naval housing site located a mile from the Port of Long Beach and three miles from Downtown Long Beach. CVC’s supportive housing paradigm provided emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent housing for a total of 1,831 homeless individuals last year (1,270 adults and 561 students) – all of whom utilized social services. CVC’s continued investment in the social networks and services in the community sets it apart from other projects that simply provide affordable housing.

According to the Knight Soul of the Community Project conducted by Gallup and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation (2010), three main qualities attach people to their communities or place: social offerings (e.g. places to meet and socialize), openness (e.g. how welcoming a place is and how accepting it is of diversity), and aesthetics (e.g. its physical beauty and green spaces). Two additional factors contribute to attachment: basic services and safety. Over the past 15 years, CVC has
Beyond Buildings: Century Villages at Cabrillo
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demonstrated that, while the built environment is essential for the functionality of the campus, it is the strength of the social programming that ensures it will thrive long after the last building permit has been issued.

The motto here is, “a hand up, not a hand out”. The “continuum of care” approach encourages formerly homeless individuals and families to progressively move through various levels of housing, increasing independence, and surpassing barriers at each stage. This interconnected approach of housing and services enables those in need to develop skills, access benefits, comply with rules and regulations and address the underlying issues that caused them to become homeless. Residents of CVC seek the safety and structure that the CVC provides and an opportunity to establish independence and a sound support system that makes it easier to integrate into mainstream society. Residents buy into the entire social system embodied at CVC and are accountable to—and for—one another.

The social network is the essence of CVC residents and the Executive Directors of all 15 service providers have been engaged in a dialogue to identify gaps in resident services or amenities; many of the “wish list” ideas generated from these discussions (a new gymnasium, playground, sound wall, market on campus) have already been implemented or have influenced revisions to the original 1997 Master Plan. In this case, a general yield study was completed by CVC to gain an understanding of the total number of units that could be accommodated in the remaining underdeveloped areas; and the plan was later refined with the input from the residents and providers.

CVC Factoids:

• CVC harnesses public-private partnerships to provide education, job training, support services such as child care, and clinical support. On-site case manager and employment services managers provide counseling, job coaching economic development strategies and training to increase job formation opportunities for residents.

• In 2009, the City identified 3,909 people that were homeless in Long Beach. Of the 846 homeless veterans in the City, 618 of them (73%) were housed at the Villages at Cabrillo.

• CVC is a collaboration of 15 different service providers on the campus (U.S. Vets, Catholic Charities, Long Beach USD, and others).

• CVC commissioned a Social Impact report in late 2011 to annually assess the aggregate impacts on the community that are generated by the services provided at CVC. The report found that it cost approximately $697 per month ($8,367 per year) to house and provide services to homeless individuals at CVC, while providing ongoing services to chronically homeless individuals can utilize over $8,000 per month ($96,000 per year) in public services (due in large part to the frequent use of emergency rooms, jails, and other crisis services (Fleming, et. al., 2009). Based on these figures, CVC’s housing model is 11.4 times more cost effective than the alternative societal cost of remaining homeless.

• A July 2012 Community Survey asked residents about their use of CVC’s amenities and their priorities for new services. Respondents indicated that they used the community convenience store (70%) and community rooms (46%) more than any other amenity.

• The majority of residents living at CVC do not own personal vehicles. CVC’s provides a listing of nearby employment services, public agencies (post office, City Hall, senior centers), and grocery stores and directions to travel to each location via transit or by walking.

• CVC continually develops day-to-day tools to assist its residents: financial literacy workshops to review the benefits of bank accounts, budgeting, credit card management, and saving money, and job skills such as resume writing, interview skills, and job searching.

• The Bethune Transitional Center is housed on the CVC campus, and is the hub for coordination of services for all homeless students in the Long Beach Unified School District. In total, Bethune has served or coordinated services for 5,300 children.

• Nearly 300 volunteers teamed up to build a new playground and community garden in just one day as part of a KaBOOM! grant. The playground’s design is based on drawings provided by CVC children who attended a Design Day for the project. One-minute video of the build: http://bit.ly/wDliTS
The South Bay Bicycle Master Plan

The South Bay Bicycle Master Plan is the first ever multi-jurisdictional bicycle master plan and is the result of a unique partnership between long-standing bicycle advocacy non-profit, Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition (LACBC), and local LACBC chapter – the South Bay Bicycle Coalition (SBBC). LACBC and SBBC worked together with the shared goal of improving the safety and convenience of bicycling in auto-centric Los Angeles County, specifically in the South Bay Region. The South Bay Bicycle Master Plan aims to improve bicycling conditions and increase connectivity across the seven participating cities of El Segundo, Gardena, Hermosa Beach, Lawndale, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, and Torrance.

SBBC approached the South Bay cities (defined as those cities encompassed by the South Bay Cities Council of Governments) in December 2009 to ask for their support and involvement in a multi-city bicycle master planning process. Seven of the cities responded favorably and within the specified time frame for grant eligibility, and are represented in the master plan.

Funding for this master planning process was made possible through a grant from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health’s Renew Environments for Nutrition, Exercise and Wellness in Los Angeles County (RENEW-LAC) initiative. RENEW-LAC is funded by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention – Communities Putting Prevention to Work Initiative. RENEW strives to implement policy, systems, and environmental change to improve nutrition, increase physical activity, and reduce obesity, especially in disadvantaged communities. Encouraging communities to participate in active transportation through pedestrian and bicycle-friendly policies is one objective of the RENEW initiative.

Each City Council adopted supportive resolutions and devoted in-kind staff time to assist with plan review and data collecting. The City of Redondo Beach provided office space in City Hall for LACBC’s South Bay Initiative Director. A team including representatives from LACBC, SBBC, and the City of Redondo Beach selected the consultant firm Alta Planning + Design (Alta) to develop the plan. Representatives from each participating city, SBBC, Alta, and the Department of Public Health met for monthly roundtable progress meetings to discuss upcoming steps and review draft materials. The dedication and commitment from all involved parties led to a successful public/private/non-profit collaboration.

One of the initial steps in the planning process was to conduct bicycle counts to determine the level of bicycling occurring at the start of the project. With training from Alta,
The South Bay Bicycle Master Plan

Continued from page 15

volunteers from LACBC and SBBC conducted weekday and weekend bicycle counts across the seven cities. There were a total of 70 count locations between the two count periods, resulting in a significant number of volunteer hours. These counts will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the plan at increasing ridership.

SBBC and LACBC led an extensive outreach campaign, also supported by volunteers. The coalitions hosted a series of community workshops in each participating city to first gather input on desired locations for different types of bikeways, and to then solicit feedback on the draft plan. SBBC met with a broad range of community groups and city departments to vet ideas with stakeholders and to gain support of the plan early in the process.

Each participating city had a unique set of existing conditions, thus coordination and collaboration among jurisdictions throughout the planning process was critical. The range of existing bicycle facilities varied from city to city, with some having fairly extensive networks in place and others without any existing bikeways. The participating cities also had a wide range of socio-economic conditions, as the plan area affected a combined population of over 359,000 residents.

As the first-ever multi-jurisdictional bike plan, the South Bay Bicycle Master Plan has a unique focus on cross-city consistency and connectivity that is often lacking in singular city bike plans. The plan recommends a network in which bicyclists will be able to pass through the participating cities to reach their destinations without losing bicycle facilities at city boundaries, which will also allow residents of adjacent cities to benefit from the bicycle system.

Implementation of this plan will promote and increase bicycle ridership for all levels of ability throughout the South Bay. The South Bay has an existing population of recreational and enthusiast bicyclists; this plan’s main objective is to increase the number of those bicyclists, as well as create a larger group of utilitarian bicyclists, including bicycle commuters, through safe, accessible, and consistent bicycle infrastructure, and the policies and programs that support it.

In addition to providing recommendations for bikeways and support facilities, the plan offers recommendations for education, encouragement, enforcement, and evaluation programs. The plan also provides guidance for wayfinding and signage throughout the region to establish cross-city consistency and more convenient navigation for network users.

The plan was adopted by all seven cities in October and November of 2011. Each participating city is now eligible for grant funding sources that they were not previously receiving. The South Bay Bicycle Master Plan has been recognized by both the Los Angeles and California chapters of the American Planning Association for its excellence in grassroots planning.
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California Zoning - Unplugged!

By Jeffrey S. Beiswenger, AICP, Project Manager, PMC

I recently authored the December 2012 issue of APA’s Zoning Practice publication entitled “Powering Down Zoning Regulations.” The full issue can be found at http://www.planning.org/zoningpractice/. A few of the zoning provisions particularly helpful to a California audience are included in this issue of Cal Planner. In California, we consume a large amount of energy for lighting, cooling and heating of buildings, lighting up streets, parking lots and signage and pumping water for drinking, irrigation and treatment. Zoning regulations play a role in reducing energy consumption.

Utility companies want more energy conservation and funding is available for planning efforts. You may ask why a utility would want less consumption of energy when they are in the business of selling it. Capacity constraints and the cost of new power plants provide a powerful financial incentive. It is costly to permit, construct, and operate a new power plant. Conservation programs can be much more cost-effective.

Thanks in part to recently enacted state mandates, California planners have been thinking creatively about ways to save energy through General Plans, Climate Action Plans, Energy Action Plans, zoning codes, and other municipal planning policy documents and regulations. Assembly Bill 32 – Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32), California’s Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (SB 375), the state required Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and the California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen) are a few examples of state mandates that directly, or indirectly require local governments to adopt more energy efficient land use regulations.

**CalGreen**

At the center of energy efficiency regulations is the relative new CalGreen building code. Building codes have long been considered a good place to look for energy savings. In 1978, California adopted Title 24, the landmark California Energy Commission building energy efficiency program. CalGreen was adopted in 2011 as part of Title 24 with the expectation that more energy efficient buildings will be constructed and energy consumption will be reduced to pre-1990 levels. CalGreen has two components: mandatory and voluntary measures. The mandatory measures are minimum baselines that must be adopted by all jurisdictions in the state. Voluntary measures are additional measures that, if implemented, would result in additional energy savings. Jurisdictions can choose to adopt additional provisions organized into Tier 1 and Tier 2. Tier 1 provisions are designed to result in an additional 15% energy savings and Tier 2 provisions are design to result in an additional 30% energy savings.

CalGreen is a building code - what does it have to do with zoning? The CalGreen code includes several provisions that are typically found in zoning regulations including. The following looks at a few of the CalGreen categories and relates these provisions to potential energy savings:

- Some property owners are already starting to include electric vehicle spaces with charging stations in their parking lots.
- Outdoor lighting provisions that limit fixture height and require shielding help to minimize wasteful light spill.
Water Management

Reducing water consumption saves energy because less water needs to be treated and pumped to end users. In California, the water sector is the largest energy user in the state, estimated to account for 19% of the total electricity consumed (much of it for agricultural purposes). The CalGreen building code includes provisions that could be adopted by jurisdictions to require the use of Low Impact Development (LID) techniques to reduce the amount of stormwater run-off. These techniques include drainage swales planted with native species and rain gutters that flow into landscaped areas (instead of storm sewers). Pervious pavement is another technique that can be utilized in parking areas to promote onsite infiltration. In 2011, Los Angeles adopted an LID ordinance requiring that the first ¾ inch of rainfall be captured on site (Ordinance No. 181899). The city also provides information on best practices such as rain barrels, permeable pavement, planters, rain gardens, and dry wells through its Stormwater Program (Los Angeles 2012).

Dual pipe systems allow for the use of non-potable water for irrigation purposes. A secondary pipe (sometimes called a purple pipe) is used to transport this water in a parallel system separate from the potable water. For example, Windsor, California, requires the installation of purple pipe for landscape irrigation purposes (§12-7-105).

Alternative Modes of Transportation

The CalGreen building code recognizes the connection between alternative vehicle use and energy efficiency with:

- Bicycle parking requirements equivalent to 5% of all vehicle parking spaces (§5.106.4).
- Parking requirements for “clean air vehicles,” which includes vanpools, carpools, electric vehicles, and gas-electric hybrids (§5.106.5.2).
- Optional provisions related to the pre-wiring of electric vehicle parking spaces (§A5.106.5.3).

Solar

Solar access increases the opportunity to generate electricity or heat water with a solar energy system. Heating water accounts for 15% – 30% of electricity use in homes (equipped with electric water heaters), and using a solar water heater can result in a 50% – 80% cost savings. At the local level, many jurisdictions have solar access or solar easement provisions in their development regulations. These provisions either enable the recordation of easements or establish a solar envelope by right to ensure that solar systems are not blocked or made less efficient by development on neighboring properties. Beyond just providing for the possibility of future solar systems through solar access and orientation requirements, some jurisdictions are taking the next step of requiring that buildings are pre-wired (or pre-plumbed) for solar service.

Reuse of Buildings (CalGreen)

While older buildings may not be energy efficient, the concept of “embodied energy” considered the fact that an energy efficient building can also be defined as one that you don’t have to build. Another consideration is “density” (the...
dreaded “D” word!). Dwelling units that share common walls (e.g. apartment, townhomes, etc.) are much more energy efficient than single family homes – even highly energy efficient single family homes. If the primary goal is to save energy, then a persuasive argument can be made in favor of reusing buildings in a more urban setting before constructing new low-density suburban settlements. Allowing a mix of uses within a district or a single building can encourage building reuse by allowing older buildings to be repurposed for new uses, capturing the embodied energy of that older building.

Shading Requirements

Cooling down buildings, parking areas, and other surfaces that tend to absorb heat from the sun can help reduce energy usage — particularly in climates dependent on air conditioning. Trees, landscaped open space, and landscaped (green) roof areas can help reduce the heat island effect and maximize pervious surfaces in urbanized areas, and zoning codes can play a particularly important role in promoting pervious surfaces. Another effective technique is to require that a certain minimum percentage of a paved parking area is shaded.

Conclusions

Zoning and development regulations offer opportunities to promote energy savings, and given the increasing overlap between state building and planning regulation related to energy efficiency, this may be an ideal time to update zoning codes. Planners should consider contacting their local utilities for partnership (and funding!) opportunities.

Jeffrey S. Beiswenger, AICP, is a project manager for PMC, an urban planning and design firm with offices throughout California. He has specialized work experience related to sustainable zoning and development codes. He has a Bachelor of Architecture from the University of Arizona and a Master of Urban Planning from the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
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APA California Legislative Update - January 2013

By David M. Snow, AICP, Vice President Policy & Legislation, APA California and Sande George, Legislative Advocate, APA California
Lauren De Valencia y Sanchez, APA California Lobbyist

Implementation of AB 1616
Cottage Food Facilities in Residential Areas

Many local governments are in the process of approving ordinances to implement the planning and zoning provisions of AB 1616, which goes into effect January 1, 2013. AB 1616 was amended on the last few days of session to include a cottage food operation that is registered or has a permit within the private home exemption of the California Retail Food Code, and to exclude a cottage food operation from specified food processing establishment and Sherman Law requirements. It also will require a cottage food operation to meet specified requirements relating to training, sanitation, preparation, labeling, and permissible types of sales and would subject a cottage food operation to limited inspections. Important to APA, it also will establish various zoning and permit requirements relating to cottage food operations. The Governor signed the bill into law in September.

APA California supported the goal of the bill. However, APA along with the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), the League of California Cities, the Regional Council of Rural Counties (RCRC), and the Urban Counties Caucus notified the author of the bill that the bill was not clear in a number of areas and such confusing provisions would make it difficult for cities and counties to implement the bill.

Since that time, APA has been participating in an implementation working group with the author’s staff, health inspectors and other local government associations. We have discussed our main concerns with the author’s staff to better understand the intent of specific provisions, and believe that clarification of these sections is necessary to ensure the requirements are clear for those that will be required to enforce them, and to reconcile differences between various sections of the bill.

The author has agreed to ask the Legislature’s Legislative Counsel to quickly answer these questions before January 1, and to help us determine which clarifications may need further legislative action.

Below is a list of the questions that need clarification. Of chief concern is the extent to which cities and counties will be able to regulate specific impacts of what will be quasi-commercial operations in residential areas under the express language in AB 1616.

• POINT OF SALE AT RESIDENCE: Can cities and counties specifically prohibit the point of sale of cottage food products out of the residence or residence kitchen? Currently the bill defines direct sale as selling to consumers not located at the residence, but would also define direct sale to include selling of products directly to consumers from the cottage food operation. (Page 6, Sec. 113758 (4) defines “direct sale” to be transactions "occurring in person in the cottage food operation.") Do Sec. 113758 (4) and Sec. 51035 (a) (2) and (3) allow cities and counties to continue to prohibit point of sale of cottage food from a residence or residence kitchen to address the potential traffic and commercial impacts in residential areas? As a general matter, local agencies would like to be specifically authorized to continue to apply the generally applicable home occupations standards to cottage food operations as necessary to protect residential areas, with the exception of allowing the one outside employee, which is unlikely to transform a residential area. However, as written it is unclear.
• VERIFICATION OF FEES ON COTTAGE FOOD OPERATIONS:
  Can the city or county use an existing fee study, completed to establish the cottage food operation permit fee pursuant to existing fee authority, to meet the bill’s requirement for verification of fees and breakdown of individual fees charged by the city or county? The bill specifically requires the local government to process any required permit not to exceed the costs of the review and permit process, as already required by existing fee statutes. But the bill would additionally authorize an applicant to demand an accounting breakdown of verification of fees and "any individual fees charged in connection with the issuance of the permit". [Pages 3 and 4, Sec. 51035 (a) (3) and (b) (2)] An existing fee study that analyzed the costs of issuing the permit to be required for the cottage food operation by the city or county should be sufficient to meet these requirements.

• RESIDENTIAL USE VS COMMERCIAL FOOD OPERATION:
  Can cities and counties through the permit process and implementing ordinance for a cottage food operation continue to address specific safety issues and impacts on neighboring residences resulting from the commercial food operations? Are local agencies limited to the specific permit restrictions listed in the bill? AB 1616 in Sec. 51035 (a) (2) and (3) allows cities to issue permits that comply with local ordinances prescribing reasonable standards, restrictions, and requirements for a cottage food operation. That section then goes on to list specific issues that can be addressed. The bill also mandates that the use of a residence for the purposes of a cottage food operation would not constitute a change of occupancy for purposes of the State Housing Law, or for purposes of local building and fire codes, and that cottage food operations must be considered residences for the purposes of the State Uniform Building Standards Code and local building and fire codes. [(Sec. 51035, (c) and (d)] Cities and counties would like to remain authorized to address specific safety issues and impacts on neighboring residences resulting from these cottage food commercial uses, such as prohibiting signage, requiring grease traps so neighborhood sewers are protected, mandating fire clearances around commercial ovens, adequate ventilation to control odors, proper fire suppression, garbage collection and pickup, and limits on hours of operation. Many of these issues are even more important when the operations are located in a multifamily residential building.

• PERMIT AND FEE INFORMATION FROM UNRELATED PUBLIC AGENCIES:
  Are cities and counties mandated to provide cottage food facility applicants a list of the permits, fees and fee verification required by public agencies that are not under the cities’ or counties’ control? The bill appears to require the city or county, upon the request of the applicant, to provide a list of the permits and fees and unspecified other information required not only by the city or county or other city or county departments, but by other public agencies which are not under the control of the city or county. [Page 4, Sec. 51035 (b) (1)] This is not information that the city and county will be able to provide.

If you have any other issues of concern, please email Sande George at sgeorge@stefangeorge.com. APA will provide members with an update as soon as we have written decisions from Legislative Counsel.

Legislature Returns January 7

The California Legislature met for one day December 3 to swear in new members and begin the process of introducing new bills. As everyone knows, both the Senate and Assembly Democrats now hold a 2/3-majority vote. What they decide to do with that 2/3 vote is still open, but indications are that Democrats plan to be judicious with their agenda. On that agenda so far: CEQA updating and exploration of possible updates to Prop 13 such as a higher property tax rate for commercial property and potentially a 55% vote for local parcel taxes to be used for specific purposes. The Legislature returns full time on January 7.

Below are a few of the more interesting bills that have been introduced so far. Look on the APA website for additional legislative information.


This bill would appropriate $2,000,000 to the state Water Board for use by the Greater Monterey County Regional Water Management Group (management group) to develop an integrated plan to address the drinking water and
wastewater needs of disadvantaged communities in the Salinas Valley whose waters have been affected by waste discharges.

**AB 5 (Ammiano) Homelessness.**

This bill would enact the Homeless Person's Bill of Rights and Fairness Act, which would provide that no person's rights, privileges, or access to public services may be denied or abridged because he or she is homeless, has a low income, or suffers from a mental illness or physical disability.

**AB 21 (Alejo) Safe Drinking Water Small Community Grant Fund.**

This bill would authorize the department to assess an annual charge in connection with loans for water projects in disadvantaged communities made pursuant to a new Safe Drinking Water Small Community Grant Fund.

**AB 22 (Blumenfield) Sidewalk Repairs.**

This bill, back again from last year, would prohibit a city or county that has an ordinance in operation that requires the city or county to repair or reconstruct streets, sidewalks, or driveways that have been damaged as a result of tree growth from repealing the ordinance without the concurrence of the local electorate by majority vote.

**AB 37 (Perea) Environmental quality: California Environmental Quality Act: record of proceedings.**

Similar to two measures stalled last year, this bill would require the lead agency, at the request of a project applicant, to prepare a record of proceedings concurrently with the preparation of negative declarations, mitigated negative declarations, EIRs, or other environmental documents for specified projects.

**SB 33 (Wolk) Infrastructure financing districts: voter approval: repeal.**

This bill would revise and recast the provisions governing infrastructure-financing districts. The bill would eliminate the requirement of voter approval for creation of the district and for bond issuance, and would authorize the legislative body to create the district. The bill would instead authorize a newly created public financing authority, consisting of 5 members, 3 of whom are members of the city council or board of supervisors that established the district, and 2 of whom are members of the public, to adopt the infrastructure financing plan, subject to approval by the legislative body, and issue bonds by majority vote of the authority by resolution. The bill would authorize a district to finance specified actions and projects, and prohibit the district from providing financial assistance to a vehicle dealer or big box retailer.

**SCA 3 (Leno) Taxation: educational entities: parcel tax.**

This measure would authorize a school district, community college district, or county office of education to impose a parcel tax if 55% of the voters approve the tax rather than 2/3.

**SCA 4 (Liu) Local government transportation projects: special taxes: voter approval.**

This measure would provide that the imposition, extension, or increase of a special tax by a local government for the purpose of providing funding for local transportation projects requires the approval of 55% of its voters voting on the proposition rather than 2/3 vote.
As a commission or board member, each of us has made a conscious decision to join the efforts in planning the future of our communities. While this is a significant commitment and our dedication noteworthy, this position also comes with an equally important responsibility and degree of humility. Aside from the obvious role as an arbitrator, we also wear the hat of a mediator, educator, ambassador, and community advocate. Our primary objective, however, is to be good stewards in facilitating a fair and meaningful conversation and decision-making process. Whether it is to forge a new path or to stay the course, it is incumbent upon all of us in this capacity to assure all voices are heard and considered.

That said and bearing in mind that most of us are not planners by profession, our role is no less important to community planning.

What does being a good steward of the public process mean in practical terms? How does our conduct of a meeting impact its course? When do we determine that a staff report is adequate for rendering a decision or that it should be delayed for additional analysis? Why do our actions ultimately matter in setting a productive tenor and being mindful of staff time and resources? Setting aside any single or specific controversy, the real challenge is to ultimately move the agenda item forward. After all one of the most frustrating aspects of this process to applicants and community members alike is the uncertainty of not having a resolution in sight. Simply put, the effectiveness of our position depends on our willingness to prepare sufficiently, engage fairly and determine objectively, all with minimal ambiguity.

We all recognize that the staff analysis initiates our review of a specific agenda item. Such evaluation, however, first requires an understanding of the framework around which a decision will be rendered. Being familiar with your agency’s General or Comprehensive Plan as well as the Zoning Code not only helps to guide the discussion but also assists in determining the appropriateness of a request being made. Remember, the central question being asked is if the proposal meets the community's goals and fits within its land-use regulations. Call or meet with planning staff prior to the meeting to review or answer questions and seek clarifications. If the information is incomplete, staff should be allowed time to provide additional information in advance. Ambushing staff during the meeting serves no one in this process and simply delays the agenda item from moving forward.

Commission and Board meetings, especially the public hearing portions, for all intents and purposes are a series of one-time occasions to set the tone for the discussions that may go well beyond the immediate request. This is why members of the community place a high expectation in our deference and deliberation. We are the arbiters between [often] competing interests as it relates to the enjoyment and impacts to our neighborhoods. Community relations – and the public's views of an official's responsiveness – are seriously undermined when it appears a planning official is not listening to the input being provided by the public. In fact, a perceived lack of attentiveness to the testimony by planning officials can be construed as a violation of the due process clause. The bottom line… involve the public, listen to their opinion, and acknowledge that you have heard them.

When it comes to making a determination, most of us would conclude that consensus is the desired outcome. So remember that the proposed action or request before you is not set in stone and can be modified upon your discretion. By articulating suggestions that address community
concerns, you are ultimately shaping the item or proposal to be more responsive and effective at achieving the community's goals. Consequently, commissions and boards who carefully weigh all the material and testimony can more easily render a thoughtful and reasoned decision that can be embraced by all stakeholders.

There are countless commission and board members throughout the state who are engaged in such strategies both from behind the dais and out in the community. Last year Stephanie Landregan, a Planning Commissioner from the City of Glendale, is just one of those examples. Last year, she was recognized as Citizen Planner by the Los Angeles Section of the American Planning Association.

As a Commissioner she wears different hats, but believes her primary role is a facilitator. “After a certain time, you should be able to help staff communicate the information necessary, and help the public understand such information to be able to move the request forward,” says Landregan. Her skill in distilling zoning code for a real world application and ability to navigate the many stakeholder interests in land-use matters demonstrates the significance of the role we play as “planners” for our communities. As a citizen planner, each of us is in the unique position to strengthen community bonds, cultivate public trust and promote the value of good planning principles and practices.

EXCLUDED CONSENT
An occasional contribution in the form of views, anecdotes and humor from commission and board members from around the state.
Congratulations to California’s Newest Candidate AICP Members!

By Betsy McCullough, AICP, Vice President for Professional Development, APA California

On behalf of the entire APA California Board of Directors, please join me in extending a very BIG CONGRATULATIONS to each of California’s 42 newest candidate AICP members:

Los Angeles
Stephanie L. Danner
Troy R. Evangelho
Rogelio A. Flores
Anita Gutierrez
Matthew Hissom
Timothy Kelly
Christopher J. Palmer
Srinivas M. Rao
Melani Smith
Hagerenesh Solomon
Andrew Svitek

Central Coast
Shine Ling
Jordan D. Young

Central
Richard A. Cummings
Bonique E. Emerson
Ken E. Okereke
Arnoldo Rodriguez
Rob Terry

Orange
William M. Hoose
Jason T. Kim
Scott S. Lunceford

Sacramento Valley
Tyra Lynn Bumbaloughhays
Nicholas D. Exline
Brandon Haydu
Lezlie M. Kimura Szeto

San Diego
Adam Finestone
Darin E. Neufeld
Natalie M. Roderick
Nicholle N. Wright

Northern
Monica F. Altmair
Katherine H. Caradec
Valerie J. Conant
Matthew M. Davis
Gary Helfrich
Thalia Leng
Stephen C Marshall
Christina Paul
Prakash Pinto
Christopher M. Sensenig
Tim M. Sullivan
Zhongping Xu

Inland Empire
Anna Rahtz

The California Chapter had a total of 66 planners who sat for the November 2012 AICP Exam. Of those, the 42 people listed above passed, which represents a 64% pass rate. Nationally, a total of 500 applicants sat for the November 2012 Exam, with 315 passing the exam, equaling a pass rate of 63%. Congratulations to our newest candidate AICP members!