

# INTEGRATED REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT CASE STUDIES

---

## SIERRA BUSINESS COUNCIL

---

### Planning for Prosperity

#### 1. Initiative Description

*Planning for Prosperity: Building Successful Communities in the Sierra Nevada* was published by the SBC as a reference guide to help Sierra Nevada communities plan for their own future wisely and effectively. The reference guide centers on 16 principles for sound growth and development. It also contains 28 case studies from around the country, 50 photographs of key planning concepts and success stories, a public opinion poll of 1,000 registered voters in the region and summaries of current general plans in 12 Sierra Nevada communities. The summaries are an assessment of each plan's consistency with the *Planning for Prosperity Principles*.

#### 2. Why did you undertake this initiative?

As a new business organization committed to securing the long-term economic environmental health of the Sierra Nevada, it was clear that one of the most important arenas for us would be land use. We wanted to establish a new framework for growth and development, one that would break through the polarized debate of Growth versus No-Growth and identify ways to accommodate growth while protecting the scenic, natural, and historic assets which draw capital to our region. We wanted to drive home the message that effective land-use planning is the best investment we can make for our region's financial security.

#### 3. Why did you design it the way you did?

We designed *Planning for Prosperity* to be easily understood by business people, planning commissioners, elected officials, and lay people who are not steeped in the technical aspects of planning. We packed the report with case studies and key contacts for additional information to help validate the efforts of planning staff and others pushing innovative land-use planning solutions. We also used color graphics to emphasize the concept of compact rural design in order to help people understand the problems associated with rural residential sprawl. Finally, we included the public opinion poll to help county supervisors and others understand the depth of public support for these concepts.

#### 4. Whom did you include and why?

We recruited an advisory committee to oversee the project. The committee was chaired by the head of the Lake Tahoe Gaming Alliance and consisted of Sierra Business Council members, including small business owners, a downtown merchant, a manufacturer, an architect, a rancher, a farmer, an attorney, and

a local banker. Committee members served as the lead spokespeople when we released the report to the media.

As the reference guide developed, we took time out to meet and interview the planning directors from the 12 Sierra Nevada counties. We also asked for their feedback on drafts. This helped to ensure that the reference guide would be a useful educational tool for planning staff and also fostered SBC's relationship with county governments throughout the region.

We also had a group of planning professionals, key business leaders, developers, and environmentalists from around the country peer-review the reference guide to ensure we were taking advantage of the very best concepts in rural planning.

### **5. What have been the most important results?**

Communities throughout the region have been using *Planning for Prosperity* to help guide local planning decisions. We are also gaining a reputation in the region as a reliable source of information, staffing, and strategic advice on how to tackle planning challenges. *Planning for Prosperity* also provided an intellectual framework for us to launch a series of pilot projects in the Sierra, including the Inyo County Vision 2020 Forum, the Placer Legacy project, and SBC's Working Landscapes Initiative.

### **6. What have you learned about how to do this right?**

Once the reference guide was released to the media and the public, SBC "took the show on the road." A critical part of the roll out strategy was a thirty-minute slide presentation made to over fifty different audiences in the region, including all of the county boards of supervisors and planning commissions. It helped to keep the concept of sustainable growth alive in the region and planted seeds in local communities for future collaborations with SBC.

We also learned that it was important to find ways to bolster the good intentions of planning staff by coordinating with them ahead of time on content and message. We spent more money on design and graphics than we had initially anticipated, but the visual impact of the guide has proven to be effective.

We paid close attention to the language and message of the guide. It was important that *Planning for Prosperity* convey the economic importance of land-use planning in a way that would resonate with Sierra Nevada residents. It had to be factual yet descriptive, optimistic about opportunities but compelling about planning choices and consequences.

### **7. What are the most relevant implications for other regions?**

*Planning for Prosperity* has served as a model for other organizations interested in launching regional planning efforts. It has also been used as a reference guide by rural communities from Montana to Maui,

Hawaii and by business leaders interested in giving voice to their concerns about growth and development.

---

# TRI-VALLEY BUSINESS COUNCIL

---

## Regional Vision Project

### 1. Initiative Description

Our initiative is to develop a Vision for the Tri-Valley Region in the year 2010. The objective is to develop a proactive plan for the proper balance between economic vitality and quality of life. We want the region to choose and shape its destiny rather than have it be determined by outside forces. We want to develop a positive and achievable plan based on the values and desires of Tri-Valley residents.

### 2. Why did you undertake this initiative?

The Region is enjoying economic prosperity and growth. There has been uncertainty and concern about how much growth can be experienced before quality of life diminishes. Growth versus No-growth elements have developed and the battles rage. In recent years, legal disputes had become common between the cities and between cities and counties. Regional perspective was missing. We felt it was very important to bring the Region together to define a plan that responds to issues and concerns and come to agreement on the desired future and actions to make those desires a reality.

### 3. Why did you design it the way you did?

We wanted to involve as many people as possible in drafting the Vision so that we had divergent views represented and considered. Also, we wanted to have Action Committees formed as the Values and Principles for Action were being developed by the Leadership Team. We used the Committee Volunteers as an at-large Advisory Group to meet and consider the themes of the Leadership Group and provide feedback and input. Currently, the Vision Draft is being presented to the Community, and the Action Committees are meeting to determine actions required to achieve the vision and prioritize these actions. This combined effort will enable us to announce and publicize the final version of the Vision and the first-year Action Plans at the same time.

### 4. Whom did you include and why?

Our 50-person Leadership Team consisted of business leaders, elected and staff officials of our local and county governments, educators, environmentalists, community leaders, and residents. We wanted as many viewpoints as possible. Also, since local and regional government was going to be very involved in the implementation of the Vision, we felt they should be involved in its formation and “buy-in” to the plan and guidelines.

### 5. What have been the most important results?

We won't release the final version until October 1999, so we don't have specific results at this time. One initial result was the rapid agreement on values and the desired future between people with varied

backgrounds and interests between and Growth/No-growth views. There still may be disputes on how to get there, but there is common agreement on the future, and people have come together quickly to plan for it. The initiative provided a vehicle for this process.

#### **6. What have you learned about how to do this right?**

The process led by Collaborative Economics guided us through the Vision development in the right manner. I believe you need to know the personality of your region and how the various key players fit into the process; it is important to know who to include and exclude. Our region called for inclusion of everyone but this may not work everywhere. Also, it is important that the entire team stay with the process. Certain people fight the process and want to move to results. You need to keep them involved, interested, and committed. Otherwise, chaos will result.

#### **7. What are the most relevant implications for other regions?**

It seems that the Vision process brings a perspective and language to regional leaders. Recognizing that each region is distinct, the Vision experience helps place us on common ground. Just as the Tri-Valley cities and counties are now coming together with our Vision, other regions may be able to come together on area vision and how to impact state actions. Region-to-region collaborations are based upon an understanding of planned futures.

**The Landscape of Choice****1. Initiative Description**

The Landscape of Choice “Strategies for Improving Patterns of Growth” was created by the Growth Alternatives Alliance. Its objective is to provide a set of principles that can be used as a blueprint for land-use planning decisions in Fresno County. The document is a tool to increase awareness of land-use issues, provide a framework for discussions among the various stakeholders and focus attention on the long-term consequences of choices made today.

**2. Why did you undertake this initiative?**

The Central Valley is one of the most productive agricultural areas in the world. It is also projected to have explosive population growth in the next few decades. The inner city of Fresno has been experiencing steady deterioration. In order to address all of these issues and build consensus around a mutually agreeable direction, key stakeholders jointly crafted a document to provide guidance for citizens and elected officials throughout the County of Fresno.

**3. Why did you design it the way you did?**

The project was designed to spark broad interest on land-use issues by providing a document to be used as an educational resource. Now, decision makers have a tool to use when making tough land-use decisions and a generally agreed upon rationale to back them up.

**4. Whom did you include and why?**

The members of the Alliance include: The American Farmland Trust, The Fresno County Farm Bureau, The Fresno Chamber of Commerce, The Building Industry Association of the San Joaquin Valley, and the Fresno Business Council. While there is some crossover in terms of constituency, each organization serves a different mission and represents key stakeholders in the community. By demonstrating that diverse interests can reach agreement and collaborate on important issues, the Alliance hoped to create an environment where policy makers would adhere to good land-use planning principles.

**5. What have been the most important results?**

All 15 cities in the County and the County itself have endorsed the principles in The Landscape of Choice. Many smaller newspapers and the Fresno Bee have published supportive editorials. The Fresno Bee has assigned one of its strongest writers to a land-use beat. Public awareness of the complexity and importance of land-use choices has increased tremendously. Time will tell whether or not principles can outweigh fiscalization of land-use influences. In general, the Alliance has helped to change the civic culture in the community from one where most groups worked in isolation, often competing with each

other, to a culture where many organizations and individuals have recognized that collaboration is the path to sustainable solutions and the effective leveraging of resources.

**6. What have you learned about how to do this right?**

A key lesson learned is the importance of trust, relationships, and leadership. The leaders in the Alliance are clearly bridgebuilders who were willing to risk traditional comfort zones for the betterment of the community as a whole. While trust-based relationships take time to establish, they provide a springboard to future collaborations and a foundation for sustainability. And while principles provide the core values for collaboration, personalities provide the inspiration and the glue.

**7. What are the most relevant implications for other regions?**

There are both substantive and process implications for other regions. Obviously, land use is a timely and critical issue all over the country. The Landscape of Choice provides principles easily adaptable to regions throughout the United States. In terms of process, the substantive issue provided a vehicle for our community to learn how to collaborate. The lessons from the process itself have helped to create a more collaborative environment, which supports other community projects.

---

# SACRAMENTO REGIONAL ACTION PARTNERSHIP

---

## Green Valley Initiative

### 1. Initiative Description

The Green Valley Initiative (GVI) was launched in 1998 as one of seven initiatives being implemented by the Sacramento Region Action Network. The Initiative is using a multi-stakeholder collaborative process to help provide for long-term regional open space needs, given the pressures of rapid population growth and the difficulties for existing public agencies and public/private activities to do so. The goal of the GVI is to achieve multi-jurisdictional, coordinated open space preservation for the six-county Region that meets a variety of public and private needs. The Initiative is establishing an ongoing structure to facilitate multiple jurisdictions and organizations in their collaborative efforts to preserve and enhance the region's open spaces. Other objectives include the creation of a "tool kit" to assist these jurisdictions and organizations, establishment of an accurate comprehensive regional information base, and identification of funding mechanisms that other entities could use to meet open space needs.

### 2. Why did you undertake this initiative?

The Sacramento region has been experiencing dramatic population growth and physical development, which is projected to continue over the next several decades. A collaborative regional project brought together leaders from key industry clusters, community leaders, and a grassroots outreach effort reaching more than 2,000 citizens across the region's six counties to identify priority issues that were important to the long-term health of the region.

Subsequently, during an 18-month issue development phase, protecting open space (habitat, recreational and agricultural lands) was identified as a significant quality-of-life and economic issue. The Sacramento region is not prepared to provide for adequate open space in the face of the rapid population growth forecast. Open space was determined to be important for keeping and attracting target businesses and employees to the region, and for maintaining community and cultural values relating to agriculture for area residents. A need for regional perspective was identified to ensure effective long-term open space preservation and to provide for communication or information-sharing among stakeholders.

### 3. Why did you design it the way you did?

GVI was created to develop a long-term, comprehensive regional strategy for open space preservation and enhancement encompassing agriculture, people space, and natural habitat. The region, based on the "economic region," was defined as the foothill and valley areas of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties. Recognizing that a broad range of stakeholders is committed to open space preservation, collaboration between traditionally competing interests was identified as critical to a successful regional effort.

The Sacramento region has experienced success in using a collaborative decision-making model for regional water planning (Sacramento Area Water Forum), and elements of this process were used to design a multi-stakeholder, volunteer-based workplan for GVI. GVI members are organized in groups of similar interests (agriculture, business/development, environmental, and public interests). Originally pioneered by Harvard University researchers, this group collaboration method requires participants to initially put aside their traditional demands and focus instead on the underlying reasons behind both their own and other stakeholder's concerns. This moves people beyond their "positions" to understanding "underlying interests." Once these interests are articulated, a group's ability to brainstorm creative approaches to our open space problems dramatically increases, and the participants as a group can begin to fashion solutions that simultaneously respect the needs of all the stakeholder interests.

#### **4. Whom did you include and why?**

We identified the broad range of stakeholders having interest in open space preservation and organized them into "caucuses" of similar interests: agriculture (ranching, farming and processing); business/development; environmental; and public interests. Drawing from a list of "Champions" from the Initiative and stakeholder interviews, we enlisted key leaders in each stakeholder area who have an open attitude, collaboration skills, ability to review and analyze technical materials, and a willingness to commit the time to meet regularly and do their homework.

Whereas the geographic area and number of stakeholder groups is too large for direct representation, the GVI members have agreed to represent the interests of their caucus stakeholder groups. Members include farmers and ranchers, developers, builders and business representatives, environmentalists, UC Davis faculty, civic leaders, and public officials from throughout the six-county region. Local land trusts and conservancies are also represented by members in each caucus. Three co-chairs lead the GVI with backgrounds in agriculture, environmental planning, and development and public policy, under the guidance of the Sacramento Region Action Network.

#### **5. What have been the most important results?**

GVI kicked off the collaborative process with a training session on collaborative decision-making. Members then completed a detailed questionnaire and analysis surveying the depth and scope of the need to work on regional open space/agricultural land preservation issues. Throughout the spring and summer of 1999, GVI participants shared their issues and interests, and identified 19 Draft Principles to guide the development of measures that will implement GVI objectives. These, along with the "Issues and Interests Statements" of each stakeholder group, will be distributed for public review and comment on a new Web page, and presented at a GVI Master Briefing for project stakeholders and champions in October, 1999. A resource publication, *Open Space in the Sacramento Region: A Profile of the Organizations and Agencies Working to Preserve and Enhance Our Region's Agricultural, Recreational and Natural Lands*, will also be distributed at that time.

Three Action Teams have been formulated to meet GVI objectives. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments is a new partner on the Information Base Team in developing a comprehensive regional open space information base, which should be in full implementation by the end of the year. A Funding/Structure Team is identifying an ongoing “governance” structure and potential new funding sources for regional open space efforts. A Regional Needs Team is hosting a series of education sessions, and maintains the community outreach process, which consists of roving meeting locations and guest lunches. This team will go through an intensive research, education, and negotiation process to develop some kind of guidance package/tool kit for promoting regional open space preservation.

A key result, based on some of the inherent distrust between interests, is the fact that everyone is still at the table. The process made leaders sit down and think about what their underlying issues and interests are, and put them on paper to educate each other. Concerns and fears and distrusts were aired, put into appropriate context, and the reasons why interests were important to each group were fully explored. Participants were pleased to discover there was more agreement than people expected; they became comfortable with the understanding that some issues would remain outside the “zone of agreement” and would have to be handled in another venue.

#### **6. What have you learned about how to do this right?**

We have learned that it is critical to include the full range of stakeholder interests, even when there is distrust and animosity. The collaborative process provides a path to identifying and taking action on areas of agreement, and a respect for the interests behind areas of disagreement. Maintaining open communication, putting time and energy into identifying and writing out issues and interests, having each caucus educate each other about those interests, and having meaningful dialogue about areas of agreement provides a strong foundation for developing solutions. Without clear eminent threats (the “burning river”), this process allows disparate groups to see where they agree and to generate long-term solutions to pending problems.

One challenge was balancing the need to educate and build this foundation of trust with the need to take action to keep people engaged and committed. Once the areas of agreement were identified, it gave us the basis to finalize clear objectives. Rather than continue with a lengthy education process, we reorganized into action teams designed to meet objectives on different timelines. This is designed to give us continued successes and create “products” to keep participants motivated and acknowledged for their efforts.

#### **7. What are the most relevant implications for other regions?**

GVI provides a model of how a group of volunteers/civic entrepreneurs from the full range of stakeholder interests can collaborate on a regional basis to preserve open space, crossing multiple jurisdictional

boundaries. With relatively little funding, success can be achieved based on identified areas of agreement, respectfully agreeing to disagree on some issues that will be left to the political process. GVI is a model for identifying gaps in the compendium of local and non-profit efforts to preserve open space, and taking action to ensure the gaps are filled and the region's needs are met, regardless of political boundaries. GVI also proves that there doesn't need to be a "burning river" to get a committed group of individuals to take action for their region's future.

---

## SANTA BARBARA ECONOMIC COMMUNITY PROJECT

---

### The South Coast Simulation Model Project

#### 1. Initiative Description

The South Coast of Santa Barbara County is a narrow coastal plain stretching from Rincon Point at the Ventura County line to Gaviota State Park, bounded on the north by the Santa Ynez Mountains and to the south by the Pacific Ocean. The South Coast Simulation Model Project (Model Project) will establish a framework for developing long-term regional land-use and transportation policies that sustain a robust economy while preserving a high quality of life throughout Santa Barbara County. The Model Project will develop several new modeling elements and integrate them into existing models/programs to develop a cohesive simulation model. The Model Project will evaluate the impacts of both specific and general land-use alternatives on: traffic congestion, regional population growth, regional commute patterns, the availability/cost of housing, local government finances, business and investment patterns, and the area's social/environmental resources.

#### 2. Why did you undertake this initiative?

In the past, the South Coast has been the setting for numerous campaigns between growth advocates and environmental activists. The result has been a political pendulum swinging one way and then another. How the South Coast has chosen to use the land over the years has been a direct result of this swinging pendulum rather than through an evaluation of the beneficial or negative effects of cumulative land-use and transportation decisions on the quality of life in the South Coast. Furthermore, there has been recent recognition that the traditional planning process implemented on the South Coast has done little to promote the quality of growth the community expected.

The Santa Barbara Region Economic Community Project's (ECP) mission is to engage all segments of the community in a collaborative process to ensure an environment that is supportive of high-value, high-wage businesses central to the economic vitality and quality of life of the South Coast. In an effort to implement these goals, while maintaining regional environmental standards, the ECP developed the Model Project.

#### 3. Why did you design it the way you did?

The Santa Barbara Region Economic Community Project has, for the past two years, facilitated a dialogue among government, business and technology, environmental and neighborhood groups in the South Coast about the relationships between traffic congestion, land use, quality of life, a strong economy, and sound planning. All parties agree that these issues are strongly interrelated. As a group, they have developed four regional Principles to guide future planning efforts.

The Model Project has been undertaken to address these Principles and foster an environment where specific elements of the Principles can be achieved. Improved regional modeling, however, will not itself be "the answer" for this area. Nonetheless, as a key element of the process, the Model Project will offer the region a critical tool for quantitative and qualitative data evaluation. Integrating the Model Project into the larger regional planning framework dramatically improves the chances of creating a genuine, sustained infrastructure/business/housing balance.

#### **4. Whom did you include and why?**

Community members who have played a vital role in developing the Model Project include researchers from the University of California, local agency staff, elected officials, and members of the general public. Furthermore, a leadership advisory task force has been assembled to formalize the community-input process.

#### **5. What have been the most important results?**

To date, the effort to assemble the regional Geographic Information System (GIS) has proven to be the Model Project's most widely acclaimed project achievement. Until the ECP, through the University of California Santa Barbara, began integrating various data sources, there was no comprehensive, searchable GIS for Santa Barbara County. Today, there are numerous publicly available GIS coverages, both countywide and specific to the South Coast. These coverages have already proven useful to local agency staff and regional research efforts.

#### **6. What have you learned about how to do this right?**

Outreach efforts have been an integral element of the Model Project. A computer model will not tell a region anything about its future until the community has told the model developers where the community has come from and where it hopes to go. By involving numerous segments of the community, both politically and financially, the Model Project could provide an analytical tool to evaluate and visualize the impacts of significant land use and transportation decisions and investments. The Model Project could lead to a more complete understanding on the part of decision makers, interest groups, and the general public, of the links between travel behavior, environmental impacts, economic activity, demographics and housing stock needs.

#### **7. What are the most relevant implications for other regions?**

This project has made it clear that regional initiatives, such as the Model Project, should be developed through a robust public participation process. Before a community tackles issues of social and environmental modeling, a clear and comprehensive vision must be engendered. This vision should not be generated by one segment of the community; rather, it should be the product of a complete participatory process. With community-wide input, regional efforts to track social and environmental indicators become more meaningful. As the community calls for indicator prediction, modeling efforts

can, and possibly should, be initiated. Finally, while a computer model or GIS is a valuable tool, which can facilitate the resource allocation and planning process, it is only a tool. That is, the Model Project is not intended to be a device that short-circuits the political process; instead it is a tool that can facilitate that process, ultimately leading to better decision-making and sound land-use practices.

**Placer Legacy****1. Initiative Description**

SBC is partnering with Placer County to develop a comprehensive, science-based plan to protect open space in the County. When completed, Placer Legacy will provide the county with three important products:

- The identification of types of land areas and specific places that should be protected as open space
- A plan to protect and manage important open space lands. Where appropriate, the plan will provide regulatory coverage for sensitive species
- A financing plan to ensure implementation of the overall program.

**2. Why did you undertake this initiative?**

One of the most disturbing findings in *Planning for Prosperity*, the Sierra Business Council’s reference guide to rural land-use planning, is that county governments in the Sierra are doing little, if anything, to integrate planning for habitat protection with planning for human settlement. If this practice continues, the prospects for maintaining both healthy natural communities and healthy human communities may be unnecessarily and irrevocably lost.

Without a working model of how to integrate human and natural systems on the landscape, local governments will continue to ignore the needs of natural communities until a crisis arises. SBC was looking for a pilot project that would demonstrate how to plan for and finance the “green infrastructure” that contributes to species health and also makes our region such a wonderful place to live and to do business.

**3. Why did you design it the way you did?**

In order to ensure the County remained in the driver’s seat for the program, Placer Legacy is designed to implement the open space policies of the Placer County General Plan by protecting open space in order to do the following:

- Preserve the diversity of plant and animal communities
- Protect endangered and other special status plant and animal species
- Maintain a viable agricultural segment of the economy
- Conserve natural features necessary for access to a variety of outdoor recreation opportunities.

We believe this locally-driven approach, which anticipates the needs of natural communities and coordinates the resources of state and federal agencies, is the only way to ensure the long-term survival of species and other quality-of-life amenities associated with open space.

#### **4. Whom did you include and why?**

*Citizen Advisory Committee:* The Board of Supervisors appointed an eleven-member Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to oversee the development of the plan. The CAC consists of representatives from various interests in the County including business, environment, building and development, and agriculture. The CAC meets monthly and provides a critical communication link between Placer Legacy and the public, facilitating public forums and providing feedback to and from various constituent groups.

*Scientific Working Group:* A five-member Scientific Working Group, chaired by a conservation biologist from the University of Nevada, Reno, is advising Placer County on how best to meet its habitat and species protection goals. The Scientific Working Group meets periodically to advise staff and other consultants as the program develops.

*Interagency Working Group:* The role of the Inter-Agency Working Group (IAWG) is to review and provide input to Placer Legacy to ensure that it meets federal and state regulations, as well as city/county needs regarding endangered species, wetlands, flood plains, and other important habitats. Members of the IAWG include staff from state and federal agencies with the authority to approve or deny HCP and NCCP programs, and in some cases, those agencies which have an interest in coordinating their land-management programs with Placer County (e.g., US Forest Service).

#### **5. What have been the most important results?**

*Data Collection:* Placer Legacy has already given a tremendous boost to Placer County's natural resource planning capacity. The county planning department is now the hub for the very best GIS data regarding natural communities in Placer County. This has deepened the department's commitment to regional resource planning and will soon strengthen the County's ability to integrate day-to-day land-use planning decisions with its broader open space conservation goals.

*Engaging the Public:* To introduce the public to Placer Legacy, SBC organized a series of Open Space Forums last November in seven locations across the county. Over 350 county residents attended the Forums, which were structured to encourage interaction. Participants broke up into small groups to discuss their interest in protecting open space. Each group was led by a team of two facilitators drawn from the Placer Legacy Citizen Advisory Committee and SBC's own Sierra Leadership Seminar (SLS). Participants identified special places they wished to see protected.

The GIS maps developed for Placer Legacy include a layer showing sites that Forum participants marked as valued open spaces. The Forums provided a critical opportunity to increase public awareness about Placer Legacy and to demonstrate the public's interest in the issue to the Board of Supervisors.

In addition to forums, SBC worked with the County to produce the first issue of the Placer Legacy newsletter to keep Placer County residents informed about the program. The color newsletter is currently distributed to more than 8,000 interested households in the county, and the mailing list continues to grow.

This summer, the Citizen Advisory Committee was divided into three work teams to help identify priorities for protecting open space. The work teams are: 1) Biological Resources, 2) Agricultural Resources and Public Safety, and 3) Recreation, Community Edges and Scenic/Historic Resources. Each work team has been meeting monthly with the public to develop objectives and to discuss strategies for protection of their resource type. The target is to have base maps that identify key open space resources. The base maps and objectives will be used by our staff and the county this fall to develop countywide conservation priorities and candidate strategies for protecting open space.

## **6. What have you learned about how to do this right?**

Take advantage of opportunities to engage in public-private partnerships

Establish goals and define individual roles early in the process. Develop a timeline that includes target dates for deliverables and key decision-making points, and make sure everyone from the public to the Board of Supervisors members are aware of it as it develops

Engage the Citizen Advisory Committee in a meaningful way early in the process and encourage them to keep checking in with their own constituencies

Keep the Board of Supervisors informed regularly through informal communications and through joint workshops with the CAC.

## **7. What are the most relevant implications for other regions?**

By taking an integrated approach to open space planning now, before the next wave of population surges into the county, Placer Legacy is setting a new standard for county governments throughout the Sierra and California. If successful, Placer Legacy will serve as a model for other counties in the area and elsewhere in the nation which are prepared to take a proactive approach to habitat protection, even as they accommodate new growth and development.

---

## **BAY AREA ALLIANCE FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

---

### **Bay Area Livability Footprint**

#### **1. Initiative Description**

The Bay Area Livability Footprint (Footprint) is an initiative to inform and foster participation in discussions and decisions about planning for the future of the Bay Area. Through this Initiative, the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Development, a multi-stakeholder coalition, is bringing together leaders who represent the “Three Es”—Economy, Environment, and Equity — stimulating and informing discussion among these diverse interests about a livable, sustainable Bay Area, and creating tools to inform planning decisions at all levels. The Footprint will use geographic information systems (GIS) and other information tools so that complex data can be integrated and analyzed, creating a shared information base that can be used widely in the Bay Area for planning and analysis.

#### **2. Why did you undertake this initiative?**

As jobs and population grow and change, many questions face Bay Area citizens, workers and decision makers about how the Bay Area can be a livable and sustainable area. How can the region be thriving and healthy: economically, environmentally, and socially? The Bay Area Alliance initiated the Livability Footprint to analyze alternatives for how the San Francisco/Oakland/San Jose Bay Area can meet its housing needs in the future to enhance the economy, environment, and social equity. The tools and shared information base will enable the region to understand itself as a whole and to understand the impacts of local choices on the region. The Footprint is also being designed to foster discussion on what that information base contains and how individuals and groups can use such information, as well as to increase the dialogue and understanding between the “Three E’s” and the government about planning a future for the Bay Area.

#### **3. Why did you design it the way you did?**

The Livability Footprint is designed to provide the information required to make the kind of planning and investments decisions that will enable the Bay Area to be a livable and sustainable region. While ultimately being designed to inform decision making at the local and regional levels, there will be implications for the operation of federal and state programs and agencies as well.

The Livability Footprint contains three analyses identified as high priority in the region: Jobs-Housing Footprint, Community Stability, and Environmental Quality. To start, the project has focused on the Jobs-Housing Footprint to look at the capacity for the region to accommodate new households as population and jobs grow, and the capability of the region to accommodate those new households near jobs. In this analysis, economic, social and environmental factors are being integrated in order to consider the constraints and opportunities they offer for future housing capacity and configuration. For

example, financial feasibility of multi-family development in the local and regional market are being considered, as are impacts on impoverished neighborhoods and the natural resources, open space, wetlands, and ecosystems. As the Jobs-Housing Footprint analysis begins to integrate these concerns, linkages will be made to the Community Stability and Environmental Quality analyses.

#### **4. Whom did you include and why?**

The main project participants now include leaders from the economic community, environmental community, and social equity community, as well as government agency representatives. In order to meaningfully consider the “Three Es,” it is critical to include individuals from all sectors. At these initial stages, the project is relying on these individuals and their networks to develop project methods and work plans. In the future, the project will seek broader input and participation to steer its course and share information and findings. Local governments will be key participants as regional analyses are tailored and refined at the local level.

#### **5. What have been the most important results?**

The Livability Footprint has made important progress already by bringing together diverse interests for the early discussions on what the Livability Footprint can be and do, and by building support for the initiation of the project. Technically, the most progress has been made on building the integrated database for the Job-Housing Footprint analysis and developing methods for analyzing the data. Property data for the nine-county Bay Area, economic data, social data, and environmental data have been statistically analyzed and are being integrated into a GIS. A technical team has developed a method to identify the most potentially developable or redevelopable land. The team has also created multiple scenarios for determining the quantity and configuration of housing on that land considering financial feasibility, land-use compatibility, access to transit and jobs, changes in impoverished neighborhoods, and various residential densities.

#### **6. What have you learned about how to do this right?**

In these early stages, the team members are learning that doing this project “right” means remaining flexible and dedicated to further input, many rounds of changes, ongoing sharing of progress and findings, and broadening of participation over time. In such a collaborative effort, it has also been important *not* to become stalled by trying to address every concern in every stage at every time. Instead, ideas such as the current Jobs-Housing methods and scenarios are worked through, discussed, and then changed and expanded. Additionally, it has been important to create the information base and tools in ways that are transparent and flexible so that the information and analyses will be clear, flexible, and accessible.

#### **7. What are the most relevant implications for other regions?**

As the Bay Area Livability Footprint progresses, the analyses are very relevant to other regions, as housing, access, jobs, economy, environment, and equity pay relatively little heed to jurisdictional lines.

The Bay Area will need to share its analyses with other regions, such as Silicon Valley, to foster collaboration, build communication, and contribute to more informed decisions about how the larger region will use land, share economic communities, share in meeting housing needs, share in protecting natural resources—in short, how the larger region can be livable.

**Smart Public Investments and the California Economy**

Steve Levy will release his new report, *Smart Public Investments and the California Economy: Information and Analysis for Infrastructure Planning*, commissioned by Californians and the Land, at the session, “How to Promote Smart Investments in California Regions.” The following is the Foreword from the report.

**FOREWORD**

The resurgence of California’s economy since 1995 has refocused broad public attention on the infrastructure needed to support the State’s continued economic prosperity and quality of life.

This spotlight on the state’s infrastructure comes at a critical juncture in California’s history. Years of under-investment have placed the state in a precarious position. Parks and public facilities are overcrowded and in poor repair. Roads are at over capacity during commute hours. Inadequate protection of open space, water and other natural resources has caused the loss of important birds, fish, and other wildlife. Schools were short of classroom space even before class-size reductions created more demand, and this is the state’s condition before more people are added to the population.

**There is now widespread recognition that the decisions California makes in the next decade about investments in both its physical and environmental infrastructure will be a key determinant in the state’s future economic prosperity in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.**

The reason is found in the 1998 report on *Land Use and the California Economy: Principles for Prosperity and Quality of Life*. Commissioned by Californians and the Land and authored by the Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy (CCSCE), the Land Use report concluded that a high quality of life is a critical determinant in attracting entrepreneurs and workers to the state’s leading wage industries.

Firms and employees in these valued industries have choices about where to locate. They can and do demand good schools, clean air and water, efficient transportation, open space, excellent public services, and great recreational, environmental, and cultural amenities—in short, a high quality of life. Increased investments in the physical and environmental infrastructure which provide these services was one of the five key principles identified by CCSCE for improving California’s land-use decision-making and quality of life.

Since the release of CCSCE’s Land Use report, there has been a surge of published projections for “how much” money needs to be invested in public infrastructure. While the cost estimates vary widely, there is

broad agreement that the state faces billions of dollars in new infrastructure investments to correct present shortages as well as to provide for future growth.

There has also been a surge in efforts to develop a statewide infrastructure investment planning process. Bond measures and other proposals to provide immediate infrastructure funding are under active discussion. New initiatives to develop a comprehensive state plan for capital investment are moving forward under the leadership of the California Governor, State Treasurer, State Legislators, and non-governmental organizations such as the Business Roundtable.

Responding to this renewed level of interest, Californians and the Land requested CCSCE to prepare a follow-up to the *Land Use and the California Economy* report to focus on public infrastructure investment planning. CCSCE was asked to address three major issues from an economist's perspective:

- What are the critical gaps in the information and analysis needed for public infrastructure planning?
- What cost-effective approaches to meeting infrastructure need should be considered in a public investment strategy?
- What economic criteria should be used to determine how much funding to invest in public infrastructure?

The bottom line identified by CCSCE is that California **can** afford and the state's economy **will** require more investment in its parks, schools and other capital facilities. The state must catch up on past maintenance of its current infrastructure.

However, these funds come directly from taxpayers and are not unlimited. The current competition for public dollars must give way to a more thoughtful planning process that anticipates the state's real needs. The future of California's economy depends upon its ability to make the right decisions and to avoid the waste of billions of dollars on the wrong infrastructure.

The conclusion is inescapable. California has before it an enormous opportunity to weave a better land-use fabric for all the state's residents. To be successful, California must significantly increase the information and analysis on which these critical decisions will be made.