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A New Approach

- For a variety of political and institutional reasons, California seems unable to come to grips with its long term growth and growth planning needs.

- The 1960s (with the California Water Project, the State Education Plan, Interstate Highway construction, and BART) really were unique in their breadth of vision of the future.

- A New Approach: Looking Back, Planning Forward: Develop “reasonable” scenarios of population and urban growth through 2020, 2050 and even 2100; and then look backward to see what we should do today.
Outline

- **Looking Back**: Business-as-Usual Development Projections for the Inland Empire
- **Planning Forward**
  - What Works? Lessons from the West Coast
  - Where to Start?
How Many Californians?
10 Million New Californians Every Generation
California’s Growing Population: Components of Change, 1940-2000

Population Change in thousands


Natural Increase (000)  Migration (000)
How Many Californians Where?
Modeling & Projecting Urban Growth Locations

CALIBRATION PHASE
A. Calibrate Historical Urban Growth Model
B. Project Future Development Probabilities by Site

FORECASTING PHASE
1. Project County-level Population Growth
2. Subtract Projected Infill and Redevelopment Shares
3. Project Future Growth Allocation Densities
4. Allocate Projected County Greenfield Population Growth to Sites in Order of Development Probability
5. Update Key Variables and Iterate
Which Factors Explain Patterns of Urban Development Where:
A Statistical Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable [and expected coefficient sign]</th>
<th>Southern California Regional Model St. Estimate</th>
<th>Northern California Regional Model St. Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DV: Within incorporated city. [+ ]</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to freeway (km) [- ]</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional job accessibility [+ ]</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Regional Income Ratio, 1989</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV: Prime Farmland [- ]</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV: Floodzone [- ]</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site slope [-]</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. 1x Neighbor Slope</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. 2-3x Nbr. Slope</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. 1x Neighbor Floodzone</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. 2-3x Nbr. Floodzone</td>
<td>Not entered</td>
<td>-.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County DV (highest)</td>
<td>.13 (S. Barbara)</td>
<td>.13 (S. Cruz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County DV (lowest)</td>
<td>-.01 (S. Bernardino)</td>
<td>-.07 (Solano)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct. Correct Predictions</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Densities Generally Increase with Urban Development
Southern California 2000 – 2100
Population Projections by County

Source: California Dept. of Finance (2000-2040); UC Berkeley (2040-2100)
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An Incomplete Story: All This Assumes….

1. California’s population will continue growing at historical rates as a function of continued immigration and natural increase. ⇒ *Shouldn’t rates tail off more sharply as California fills up?*

2. Average infill shares and population densities will increase with additional development ⇒ *Won’t increased opposition to development lead to reduced infill and densities?*

3. Jobs will keep decentralizing.

4. Infill shares and allocation densities are county-wide, do not vary within counties. ⇒ *They should and will.*
An Incomplete Story

5. Long-term development probabilities based on 10 years of experience (1988-98) ⇒ Future will resemble the past.

6. Planning and regulatory framework assumed not to change. ⇒ It will, but HOW?

7. No new infrastructure investments (freeways, high-speed rail, mass transit, water and sewer systems). ⇒ Much more will be needed, and developed.

In sum, these are scenarios, not projections
Prime Farmlands by Region and Losses due to Projected Urban Growth, 1998-2100

Source: UC Berkeley analysis of CFMMP data
Grazing Lands by Region and Losses due to Projected Urban Growth, 1998-2100

Source: UC Berkeley analysis of CFMMP data
Habitat Lands with TESA Scores of 50 or Higher by Region, and Losses due to Projected Urban Growth, 1998-2100 (TESA scores vary between 0 and 66)

Source: UC Berkeley analysis of GAP & WHR data
Average Prime Farmland Patch Size (ha) by Region, 1998-2000

Source: UC Berkeley
Average Grazing Land Patch Size (ha) by Region, 1998-2000

Source: UC Berkeley
### Projected Urban Growth Threats to Environmental Landscapes by Region, 1998-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Southern California</th>
<th>San Francisco Bay Area</th>
<th>San Joaquin Valley</th>
<th>Sacramento Region</th>
<th>Central Coast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime Farmland</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; Local Farmland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Farmland</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing Lands</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsides</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESA Habitat &gt;= 10</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESA Habitat &gt;=30</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESA Habitat &gt;=50</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Forward: How Can the Inland Empire Avoid a Future as “Sprawlville,” and Still be Affordable

1. **Lessons from the Bay Area**: Uncoordinated local planning + NIMBYISM = High housing prices and long commutes

2. **Lessons from San Diego and San Jose (1970s and 1980s)**: Growth prioritization systems and appropriate UGBs can work.


4. **Lessons from Contemporary San Diego and the Central Coast**: Land conservancies, MSCP, and PDRs work, but they take time to set.

5. **Lessons from SF, Santa Monica, Portland, Vancouver & Seattle**: Private developers will do infill where there is a “nexus of value.”
Planning Forward: What Should “We” Be Striving For in the Inland Empire?

1. Conservation and enhancement of irreplaceable habitat and farmlands.
2. Increased development choices, particularly housing choices.
3. Renewed place-making through planned infill.
4. Improved corridor-based regional transportation improvements, and locally-based pedestrian transportation improvements.
5. Increased densities where appropriate.
Planning Forward: Where to Start?

1. Conservation and enhancement of irreplaceable habitat and farmlands.
   - Work with California Legacy Program and non-profits (e.g., TNC) to identify critical conservation areas.
   - Regional impact fees for habitat and land conservation (i.e. RCIP).
   - Coordinated open-space planning across jurisdictions.
   - Development prioritization systems (“future urbanizing”).
Planning Forward: Where to Start?

2. Increased development choices, particularly housing choices.
   • Infill/mixed-use specific plans tied to CEQA relief. [State action]
   • Mandatory inclusionary zoning [State action].
   • Increase redevelopment housing set-aside to 40% [State action]
   • Reinvigorated PUDs [Local action]
3. Renewed place-making through planned infill.

- **Regional Places**
  - Center: Cultural buildings linked to non-mall retail spaces linked to urban greenspace or meeting space; exemplary architecture. Example: Walnut Creek (75%)
  - Mixed-use structures, parking in structures, regional transit transfer point
  - ½-mile pedestrian texture

- **Town Center Places**
  - Center: Plazas linked to non-mall retail spaces, linked to public buildings. Example: Pleasant Hill (so-so).
  - Some housing over retail, parking in structures or at periphery; local transit transfer point
  - 1/4-mile pedestrian texture

- **Neighborhood Places**
  - Community shopping centers, schools, and recreational facilities at center; linked via pedestrian and bikeways; balance of on- and off-street parking.

→ Require urban design and site planning element to be added to local general plans.
Planning Forward: Where to Start?

4. Increased densities where appropriate (where traffic impacts can be mitigated)
   • Regional Places & Town Centers
   • Regional Transportation Corridors
   • As integral part of new MPCs.
Planning Forward: Where to Start?

5. “De-fiscalize” land use decisions. Take the Pledge:

“I will not reject otherwise good urban development, particularly housing, solely on dubious fiscal grounds.”