

Stephanie Pincetl
Director, Center for Sustainable Communities
Institute of the Environment and Sustainability
UCLA
May 13, 2014

Thank you for inviting me to comment on SB 375 today. My back ground is in urban planning and I work on urban environmental issues including urban metabolism which quantifies the energy, water, materials and other flows into cities, how these are used where and by whom, and the waste flows out. The urban metabolism approach is a sophisticated multidimensional platform that can integrate sociodemographic factors, parcel data like size and age of building, building shell as well as other factors such as transportation flows and embedded energy. Understanding the patterns of flows at a disaggregated level and their interaction allows the targeting of areas of the urban fabric and activities whose GHG emission and criteria pollutants can be reduced to ensure we are moving toward a more sustainable use of resources over time.

A quick word on my background. My main area of expertise has been land use. Writing my book, *Transforming California, a Political History of Land Use in the State* allowed me to understand the history of attempts to manage and to control urban growth, combat segregation and protect agricultural lands and habitat over the course of the 20th century. SB 375 is a major step in this historical interest and concern about how our communities and the **state** have grown.

Efforts to address urban growth really started under Pat Brown with his Metropolitan Government Commission that recommended state oversight over annexations and incorporations to guide orderly growth, and regional elected institutions to address cross jurisdictional issues such as water management, and land use. These failed due to opposition by local governments and the Chamber of Commerce. Fast forward 50 years and we are still confronting the fundamental tension – local control over local land use – exacerbated by deep challenges in financing programs due to Proposition 13, 26, 218. How do we move forward from here?

Clearly SB375 has played an important role in further explicitly connecting land use and transportation and their interwoven impacts on GHG emissions. It has heightened – again – awareness of a number of other externalities due to current land use such as high costs of infrastructure development to accommodate sprawl, inefficient land uses, segregation between rich and poor, and unnecessarily high water and other resource use. Yet we know that to achieve the goals of SB 375 by 2050, fundamental changes need to occur. And we know what those are.

Current urbanized areas must accommodate future growth, through significant changes in zoning and in the provision of affordable – more broadly defined -- housing. Jobs – as the recent PPIC report points out – need to be located where there is housing as well. Exurban or distant new office parks can no longer be permitted. Essentially a transformation of the urban fabric over time is what is called for. We have 40 years to do this to comply with SB 375, but the climate change that is taking place heightens the urgency to make more livable and resilient communities that use less resources overall and are built at a human scale.

I would suggest that the fundamental missing component is a candid acknowledgement of what, in old fashion terms, could be called “the land question.” Due to the price of real estate and current zoning regulations, affordability is an enormous problem, coupled with historic fear of mixed use and densification of neighborhoods. These have led to our doing a poor job of building *complete neighborhoods* that provide residents the ability to walk to basic services and to jobs, to integrate schools and community activities all within reach.

It is obvious that for our urban regions to reduce GHG emissions from transportation, they must be far less automobile dependent. Yet during the real estate bubble, and the far flung suburbanization that occurred, we have now an even greater challenge than before as land has been developed and people are stuck with mortgages that many still struggle to afford, far from services, jobs and schools and by and large devoid of basic services. Take the *NY Times* article on Saturday – one of many now -- about growing

poverty in the suburbs. Jobs are scarce, and transportation expensive. Suburbs are becoming the homes of low income people since many of the newer ones offered illusorily cheaper housing – drive to you quality – and now these places are traps, places where people are isolated and scrambling to survive. And land is still a speculative investment. This land use pattern must stop.

I can speak to the thirst for this land use from Los Angeles. Anywhere there is a small commercial strip – and not a strip mall – and decent housing, people are buying houses and apartments, hungry to walk to local services, driving real estate prices through the roof. There is simply not enough to meet demand. These are not TOD neighborhoods, they are ones with mixed densities and mixed use, quite the opposite of plunking a giant development down on a corner with expensive retail space that can only be afforded by chain brands. Such pressure on so few walkable and human scale neighborhoods shows that, transit oriented development is only one piece of the puzzle; its about increasing livability and access throughout the urban fabric. Greater overall densification and mixed use will make more of the urban region transit friendly. Imagine complete neighborhoods where -- like in Vancouver and older neighborhoods in SF and many of our cities in CA for that matter where land use patters were set pre-auto -- single family residences are mixed with modest apartment buildings and services: the dry cleaners, hair dresser, bank, neighborhood fresh food store, coffee shop and small restaurant we all crave. This will dramatically reduce – over time – automobile dependencies and create vibrant neighborhoods. But affordability is a big issue.

The following are several suggestions that go straight to the land question:

- Require GHG and CAP emissions estimations of new development compared to infill, including water provision, electricity and VMT impacts. A holistic accounting.
- The new General Plan Guidelines to include a complete neighborhoods element, neighborhoods where services such as dry cleaners, hair dressers, neighborhood stores and cafes, small parks and schools are within a ½ mile walking distance.

- RHNA reform to exclude building of housing isolated from transit, basic services and jobs.
- Develop a financing mechanism for city and housing land banking by state law to ensure affordability into the future and better control over land use for complete neighborhoods. We can create Development Corps like Civic SD a possible vehicle that could be given additional “powers” <http://www.ccdc.com/>
- School routes must have safe routes for walking and biking and personnel to administer and implement ~ to current crossing guards.
 - Consider using SB 39 funds to reduce GHG emissions from automobile trips to schools
- Reform zoning codes to require mixed use by state law
 - Encourage densification beyond TODs by encouraging neighborhood commercial hubs, more aggressive implementation of granny flat ordinances and multi-generational housing.
 - Develop community based engagement and decision making for location and mix of neighborhood serving commercial and fund with cap and trade funds. Great example of transition plan: <http://saha.org/Choice/Wheatley-Choice-Draft-Transformation-Plan.pdf>
 - Retrofit streets to be complete streets
- Address NIMBY challenges to TOD and other proposals by developing a coordinated statewide program to address the structural issues that favor opposition to change:
 - Create infrastructure finance districts that apply only to complete neighborhood proposals, or areas with a complete transit oriented neighborhoods. This should include complete streets.
 - Level the CEQA suit playing field by requiring greater transparency. Large developers can placate Home Owner Associations through payments. Small infill developers cannot.
- Reform and reduce parking requirements by state law

- Require urban limit lines for all communities, cities and counties. Require counties to justify community boundaries and boundary adjustments through LAFCO
- Develop strict criteria for new Service Districts such that they do not support development or new towns disconnected from existing urban areas, transit and jobs.

The state should fund pilot programs to engage communities in planning these neighborhood hubs, in conjunction with public/private development partners. Such hubs will add value to neighborhoods. Pick right first pilots through competitions, grants to communities.

There is so much more that we could discuss today, but I thank you for the opportunity to make some initial remarks. I believe we are ready for the changes we need to make not only to address the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but also to create beautiful, livable and vibrant neighborhoods. We built extraordinary cities and communities in the 20th century, based on seemingly limitless resources – land, fuel, water and materials. These were enormously successful, but today we have reached the limit of that paradigm in so many ways. We have the knowledge and the tools to shift the direction; we now need the leadership to mobilize the widespread desire that exists, to do so.