On behalf of the organizers and sponsors who put together Governments & Growth, I welcome you to the Georgia Tech campus for what we hope will be a stimulating and useful 2½ days. We’re thrilled to host an event that brings together local officials from throughout Georgia on such an important topic.

Change is a given in our cities and counties. We hope that you will leave the workshop with new ideas and new techniques for making the very best of that change. We have assembled a lineup of top names in the quality growth field to lead discussions and small-group sessions. We also have on hand a Georgia Department of Community Affairs advisory team, who will be working out of the CQGRD office next door. We invite you to stop by and see their work as it progresses between now and Friday, and discuss with them any issues of particular relevance to you.

This is the first of what we hope will be a series of workshops on quality growth and development for local officials. We want to make each workshop as useful as possible, so please share with us any thoughts you have during the course of your stay on what we’re doing well and what we might do better.

Sincerely,

Catherine J. Ross
Director
Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development
College of Architecture
Georgia Institute of Technology
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Governments & Growth Agenda

Note: DCA's Quality Growth Advisory Clinic will be operating at the Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development, **10:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, 8:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m. on Thursday, and 8:30 a.m.-10:00 a.m. on Friday** (except at lunch time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00-8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Continental Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 236</td>
<td>Dr. Thomas D. Galloway, Dean, College of Architecture, Georgia Tech;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Durrett, Urban Land Institute-Atlanta; Dr. Catherine Ross, Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development, Georgia Tech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Brainstorming: Three communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 236</td>
<td>Rick Brooks, Georgia Department of Community Affairs Quality Growth Advisory Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-10:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Floor Lounge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Case study: Covington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 236</td>
<td>Randy Vinson, Clark's Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 a.m.-Noon</td>
<td>Panel Discussion: Public Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 236</td>
<td>Moderator: Dr. Cheryl Contant, Georgia Tech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon-1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 132, Tech Square Research Building</td>
<td>Speaker: Steve Nygren, Chattahoochee Hill Country Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Panel Discussion: Land development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 236</td>
<td>Moderator: Ellen Keys, Jordan, Jones &amp; Goulding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panelists: Denise Brinson, Suwanee economic and community development manager; Lyn Menne, Decatur assistant city manager; Rick Porter, Richport Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-3:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Floor Lounge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15-4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Breakouts (Group I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrium</td>
<td>Sponsored by ULI-Atlanta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Continental Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Panel Discussion: Legal framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator: Kevin Green, Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panelists: Sharon Gay, McKenna, Long &amp; Aldridge; T. Michael Tennant,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alston &amp; Bird; Gerald L. Pouncey, Jr., Morris, Manning, &amp; Martin; T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Tennant, Alston &amp; Bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-9:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Breakouts (Group I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 a.m.-12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Breakouts (Group II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45-3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Breakouts (Group II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-3:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15-4:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Main topic: Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator: Catherine Ross, Georgia Tech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panelists: Michael Dobbins, Georgia Tech; Dan Reuter, Atlanta Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commission; Gary Cornell, Jordan, Jones &amp; Goulding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Optional self-guided tours of Tech Square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See page 43 for map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Continental Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Atrium</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Panel Discussion: Revenue issues, including cost of sprawl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator: Gregg Logan, Robert Charles Lesser &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panelists: Economic Development Director Emory Brock, Clayton County; Dr. Jeffrey Dorfman, University of Georgia; Larry Gellerstedt III, Gellerstedt Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-9:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Floor Lounge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:45 a.m.</td>
<td>General discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Floor Lounge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 a.m.-Noon</td>
<td>Wrapup - Georgia Department of Community Affairs Quality Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Breakout Sessions

Note: Breakout Sessions will be held in rooms 235, 236, 327, 334 and 130. Room assignments will be announced during the Land Development General Session.

Group 1
3:15 – 4:30 p.m. Wednesday, Nov. 17 & 9:45 – 11:00 a.m. Thursday, Nov. 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrianization</td>
<td>Charles Brewer, Green Street Properties; Sally Flocks, PEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School facilities and transportation</td>
<td>Stan Harvey, Urban College; Rob LeBeau, Atlanta Regional Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative smart growth methods</td>
<td>Mayor Ken Steele, Fayetteville; Alycen Whiddon, Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street design, connectivity and traffic calming</td>
<td>Jon Hoffman, Glatting Jackson Kercher Anglin Lopez Rinehart, Inc.; Eric Sundquist, Georgia Tech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 2
11:15 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. & 1:45 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Thursday, Nov. 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with state agencies and neighboring localities</td>
<td>Scotty Greene, Buckhead Community Improvement District; Alycen Whiddon, Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing success stories</td>
<td>Lynette Gross, Columbus Community Reinvestment; Cathy Williams, Columbus Housing Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with strip centers and big boxes</td>
<td>Mayor Steve Brown, Peachtree City; David Witt, Selig Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using green space programs for quality growth</td>
<td>Robert Barr, Carroll County Commission; Susan Kidd, Georgia Conservancy; James Langford, Trust for Public Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The right regulations to encourage quality growth</td>
<td>Gary Cornell, Jordan, Jones and Goulding; Larry Kaiser, Rockdale County Public Services and Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DCA's Quality Growth Advisory Clinic

About the Quality Growth Advisory Clinic

The Georgia Department of Community Affairs’ Quality Growth Advisory Clinic is an opportunity to participate in a hands-on workshop using techniques combined from Quality Growth Resource Team Visits and past Quality Growth Advisory Clinics. Participants can learn by being part of the process and help local communities at the same time. Attendees of the Governments and Growth Conference are welcome to visit the Quality Growth Hands-On Workshop workspace Wednesday and Thursday to view the process, ask questions of the team members, or volunteer of their time and expertise to a fast-paced, hands-on session with a multidisciplinary team of experts and local stakeholder group from three communities throughout the state of Georgia (refer to page no 11 for directions).

The Quality Growth Advisory Clinic will be operating at the Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development from 10:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, 8:30 p.m.-5:00 p.m. on Thursday and 8:30 a.m.-10:00 a.m. on Friday (except at lunch time).

Community Project Descriptions

Chickamauga (corridor focus)
Team members will look at an area of GA Hwy. 27 between the city of Chickamauga and the Chickamauga National Battle Field where commercial sprawl threatens to become the typical development pattern. Recommendations will be made to assist the city and county in retrofitting the current strip commercial development into more aesthetically pleasing quality growth development. Some of the issues include retrofit commercial strip development, streetscape improvements, and tourism linking the city to the battle field.

Flowery Branch (downtown focus)
Team members will look at a vacant parcel adjacent to the existing business district in order to develop recommendations on how the community can provide mixed-use development including retail, housing, and open space in the area to encourage walkability and strengthen economic vitality in downtown.

Hinesville (compact development focus)
Team members will focus on an area currently located in Liberty County to be annexed into the city of Hinesville. The tract of land is owned by a development company who wishes to obtain alternative development concepts for the area to include mixed-use development with commercial, residential, and linkage to the downtown area.
Directions to TSRB (Tech Square Research Building) – Venue for lunch, Wednesday, November 17th
The TSRB is across the street from the Global Learning Center. Exit from Global Learning Center and cross Fifth Street at the crosswalk. Walk through the courtyard and the entrance to TSRB will be toward your left.

Directions to CQGRD (Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development) – Venue for the DCA’s Quality Growth Advisory Clinic
CQGRD is on the other side of the block from Global Learning Center. Exit from Global Learning Center and walk east toward Spring Street. Take a right at the intersection of Spring and Fifth Streets. Follow Spring Street south, passing the parking deck on your right. The entrance to the building will be on your right. Take the elevator to the second floor.
Speakers

Robert Barr, Chairman, Carroll County Board of Commissioners
Robert Barr has been Chairman of the Carroll County Board of Commissioners since 2001. His Association of County Commissioners activities include: Board of Managers (2003-present), joint ACCG/GMA negotiating team SPLOST/MOST tax (2003-present), Chairman, ACCG Natural Resources & Environment Committee (2002-2003), ACCG Self-insured Workers’ Compensation Board, (2001-present). During this time, Barr has served as Vice-Chairman, Institute for Georgia Environmental Leadership Board (2003-present), Member, Department of Community Affairs Minimum Planning Standards Task Force (2002), Member, West Georgia Regional Water Authority (2001-present), Member, West Area Regional Radio System (2002-present), Member, Governor’s Advisory Council on Georgia Land Conservation Partnership (2004-present), and DCA CDBG Advisory Committee (2004).

Prior to his current appointment, Barr was Assistant City Manager, City of Carrollton (1991-2000). While there, Barr served on the Board of Advisors, Upper Tallapoosa Watershed Group (1999-2000), Charter Member, first President, Little Tallapoosa Botanical Society (1992-present), Board member, Carroll County Water Authority (1997-2000), Chairman, Carroll City/County Hospital Authority (1994-2000), Member, Tanner Medical Center Board of Directors (1993-2000), and Chairman, Carroll County Chamber of Commerce (1991).

From 1986 to 1991, Barr was the City Manager for the City of Villa Rica. While there, he was a Member of the Georgia City/County Managers Association (1986-present), and served on the Carroll County Chamber of Commerce Board (1986-1989). From 1983 to 1986, Barr worked with the Chattahoochee-Flint Area Planning and Development Commission as an Economic Development Planner (1984-1985) and as Regional Planner (1983-1984).

Denise B. Brinson, Community & Economic Development Manager, City Of Suwanee
Denise Brinson has spent the last five years serving as the Economic and Community Development Manager for the City of Suwanee. Denise directs all downtown revitalization efforts and oversees all economic development, promotional and public relations efforts for the City. Denise has a Master of Business Administration (MBA) from the Florida Institute of Technology and a bachelor's degree in business management from the University of South Florida.

Prior economic development activities include several years as an economic development specialist for Florida Power Corporation, based in St. Petersburg, FL. In this capacity, Denise led and facilitated on-going planning sessions with city/county governmental entities, chambers of commerce, and regional economic development organizations. In addition, Denise designed and wrote a community-based strategic planning program that she marketed and implemented in 10 Florida communities, including a regional effort for an eight-county area in North Florida.

Although Denise’s activities with the City of Suwanee are very important, her first priority is her family. Larry (husband), Paige (7 year old daughter) and Grey (3 year old son) keep her very busy along with various church and community activities.
Emory Brock, Director, Economic Development, Clayton County and the Clayton County Development Authority

Emory Brock has been Director of Economic Development for Clayton County and the Clayton County Development Authority since 1990. He was employed previously with the City of College Park, City of Cartersville and the Coosa Valley APDC. Brock has been in economic development for 34 years. He received his graduate degree in Urban and Regional planning from the University of Mississippi and his undergraduate degree from the University of Georgia.

Rick Brooks, Director, Planning and Environmental Management Division, Georgia Department of Community Affairs

Rick Brooks currently serves as Director of the Planning and Environmental Management Division of the Georgia Department of Community Affairs. In that capacity he has overall responsibility for the state's quality growth and coordinated planning efforts, environmental assistance activities including the WaterFirst and Keep Georgia Beautiful programs, DCA's research and surveys function, and the construction codes program.

In October 2003, Governor Perdue issued an Executive Order creating the Georgia Water Resources Council comprised of the heads of eight state agencies, authorities and commissions. The main charge to the Council was to recommend the "contents and scope of the state comprehensive water resources management plan." Rick served on that Council as DCA Commissioner Mike Beatty's designee.

Shortly after joining DCA in 1995 as then-commissioner Jim Higdon's Executive Assistant, Governor Miller appointed Rick to serve as Interim Executive Director of the Georgia Housing and Finance Authority to manage the transition and merger of DCA and GHFA. Subsequently, he directed the Department's economic development financing division which included the $40 million Community Development Block Grant program.

Prior to joining DCA, Rick worked with the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget. In his 10 years with OPB he held various positions including Special Assistant to the Director and policy coordinator for environmental and natural resources.

Rick began his career in state government in 1979 as a management analyst responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of a variety of state programs and operations. Previously, upon graduating from Georgia Tech with an industrial management degree, Rick managed various retail and industrial operations in the private sector.

Julie Brown, Georgia Department of Community Affairs

Julie Brown, with the Office of Planning & Quality Growth at the Georgia Department of Community Affairs (DCA) has been the logistics coordinator for several programs such as Quality Growth Resource Teams, Quality Growth Grant Program, and Quality Growth Advisory Clinics during her four years with DCA. Through these programs, she has had the opportunity to work with experts in various fields including housing, historic preservation, architecture, planning, and many more to assist local governments throughout the state of Georgia with incorporating "Smart Growth" best practices into their communities. She has learned much about the challenges that local governments face in planning and implementing the concepts of Quality Growth and looks forward to continuing to assist them for many years to come.
Cheryl K. Contant, Professor and Director, City and Regional Planning Program, College of Architecture, Georgia Tech

Cheryl Contant is Professor and Director of the City and Regional Planning Program in the College of Architecture at Georgia Institute of Technology. She is currently the Vice Chair of the Partners Committee of The Georgia Conservancy's Blueprints for Successful Communities and has been directly involved in several projects associated with the Blueprints program. She has also facilitated a statewide stakeholder process to design a water quality monitoring program in the Midwest. Prior to moving to the Georgia Tech in 1999, she was an Associate Professor in the Graduate Program in Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Iowa, where she taught for 14 years. She received her M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from Stanford University in the Department of Civil Engineering (concentrating in environmental engineering and environmental planning, respectively). She earned her B.S. in Civil Engineering from the University of Utah.

Gary A. Cornell, AICP, Principal Planner for Jordan, Jones & Goulding, Inc.

Gary Cornell received his Bachelor of Architecture degree, magna cum laude, from the Georgia Institute of Technology in 1973 and his Master of City and Regional Planning, with distinction, from Harvard University's Graduate School of Design in 1978. Cornell has been Principal Planner for Jordan, Jones & Goulding since October of 2000. Former positions include: Senior Associate, EDAW, Incorporated (1996-2000), Planner in Residence, Florida State University Department of Urban and Regional Planning (1993-1996), Director, Planning Division, Gwinnett County Department of Planning and Development (1986-1993), The RBA Group, Project Manager (1985-1986), Atlanta Regional Commission, Principal Transportation Planner (1978-1985).

Cornell has acted as Past President of the Georgia Planning Association, 2002-2003. He is a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) and the Governor's Environmental Advisory Council, and Leadership Gwinnett, Class of 1989-1990.

Michael A. Dobbins, FAIA, AICP, Georgia Tech

Michael Dobbins is part-time Professor of Practice in the Architecture and City and Regional Planning programs, and supports the Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development at the College of Architecture at Georgia Tech.

From June 1996 until April 2002, Dobbins was Commissioner of the Department of Planning, Development and Neighborhood Conservation for the City of Atlanta. He continues to provide advisory services to the City of Atlanta, for transportation and land use issues.

Dobbins received Bachelor and Master of Architecture Degrees from Yale University. He is a licensed Architect in Georgia and California; Fellow of the American Institute of Architects; member of the American Institute of Certified Planners, the American Planning Association, the Urban Land Institute, the Congress of New Urbanism, and the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards.

Past experiences include: planning director positions at UC Berkeley, Birmingham, Alabama, New York City Planning Department (Staten Island), New Orleans Comprehensive River Area Study and teaching at UC Berkeley, Birmingham Southern College, Tulane School of Architecture and Columbia University. Dobbins is a participant in planning and design forums and technical assignments across the country, in Europe, and China. He is a supporter of a range of community and neighborhood based activities and is the recipient of a variety of honors and awards.
Jeffrey Dorfman, Economist and Professor, University of Georgia
Jeffrey Dorfman is an economist and professor at The University of Georgia, where he has been since 1989. He teaches classes in economic theory and the economics of the food industry and performs research on productivity measurement and the economics of growth and sprawl. He has authored a book, over fifty academic journal articles, and a variety of other articles published in trade publications, the popular press, and on the web. He has testified to the U.S. Senate Agriculture Committee, to the Georgia Senate Special Committee on Feedgrains, and to a USDA Panel on Farmland Preservation. He is a consultant to a variety of business and foundations with past and current clients including Sprint, the Turner Foundation, the American Farmland Trust, The Georgia Conservancy, Pennington Seed, Fulton County Schools, and a number of city and county governments in the Southeastern U.S.

Jim Durrett, Executive Director, Urban Land Institute
Jim Durrett joined the Urban Land Institute (ULI) in January 2001 as Executive Director of ULI's Atlanta District Council. ULI is a research and education think tank dedicated to land use and real estate development issues. The mission of the organization is to provide responsible leadership in the use of land in order to enhance the total environment. ULI Atlanta has a membership in excess of 1,000, and is extremely active in regional policy discussion regarding land use and quality growth.

Durrett came to ULI from the Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, where he held the position of Vice President of Environmental Affairs. Previous experience includes the position of Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of The Georgia Conservancy, and ten years as a professional geologist with Golder Associates, an international engineering consulting firm.

Jim has been a member of the Georgia Environmental Advisory Council since 1998, a position appointed by the Governor to advise the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division and the Governor on environmental policy matters. He was a member of the inaugural class of the Institute for Georgia Environmental Leadership. He serves on numerous collaborative committees and task forces working on growth management issues in the state of Georgia, and has served on various ad hoc committees to advise Georgia EPD on regulatory matters.

Sharon Gay, Partner, McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP
Sharon Gay is a partner in the Atlanta law firm of McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP. She concentrates her practice in state and local government law, particularly in the areas of land use and zoning, tax allocation district financing and other economic development incentives, and public-private partnerships. She works with clients to accomplish revisions in state and local laws and to obtain incentives to facilitate economic development projects.

Larry L. Gellerstedt, III, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, The Gellerstedt Group
In the summer of 2003, Larry Gellerstedt, III founded The Gellerstedt Group, a uniquely capable player in Atlanta’s evolving intown residential market. Led by experienced leaders in urban planning and development, the company consults on high-profile private and civic development projects, develops infill housing at mid-market prices, and adapts and re-uses strategically located residential properties.

Larry began his career at Beers Construction Company in 1978 as an estimator and project manager, working on the High Museum and the AT&T Long Lines Building. At age 26, he founded and became president of BCB Company, a Beers subsidiary focused on the health care industry.
BCB grew to over $100 million in revenues in just four years, at which time Mr. Gellerstedt was named chairman and chief executive officer of the entire Beers organization.

His first action as CEO of Beers was to initiate six months of strategic planning for the company’s future. The results of that discipline included acquisitions, diversification and joint ventures and led to revenues of over $1.2 billion by 1994.

In 1998, after the sale of Beers to Skanska USA, Larry was elected chairman and chief executive officer of American Business Products, a NYSE-listed manufacturer of packaging and printed office products. Emphasizing customer service, growth and shareholder value, he led a complete overhaul of every aspect of the business. In March of 2000, ABP was sold for a handsome premium for shareholders.

In 2000 Larry became president and chief operating officer of The Integral Group, which is nationally known for visionary urban mixed-use development, construction management, property management and asset management. He helped develop, build and manage approximately 1,000 new rental apartments at the Villages at Carver, Ashley Courts, and Ashley Terrace. He also oversaw the development of a Publix-anchored retail center, and several significant land assemblages. In addition to his efforts in Atlanta, he served as the development agent for a 1,200-space parking garage and a 100-room, extended-stay hotel in downtown Birmingham for the University of Alabama at Birmingham Medical Center.

His professional accomplishments have earned multiple accolades. He was named Entrepreneur of the Year by Ernst and Young in 1992, CEO of the Year by Atlanta Business League in 1993, and one of Georgia’s 100 Most Influential People by Georgia Trend magazine. He also serves on the boards of two NYSE firms – Alltel and Rock-Tenn Company.

Paralleling his business success is civic leadership. As chairman of the Fernbank Museum of Natural History, he led that organization from the verge of bankruptcy to sustained viability and status as the most-attended museum in Georgia. As chairman of Children’s Healthcare of Atlanta, he oversaw the complex but successful merger of two major children’s healthcare systems. He also chaired the Metropolitan Atlanta YMCA, providing direction for 16 locations throughout the area.

Larry Gellerstedt grew up in Atlanta. He graduated from Westminster High School and the University of North Carolina, where he was president of his fraternity and a member of Phi Beta Kappa. Larry and Carol Gellerstedt have been married 24 years. They have two children, Lawrence, age 19, and Liza, age 17. Mr. Gellerstedt is an avid runner and enjoys golf, hunting and fishing.

Kevin Green, Vice President, Environmental Affairs, Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce

Kevin Green is currently Vice President of Environmental Affairs with the Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, where he works to advance regional policy initiatives for water resources, air quality and land use.

Kevin managed the business-led Clean Water Initiative that resulted in the creation of the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District in the 2001 session of the Georgia General Assembly. Kevin also managed the public-private Quality Growth Task Force in 2004, focusing
on strategies to successfully accommodate the Atlanta region's next 2.5 million residents and the critical role of coordinating land use and development with major infrastructure investments.

Kevin is a graduate of Emory University School of Law, and practiced law in Atlanta for 10 years. Other current affiliations include: Institute for Georgia Environmental Leadership Board of Directors; Clean Air Campaign Board of Directors; member of the Water Advisory Council to the Georgia Attorney General; Atlanta Regional Commission Environment and Land Use Committee; and a collection of papers at the University of Georgia - Draper Archives for the Waters of Georgia in History, Law and Policy.

**Ellen G. Keys, Director of Community Development, Jordan, Jones & Goulding**

Ellen Keys is the Director of Community Development with 21 years of experience. She received her MS in Education from Florida State University in 1979. She is nationally recognized for the development of innovative public outreach and education programs. She has extensive experience in public involvement and community visioning, particularly in the areas of land use, urban design, and sustainable development. Ms. Keys is a published author and speaks nationally on growth management, land use, transportation and the environment.

Formerly, Ms. Keys was vice president for environmental policy at The Georgia Conservancy where she was responsible for managing the organization's policy initiatives. One of her primary responsibilities was creation and management of the award winning *Blueprints for Successful Communities* initiative, a nationally recognized model for public education on land use and transportation strategies, which are environmentally sound and economically viable. Ms. Keys also has experience in educational programming and served as a reviewer for the *National Science Education Standards*, the nation's first comprehensive standards to improve science education in grades K-12, developed by the National Academy of Sciences.

Since joining JJJG, Ms. Keys has led numerous public involvement and community visioning projects that have generated community consensus leading to positive public policy change. She has developed public education and participation programs for major investment studies, comprehensive planning, transit, and transportation projects.

Ms. Keys also serves as JJJG's discipline lead for Public Art, developing processes that involve local communities and art commissions in the selection of artists, review and approval of artwork, as well as coordination between artists, architects, and design teams. She also lends technical expertise on projects related to smart growth, open space preservation, and resource conservation.

**Ron Littlefield, AICP**

Ron Littlefield is a professional city planner with 34 years of experience working with cities, counties, states and private sector organizations.

He was the first director of Chattanooga's combined city/county/chamber of commerce economic development office where, in 1981, he initiated the annual ritual of leadership visits to dynamic cities such as Indianapolis, Baltimore and Charlotte that have inspired a number of major Chattanooga projects.

In 1984, he was an incorporator and initial Executive Director of Chattanooga Venture where he led the successful Vision 2000 planning program – credited with shaping the communities grand scale ideas for riverfront and downtown redevelopment.
Subsequently, he was elected Commissioner of Public Works for the City of Chattanooga where he had opportunities to implement plans for restoration of the Walnut Street Bridge and construction of streets, sewers and other infrastructure associated with the Tennessee Aquarium and related projects.

Later following a change in the form of local government, he became the first Chairman of the new Chattanooga City Council and helped to guide the community's transition from the old form of government to the new.

During an eight-year hiatus from public office, Littlefield worked as a planning consultant for a number of public and private clients on a wide variety of development projects. In 1998, he was recruited by Mayor Jon Kinsey to assist with proposals for a high-speed passenger rail connection between Chattanooga and Atlanta.

In April of 2001, he was reelected to the Chattanooga City Council from District Six and ultimately was selected by fellow council members to serve once again as Chairman for FY 2002-03.

Gregg Logan, Managing Director, Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

Lyn Menne, Assistant City Manager, Community and Economic Development, City of Decatur
Lyn Menne is Assistant City Manager for Community and Economic Development for the City of Decatur. This position evolved out of her role as Executive Director of the Decatur Downtown Development Authority – a position she has held since 1983. Lyn has been an active partner in the implementation of the Decatur Town Center Plan. This innovative planning document, adopted in 1982, outlined the development of Decatur's central business district as a pedestrian friendly, high-density center with a healthy mix of office, retail and residential uses. Decatur's development philosophy is based upon the successful National Main Street Program strategy that encourages the preservation of the unique character and sense of place found in historic commercial districts as an important component of a redevelopment program. Decatur now has over 1 million square feet of office space, 250,000 square feet of retail space and over 1200 downtown residential units built or under construction and is hailed as one of the best examples of Smart Growth planning in the metropolitan Atlanta area.

Lyn received her undergraduate degree in American Studies from Queens College in Charlotte, NC and her masters degree in Public Administration from the University of Georgia. Prior to joining the Decatur staff, Lyn worked for the State Historic Preservation Office and was program manager for the Georgia Main Street program. She is the immediate past president of the Georgia Downtown Association and is on the board of trustees for the DeKalb Historical Society and the DeKalb Chamber of Commerce. Lyn is a 1991 graduate of Leadership DeKalb.

Steve Nygren, Chairman, Chattahoochee Hill Country Alliance

Rick Porter, President, Richport Properties Inc.
Rick Porter received his Architectural Degree from Georgia Tech in 1975 with High Honors. He began his homebuilding company that same year. Over the past 29 years Richport has built homes in many price ranges, but currently builds 150 to 200 single family homes a year in the $150,000 to $225,000 price range in northeast Atlanta. Richport has diversified over the years
and currently is involved in land development and real estate brokerage as well as homebuilding.

Porter has served on the boards of a number of civic organizations including the National Association of Homebuilders (NAHB) of which he was National Vice President in 2002-2003; the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) 1992-2001; the Georgia Department of Industry, Trade & Tourism 1997-1999; President, Home Builders Association of Georgia (HBAG), 1999; President, Greater Atlanta Home Builders Association (HBA), 1995; the Gwinnett Council for Quality Growth of which he was President in 1991; 1995 Chairman of the Gwinnett County Chamber of Commerce; and 1990-1991 Chairman of the Gwinnett Development Advisory Committee.

Porter has received numerous awards and recognitions. In 2003, he was inducted into the Builder Hall of Fame, Home Builders Association of Georgia. He received the 2001 Annual Development of Excellence Award from the Atlanta Regional Commission as well as the Builder of the Year from the Home Builders Association of Georgia. Other awards include: 1998 Diamond Builder Award, Home Buyers Warranty, 1997 Lewis Cenker Award, 1994 Build American Beautiful Award, 1992 Regional Leadership Institute, 1990 Leadership Gwinnett, 1989 Metro Atlanta Builder of the Year, and Gwinnett County Builder of the Year in both 1988 and 1986.

In addition to his active professional life, Porter enjoys competition aerobatic flying, running, and biking.

Gerald L. Pouncey, Jr, Partner, Morris, Manning & Martin

Gerald L. Pouncey, Jr. is a partner and head of Morris, Manning & Martin's environmental law section in the firm's Atlanta, Georgia office. His primary focus is the redevelopment of and litigation concerning environmentally impacted properties (including state and federal superfund sites and insurance claims/coverage associated with such sites), as well as corporate mergers/acquisitions involving such properties, and he lectures nationally on these topics. He has also written numerous articles on this issue and is a contributing author to the American Bar Association publication Brownfields, A Comprehensive Guide to Redeveloping Contaminated Property.

Notably, Mr. Pouncey served as lead environmental counsel for the Atlantic Station project, which is the nation's largest brownfield redevelopment. Mr. Pouncey is a past Board Member and chair of the Environmental and Toxic Tort Section of the Atlanta Bar Association. He serves on the National Environmental Subcommittee for the International Council of Shopping Centers, the Environmental Committee for the Atlanta Chapter of the Urban Land Institute and the Metro Chamber Task Force. Mr. Pouncey also served as a legislative appointee to the Study Group formed to review Georgia's Hazardous Site Response Act in 2002. As part of this legislative committee, Mr. Pouncey was the principal author of the state's new brownfield legislation.

Mr. Pouncey obtained his law degree, magna cum laude, in 1985 from the University of Georgia, where he was a member of the Order of the Coif and served both on the Editorial Board and the Managing Board of the University of Georgia Law Review. He obtained his undergraduate degree in chemical engineering with honors from Auburn University. Following his legal education, Mr. Pouncey served as a law clerk for the Honorable James C. Hill, United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.
Daniel J. Reuter, AICP, Division Chief, Land Use Planning, Atlanta Regional Commission

Daniel Reuter has been the Division Chief of Land Use Planning for the Atlanta Regional Commission since 1999. This division of ARC is responsible for comprehensive planning duties under the Georgia Planning Act including review of local comprehensive plans, Developments of Regional Impact (DRI), Regional Development Plan, implementation of the Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) program, forecast coordination with local governments, and greenspace and regional housing planning activities. Reuter serves as Chairman of the ARC Land Use Coordinating Committee (LUCC).


Reuter received his Bachelor of Business Administration degree from the University of Georgia, Terry College of Business in 1988 and his Master of Science degree from Georgia State University in 1992. Reuter is a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP). He is a graduate of the Atlanta Regional Leadership Institute and a member of the Regional Leadership Foundation. He is also Vice-President for Legislative Affairs of the Georgia Planning Association (GPA).

Catherine L. Ross, CQGRD Director and Georgia Tech’s Harry West Chair

Catherine L. Ross is Director of the Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development (CQGRD) and Harry West Professor for Regional Planning at Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta, Georgia. She serves on the Executive Committee of the Transportation Research Board, National Academy of Sciences and the ENO Transportation Foundation in Washington, D.C. She previously served as a senior policy advisor to the Transportation Research Board. Catherine is also past president of the National Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ASCP).

Dr. Ross previously served on the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) and organized and served as the first Executive Director of the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA). This innovative regional entity was created by the Georgia Legislature in response to the federal cut-off of transportation funds to the Atlanta region. GRTA was created to help 13 counties out-of-compliance with clean air standards develop new transportation plans and initiatives to help them meet or exceed federal requirements.

Ross began her career at Georgia Tech as an assistant professor in the Graduate City Planning Program, associate professor, then full professor in 1990. She has held a variety of leadership positions at Georgia Tech including vice provost for academic affairs, associate vice president for academic affairs, co-director of the Transportation Research and Education Center and director of the College of Architecture’s PH.D program.

Locally, Ross serves on several boards/committees including the ULI-District Council Steering Committee, Metro Atlanta Quality Growth Task Forces, Atlanta Convention and Visitors Bureau, Ferst Center Advisory Board, High Museum of Art and the Midtown Alliance. Regionally, she co-founded the "Healthy Places Research Group" in cooperation with Emory University’s School of
Public Health. Ross earned a Bachelor's degree from Kent State University, a Master's degree in regional planning from Cornell University and a doctorate in city and regional planning from Cornell in addition to completing post-decorate work at the University of California, Berkeley.

In addition to teaching at Georgia Tech, Ross has conducted research for numerous governmental transportation agencies. She has published extensively in the fields of Urban Planning, transportation planning and public participation.

T. Michael Tennant, Partner, Alston & Bird LLP
Mike Tennant is a member of the Environmental & Land Use Group as well as the Real Estate Group. Mr. Tennant concentrates his practice on real estate law, focusing on land use, zoning, property rights, condemnation, local government law, telecommunications as well as ad valorem tax law and real estate litigation.

As a senior member of the firm’s land use practice and head of the firm’s Real Estate Litigation Team, Mr. Tennant has worked in a multitude of areas of zoning, land use and the governmental regulation of real estate. For example, he handled the local and state land use and utility commission approvals for the largest acquisition in cellular towers in history, representing GTE (now Verizon) in its joint venture with Crown Castle involving 2,300 cellular telephone tower sites located in 21 states throughout the country valued at $1 billion. Additionally, he successfully represented BellSouth Mobility now Cingular, a wireless telecommunications provider, in the first case in the United States brought under the 1996 Federal Telecommunications Act challenging a local government’s denial of a permit for a cellular communications tower. Subsequently, he has successfully handled similar cases in the Southwest and Mid-West. He has also been involved in successfully representing numerous other clients for Locally Unwanted Land Uses (LULU’s) including radio and telecommunication towers, quarries, sanitary landfills, multi-family and neo-traditional projects, with transit-oriented mixed uses.

Mike handled the rezoning of the 2,000-acre Sugarloaf Farm development in metropolitan Atlanta, as well as the land use work, including historical preservation issues for the $100 million capital campus expansion of Agnes Scott College. Mr. Tennant successfully handled over 300 different cases in a comprehensive reappraisal for ad valorem tax purposes representing regional malls, retail shopping centers, quarries, office and industrial parks and residential developments. In 2003, he shepherded the state and local approvals for the victorious land use case for a $188,000,000.00 transit oriented redevelopment containing 605,000 square feet of office, 438 residences, a 200-room hotel and 20,400-feet of street level commercial retail space at Perimeter Center. Recently he led a team for the successful annexation and rezoning for an 100-acre tract of land in a Metropolitan Atlanta suburban city for the redevelopment as a high-end mixed use development including residential and village-style retail. He has represented clients in governmental acquisitions of property for public projects including roads, schools, sewage treatment facilities and other governmental facilities.

Mr. Tennant is a frequent author and lecturer on topics of professionalism and ethics and as well as land use and smart growth for the State Bar of Georgia, National Business Institute, Urban Land Institute and others. Mike has been named Georgia Super Lawyer for 2004 as being in the top 5% of lawyers in Georgia. He is listed in “Who’s Who in Real Estate” of the American Reference Institute as well as “Who’s Who in Law in Atlanta” by the Atlanta Business Chronicle and “Who’s Who in American Law.” He is tapped to serve as a member of the Legal and Technical Committee of the Atlanta Metro Chamber of Quality Growth Task Force with specific responsibility on the legal challenges to sanitary and storm sewer infrastructure. Mr.
Tennant has authorized numerous publications, including “Raising Constitutional Claims in Zoning Litigation,” Georgia County Government, October 2000.

In January 1999, Mr. Tennant was named the Jack Sawyer Citizen of the Year for Gwinnett County by the Gwinnett County Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Tennant received his J.D. degree in 1973 from Mercer University and a B.S. from Auburn University in 1970. He is a former member of the Board of Governors and served on the Review Panel of the State Disciplinary Board of the State Bar of Georgia. He serves on the Board of Directors of the Regional Leadership Forum and as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Leadership Gwinnett. Mr. Tennant is a long serving member of the Board of Directors of the Council for Quality Growth a regional development constituency currently serving as Chairman of the Board. He is a member of the National Multi Housing Council. He serves as a member of the State Bar of Georgia, the Association of Property Rights Lawyers, Atlanta Bar Association, and the Gwinnett County Bar Association and is a fellow of the Georgia Bar Foundation.

Randy Vinson, ASLA, Clark’s Grove

Randy Vinson is a designer, planner, and project manager working on quality-of-life projects in the region east of metro Atlanta. Formerly the special projects coordinator and then planning director for Newton County, Randy worked on projects ranging from the national award winning Turner Lake Park and Recreation Center to the Main Street Georgia award winning new Judicial Center in downtown Covington. Randy also spearheaded the growth management movement in Covington and Newton County by organizing numerous charrettes, design workshops, and speaker forums, redesigning the future land use map to promote compact, mixed-use, pedestrian friendly development in new village “nodes” and taking local business leaders and officials on field trips throughout the southeast to tour relevant projects. Randy serves on the Board of Directors of Smart Growth Newton County, and is the President of the Newton County Historical Society.

Mr. Vinson is currently assisting the towns of Newborn and Porterdale with their planning and growth management as well as managing a new Traditional Neighborhood Development project in Covington called Clark’s Grove. An avowed New Urbanist, Randy lives on the banks of the Alcovy River with his wife Sara and children, seven-year-old Claire and four- year-old Eli.
Organizers

ULI Atlanta

Urban Land Institute, Atlanta District Council: Through District Council sponsored educational forums and events such as trends conferences, Smart Growth programs, and project tours, through community outreach programs, and by providing industry expertise to community leaders, the opportunity to influence local land use policy and practice continues to be the focus and achievement of ULI Atlanta.

In the ULI fashion of offering an unbiased and non-partisan exchange on issues impacting the industry, ULI Atlanta strives to provide the avenues for active dialogues between private industry, environmental organizations, and public agencies to help provide solutions to local and regional issues.

ACCG

ACCG is a nonprofit instrumentality of Georgia’s county governments. Formed in 1914 with 19 charter county members, today ACCG serves as the consensus-building, training, and legislative organization for all 159 county governments in the state. With this primary charge, ACCG works to ensure that the counties can provide the necessary leadership, services and programs to meet the health, safety and welfare needs of their citizens.

Association County Commissioners of Georgia: It is the mission of the Association County Commissioners of Georgia to enhance the role, stature and responsiveness of county government in Georgia. Since counties are the level of government closest to the people and serve all the people of the state, ACCG will promote the ability of Georgia counties to provide public services responsibly, efficiently and cost effectively through cooperative legislative action, education of public officials, provision of quality member services and technical assistance, and increasing public awareness of critical local government issues.

Georgia Municipal Association: GMA’s purpose is to anticipate and influence the forces shaping Georgia’s communities and to provide leadership, tools and services that assist local governments in becoming more innovative, effective and responsive.

Created in 1934, the Georgia Municipal Association (GMA) is the only state organization that represents municipal governments in Georgia. Based in Atlanta, GMA is a voluntary, non-profit organization that provides legislative advocacy, educational, employee benefit and technical consulting services to its members. GMA’s membership currently totals more than 485 municipal governments, accounting for more than 99 percent of the state’s municipal population. A 56-member Board of Directors, composed of city officials, governs GMA. Program implementation is charged to the Executive Director and staff of 60-70 full-time employees.
The Georgia Department of Community Affairs: DCA was created in 1977 to serve as an advocate for local governments. On July 1, 1996, the Governor and General Assembly merged the Georgia Housing and Finance Authority (GHFA) with the Department of Community Affairs. Today, the newly expanded DCA operates a host of state and federal grant programs; serves as the state’s lead agency in housing finance and development; promulgates building codes to be adopted by local governments; provides comprehensive planning, technical and research assistance to local governments; and serves as the lead agency for the state’s solid waste reduction efforts.

Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development (CQGRD): CQGRD was established in 2003 as a research arm of College of Architecture, Georgia Tech to work cooperatively with other entities to help society achieve a sustainable, superior quality of life through the generation of new knowledge in land development policy, city and regional planning, architecture and community design, transportation systems, and environmental resource management. To achieve this end, CQGRD is dedicated to the study, dissemination, and implementation of ideas and technology that improve the theory and practice of quality growth.
Georgia Power: Georgia Power, the largest of five electric utilities that make up Southern Company, has been providing electricity to Georgia for more than a century.

Georgia Power, the recipient of the 2001 IDRC Global Innovator Award for Economic Development, operates a full-service Community and Economic Development organization serving the entire state of Georgia that assists new and old businesses expand and also helps Georgia communities build their economic development attractiveness by offering leadership, strategy, infrastructure, and marketing consultation services. Georgia Power also actively promotes environmentally sound generation and funds research and development for advanced energy technologies.

Alston and Bird: Alston and Bird is a major US law firm with an extensive national and international practice. In business since 1893, the firm is committed to focus on their client’s long term goals.

Jordan, Jones & Goulding: Founded in 1958, Jordan, Jones & Goulding, Inc. (JJG) is an Atlanta-based consulting firm offering a full range of engineering, management and planning services to both private and public sector clients.

With their main office located in Atlanta, Georgia, JJG has other regional offices in Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio, and Puerto Rico. JJG is committed to performing the work in the office closest to the project, thus adopting a concept of "local firm" that enhances communication and coordination with the client, increases the accessibility of the firm to the client, and ensures ties with local and state regulatory agencies.

With a professional staff of over 600 the firm holds a 150 ranking in the prestigious ENR Top 500 Design Firms 2001 list, and has received numerous Engineering Excellence awards.
Wachovia Bank: The former Wachovia (founded in 1879 in Winston, NC) and First Union (founded in 1908 in Charlotte, NC) merged on September 1, 2001, to create Wachovia Corporation.

Wachovia Corporation is a diversified financial services company that provides a broad range of banking, asset management, wealth management, and corporate and investment banking products and services. With over 95,000 employees, Wachovia serves banking, brokerage, and corporate customers primarily on the East Coast, as well as through investment banking offices in selected locations. Global services are provided through 33 international offices.
## Participants

*Participant Roster as of November 8th. A final list will be handed out on Thursday.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Steve Acenbrak      | Director of Transportation City of Roswell  
38 Hill Street  
Suite G-20  
Roswell, GA 30075  
770-594-6420 770-594-6429  
sacenbrak@ci.roswell.ga.us |
| Margaret Ballard    | City of Commissioner  
City of Cornelia  
P. O. Box 785  
Cornelia, GA 30531  
706-778-8585 706-778-2234 |
| Chance Barber       | Community Development Specialist  
City of Moultrie  
P. O. Box 3368  
Moultrie, GA 31776  
229-890-5405 229-985-9495  
chanceb@moultriega.com |
| John Bennett        | City Manager  
City Of Rome  
P. O. Box 1433  
Rome, GA 30162  
706-236-4400 706-236-4405  
cmanager@romeaga.us |
| Rickey Blalock      | Zoning Administrator  
Peach County Board of Commissioners  
410 Old Macon Road  
Fort Valley, GA 31030  
478-825-5118 478-825-2684  
rickey-blalock@peachcounty.net |
| Fred Boykin         | Decatur City Commission  
2098 N. Decatur Road  
Decatur, GA 30033  
404-636-4444  
Fboykin@bicyclesouth.com |
| Mary Jo Bragan      | Smart Growth Program Manager  
US EPA  
61 Forsyth Street  
Atlanta, GA 30303  
404-562-8323 404-562-8269  
bragan.maryjo@epa.gov |
| Steve Brinkley      | Assistant to Commissioner  
Fulton County Board of Commissioners  
141 Pryor Street  
Suite 10035  
Atlanta, GA 30303  
404-750-8800 404-730-8254 |
| Steve Brown         | Mayor  
City of Peachtree City  
151 Willowbend Road  
Peachtree City, GA 30269  
770-487-7657 770-631-2505  
gloria@peachtree-city.org |
| William Bryant      | Georgia Power Company Economic Development  
285 Peachtree Center Avenue, NE  
Marquis II Tower, Lobby Level  
Atlanta, GA 30303-1229  
404-506-2213  
wfbryant@southernco.com |
| Virginia Burton Gray| Commissioner  
Clayton County Board of Commissioners  
112 Smith Street  
Jonesboro, GA 30236  
770-477-3208 770-477-3217  
joan.scraggs@co.clayton.ga.us |
| Jim Cain            | Principal Planner  
Cherokee County Plan & Zoning Department  
130 East Main Street  
Suite 108  
Canton, GA 30114  
678-493-6106 678-493-6111  
jcain@cherokeega.com |
| Ruth Caudell        | Council Member  
City of Ellijay  
167 Gartrell Street  
Ellijay, GA 30540  
706-635-4447 706-635-4712  
rhcaudell@ellijay.com |
| Eric Clarkson       | PO Box 81281  
Atlanta, GA 30341  
770-452-3000  
ecent@mindspring.com |
| Richard Colclough   | Commissioner  
Office of the Clerk of Commission  
530 Greene Street  
Room 801 - Municipal Building  
Augusta, GA 30911  
706-821-1820 706-821-1836  
lbonner@augustaga.gov |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone Numbers</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pam Conner</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
<td>City of Powder Springs P.O. Box 46</td>
<td>770-439-2500</td>
<td><a href="mailto:planner@cityofpowdersprings.org">planner@cityofpowdersprings.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Cox</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Dawsonville City Hall P.O. Box 6</td>
<td>706-265-3256 706-265-4214</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cityhall@dawsonville.com">cityhall@dawsonville.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Crowel</td>
<td>Council Member</td>
<td>City of Dahlonega 465 Riley Road</td>
<td>706-861-6133 706-864-4837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharyn Darlington</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Putnam County Planning &amp; Engineering 663 Godfrey Road Eatonton, GA 31024</td>
<td>706-485-2776 706-485-0552</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sdarlington@putnamga.com">sdarlington@putnamga.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul T. Decamp, Jr.</td>
<td>Planning Director</td>
<td>Augusta-Richmond County Planning Commission 525 Telfair Street Augusta, GA 30901</td>
<td>706-821-1801 706-821-1806</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pdecamp@augustaga.gov">pdecamp@augustaga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina DuPree</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Fulton County Government 461 Young James Circle Stockbridge, GA 30281</td>
<td>404-730-8192 404-893-6389</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christina_mickey@hotmail.com">christina_mickey@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Dutton</td>
<td>Senior Planner</td>
<td>Coosa Valley RDC P.O. Box 1793</td>
<td>7062956485</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ddutton@cvcrdc.org">ddutton@cvcrdc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Emmons</td>
<td>Councilman</td>
<td>City of Midway P.O. Box 125 Midway, GA 31320</td>
<td>912-884-3344 912-884-5107</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cityofmidwayga@hotmail.com">cityofmidwayga@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Field</td>
<td>Director of Community Development</td>
<td>City Of Roswell 38 Hill Street Suite G-30 Duluth, GA 30097</td>
<td>770-594-6173 770-641-3733</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kfield@ci.roswell.ga.us">kfield@ci.roswell.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fretti</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City Of Valdosta 216 E. Central Avenue P. O. Box 1125 Valdosta, GA 31603</td>
<td>912-259-3500 612-333-5411</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cityhall@valdostacity.com">cityhall@valdostacity.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Gilmour</td>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>City Of Perry P.O. Box 2030 Perry, GA 31069-6030</td>
<td>478-988-2703 478-988-2705</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lee.gilmour@perry-ga.gov">lee.gilmour@perry-ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby Hankerson</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Office of the Clerk of Commission 530 Greene Street Room 801 - Municipal Building Augusta, GA 30911</td>
<td>706-821-1820 706-821-1836</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lbonner@augustaga.gov">lbonner@augustaga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harley</td>
<td>City Administrator</td>
<td>City of Centerville 300 E. Church Street P.O. Box 55 Centerville, GA 31028</td>
<td>478-953-4734 478-953-4797</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cvillecityclerk@alltel.net">cvillecityclerk@alltel.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Herring</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Development Director</td>
<td>City of Jefferson 147 Athens Street Jefferson, GA 30549</td>
<td>706-367-5002 706-367-5751</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gherring@cityofjeffersonga.com">gherring@cityofjeffersonga.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hiss</td>
<td>County Administrator</td>
<td>Meriwether County P.O. Box 428 Greenville, GA 30222</td>
<td>706-672-1314 706-672-1886</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robhiss@hotmail.com">robhiss@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Ann Hutchinson</td>
<td>City Planner/Zoning Administrator</td>
<td>City of Thomasville P. O. Box 1540 Thomasville, GA 31799</td>
<td>229-227-3301 229-227-7028</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeananhh@thomasville.org">jeananhh@thomasville.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Jackson</td>
<td>Zoning Coordinator</td>
<td>Putnam County Planning &amp; Engineering 663 Godfrey Road Eatonton, GA 31024</td>
<td>706-485-2776 706-485-0552</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ljackson@putnamga.com">ljackson@putnamga.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian Johnson</td>
<td>Council member</td>
<td>City of Fairburn 56 Malone Street Fairburn, GA 30213</td>
<td>770-964-2244 770-969-2484</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johnsonsonthehill@fairburn.com">johnsonsonthehill@fairburn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Municipal Position</td>
<td>City/Address</td>
<td>Phone Numbers</td>
<td>Email Addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Johnson</td>
<td>Mayor Pro Tem</td>
<td>City of Sugar Hill</td>
<td>770-945-6716 678-714-8145</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ronjohnson@cityofsugarhill.com">ronjohnson@cityofsugarhill.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Kaiser</td>
<td>Director, Public Services &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>Rockdale Public Services &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>P. O. Box 289 Conyers, GA 30012</td>
<td><a href="mailto:larry.kaiser@rockdalecounty.org">larry.kaiser@rockdalecounty.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg Kelsey</td>
<td>Assistant City Manager</td>
<td>City Of Lagrange</td>
<td>706-883-2013 706-883-2020</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mkelsey@lagrange-ga.org">mkelsey@lagrange-ga.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Maltese</td>
<td>Community and Economic Development Director</td>
<td>City of Lagrange</td>
<td>706-882-2010 706-883-2020</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmaltese@lagrange-ga.org">jmaltese@lagrange-ga.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Mannino</td>
<td>Director of planning and Zoning</td>
<td>City of Cartersville</td>
<td>770-607-6181 770-387-5605</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmannino@cityofcartersville.org">rmannino@cityofcartersville.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary McCullough</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City of Dahlonega</td>
<td>706-861-6133 706-864-4837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry McElwee</td>
<td>City Clerk</td>
<td>City of Auburn</td>
<td>770-963-4002 770-513-9255</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tmcelwee@cityofauburn-ga.org">tmcelwee@cityofauburn-ga.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard McLeod</td>
<td>Director of Planning and Economic Development</td>
<td>City of Woodstock</td>
<td>678-614-5039</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmcleod@ci.woodstock.ga.us">rmcleod@ci.woodstock.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Money</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City of Auburn</td>
<td>770-963-4002 770-513-9255</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hmoney@cityofauburn-ga.org">hmoney@cityofauburn-ga.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Montesinos</td>
<td>Interim Director of Community Services</td>
<td>City of East Point</td>
<td>404-765-1031 404-765-1186</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmontesinos@eastpointcity.org">cmontesinos@eastpointcity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winton Moreland</td>
<td>Mayor Pro Tem</td>
<td>City of Douglasville</td>
<td>770-920-3000 770-920-0499</td>
<td><a href="mailto:winton-moreland@ci.douglasville.ga.us">winton-moreland@ci.douglasville.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Mueller</td>
<td>Council Member</td>
<td>City of Woodstock</td>
<td>770-592-6002 770-926-1375</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rvmueller324@msn.com">rvmueller324@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Newton, IV</td>
<td>Chairman of Commission</td>
<td>McDuffie County Board of Commissioners</td>
<td>706-595-2100 706-595-4710</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cnewton@thomson-mcduffie.net">cnewton@thomson-mcduffie.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Ogundu</td>
<td>Mayor Pro Tem</td>
<td>City of Hahira</td>
<td>229-794-2330 229-794-9310</td>
<td><a href="mailto:citymanager@hahira.ga.us">citymanager@hahira.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Patterson</td>
<td>Community Planner</td>
<td>Coosa Valley RDC</td>
<td>7062967485</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kpaterson@cvrdc.org">kpaterson@cvrdc.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone Numbers</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connie Perry</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City of Nashville</td>
<td>405 West Washington Avenue</td>
<td>229-686-5527 229-686-2187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 495</td>
<td>Nashville, GA 31639</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cityofnash@alltel.net">cityofnash@alltel.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Pruitt</td>
<td>Council Member</td>
<td>City of Cartersville</td>
<td>P. O. Box 1390</td>
<td>770-607-5265 770-607-5269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cartersville, GA 30120</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:loripruitt@bellsouth.net">loripruitt@bellsouth.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Rawlings</td>
<td>Interim Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>City of Bloomingdale</td>
<td>912-748-0970 912-748-1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td></td>
<td>P. O. Box 216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bloomingdale, GA 31302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Rodgers</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Harris County</td>
<td>P. O. Box 365</td>
<td>706-628-4958 706-628-4223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hamilton, GA 31811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufus Stewart</td>
<td>Council Member</td>
<td>City Of McDonough</td>
<td>136 Keys Ferry Street</td>
<td>770-957-3915 770-898-1086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McDonough, GA 30253</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mcdadmin@charter.net">mcdadmin@charter.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickey Thompson</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City of Douglasville</td>
<td>P. O. Box 219</td>
<td>770-920-3000 770-920-0499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Douglasville, GA 30133</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:thompsonm@ci.douglasville.g.us">thompsonm@ci.douglasville.g.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Tinsley</td>
<td>Planning Director</td>
<td>City of St. Marys</td>
<td>418 Osborne Street</td>
<td>912-882-2109 912-673-1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saint Marys, GA 31558</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:max.tinsley@ci.st-marys.ga.us">max.tinsley@ci.st-marys.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Wood</td>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>City Of Statesboro</td>
<td>P. O. Box 348</td>
<td>912-764-5468 912-489-6140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 East Main Street</td>
<td>Statesboro, GA 30459</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gwood@statesboroga.net">gwood@statesboroga.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronnie Wallace</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City Of Rome</td>
<td>P. O. Box 1433</td>
<td>706-236-4400 706-236-4405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rome, GA 30162</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rwallace@coosavalleytech.edu">rwallace@coosavalleytech.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemontine Washington</td>
<td>Councilwoman</td>
<td>City of Midway</td>
<td>P. O. Box 125</td>
<td>912-884-3344 912-884-5107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midway, GA 31320</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cityofmidway@hotmail.com">cityofmidway@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Watkins</td>
<td>Director of Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>Cherokee County</td>
<td>130 East Main Street</td>
<td>770-345-3375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 108</td>
<td>Canton, GA 30114</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwatkins@cherokeega.com">jwatkins@cherokeega.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Wedincamp</td>
<td>Councilman</td>
<td>City of Bloomingdale</td>
<td>P. O. Box 216</td>
<td>912-748-0970 912-748-1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bloomingdale, GA 31302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathleen Williams</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Columbus Housing Initiative</td>
<td>18 11th Street</td>
<td>706-324-4663 706-320-9899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus, GA 31901</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cwilliams@chiinc.org">cwilliams@chiinc.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Presenters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Askew</td>
<td>Office of Environmental Management, Georgia Department of Community Affairs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laskew@dca.state.ga.us">laskew@dca.state.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Barr</td>
<td>Carroll County Commission</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rbarr@carrollcountyga.com">rbarr@carrollcountyga.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jo Bragan</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bragan.maryjo@epa.gov">bragan.maryjo@epa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Brewer</td>
<td>Green Street Properties</td>
<td><a href="mailto:colleen@gsprop.com">colleen@gsprop.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Brinson</td>
<td>City of Suwanee</td>
<td><a href="mailto:denise@suwanee.com">denise@suwanee.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory Brock</td>
<td>Clayton County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emory.brock@co.clayton.ga.us">emory.brock@co.clayton.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Brockenbrough</td>
<td>Service Delivery Region 12</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sbrocken@dca.state.ga.us">sbrocken@dca.state.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick L. Brooks</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Environmental Management Division</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rbrooks@dca.state.ga.us">rbrooks@dca.state.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Brown</td>
<td>Office of Planning &amp; Quality Growth, Georgia Department of Community Affairs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbrown@dca.state.ga.us">jbrown@dca.state.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Brown</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sbrown@peachtree-city.org">sbrown@peachtree-city.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Cochran</td>
<td>J. Cochran &amp; Co.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jacoch@bellsouth.net">jacoch@bellsouth.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Contant</td>
<td>College of Architecture</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cheryl.contant@coa.gatech.edu">cheryl.contant@coa.gatech.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Cornell</td>
<td>Jordan, Jones &amp; Goulding</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gcornell@jjg.com">gcornell@jjg.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Day</td>
<td>Day Wilburn Associates Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rday@daywilburn.com">rday@daywilburn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Dean</td>
<td>Fortson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tdean@knology.net">tdean@knology.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dobbins</td>
<td>Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike.dobbins@arch.gatech.edu">mike.dobbins@arch.gatech.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Dorfman</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jdorfman@agecon.uga.edu">jdorfman@agecon.uga.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Durrett</td>
<td>Urban Land Institute-Atlanta</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jdurrett@atlanta.uli.org">jdurrett@atlanta.uli.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Flocks</td>
<td>PEDS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@peds.org">info@peds.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas D. Galloway</td>
<td>College of Architecture</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tom.galloway@coa.gatech.edu">tom.galloway@coa.gatech.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Gavigan</td>
<td>Office of Planning &amp; Quality Growth, Georgia Department of Community Affairs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sgavigan@dca.state.ga.us">sgavigan@dca.state.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Gay</td>
<td>McKenna, Long &amp; Aldridge</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sgay@mckennalong.com">sgay@mckennalong.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Gellerstedt III</td>
<td>Gellerstedt Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lgeller@gellerstedtgroup.com">lgeller@gellerstedtgroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise R. Grabowski</td>
<td>Lott + Barber Architects</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dgrabowski@lottbarber.com">dgrabowski@lottbarber.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Green</td>
<td>Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Harvey</td>
<td>Urban Collage</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Johnston</td>
<td>Office of Economic Development, Georgia Department of Community Affairs</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Kidd</td>
<td>The Georgia Conservancy</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Laudeman</td>
<td>Economic Development Institute</td>
<td>Dalton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Logan</td>
<td>Robert Charles Lesser &amp; Co</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Papa</td>
<td>Office of Regional Services</td>
<td>Gainesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Dee Quinnelly</td>
<td>Office of Planning &amp; Quality Growth</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynette Gross</td>
<td>Community Reinvestment</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Hoffman</td>
<td>Glattinng Jackson Kercher Anglin Lopez Rinehart, Inc.</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Kaiser</td>
<td>Public Services and Engineering</td>
<td>Conyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Kirbow</td>
<td>Office of Single Family Housing</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob LeBeau</td>
<td>Atlanta Regional Commission</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyn Menne</td>
<td>City of Decatur</td>
<td>Decatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Porter</td>
<td>Richport Properties</td>
<td>Tucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Reuter</td>
<td>Atlanta Regional Commission</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Ross</td>
<td>Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotty Greene</td>
<td>Buckhead Community Improvement District</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Hogsed</td>
<td>Data Smarts</td>
<td>Dulduth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Keys</td>
<td>Jordan, Jones &amp; Goulding</td>
<td>Norcross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Langford</td>
<td>Trust for Public Land</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Littlefield</td>
<td>Chattanooga City Council</td>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Nygren</td>
<td>Chattahoochee Hill Country Alliance</td>
<td>Palmetto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Pouncey Jr</td>
<td>Morris, Manning &amp; Martin, LLP</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Kirbow</td>
<td>Office of Single Family Housing</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company/Institution</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Troy Russ</td>
<td>Glatting Jackson Kercher Anglin Lopez Rinehart, Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:truss@glatting.com">truss@glatting.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leamon Scott</td>
<td>Office of Regional Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lscott@dca.state.ga.us">lscott@dca.state.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Steele</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ksteele@fayetteville-ga.gov">ksteele@fayetteville-ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Sundquist</td>
<td>Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eric.sundquist@coa.gatech.edu">eric.sundquist@coa.gatech.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Michael Tennant</td>
<td>Alston &amp; Bird</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mtennant@alston.com">mtennant@alston.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Vinson</td>
<td>Clark’s Grove</td>
<td><a href="mailto:randvison@aol.com">randvison@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Westin</td>
<td>Office of Decision Support Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lwestin@dca.state.ga.us">lwestin@dca.state.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alycen Whidden</td>
<td>Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh &amp; Associates</td>
<td><a href="mailto:awhidden@tunspan.com">awhidden@tunspan.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James R. Wilburn</td>
<td>Day Wilburn Associates Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rwilburn@daywilburn.com">rwilburn@daywilburn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Williams</td>
<td>Columbus Housing Initiative</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cwilliams@chiinc.org">cwilliams@chiinc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Witt</td>
<td>Selig Enterprises</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dwitt@seligenterprises.com">dwitt@seligenterprises.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriane Wood</td>
<td>Office of Planning &amp; Quality Growth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:awood@dca.state.ga.us">awood@dca.state.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annaka Woodruff</td>
<td>Office of Planning &amp; Quality Growth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:awoodruf@dca.state.ga.us">awoodruf@dca.state.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conference Planners & Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saskia Benjamin</strong></td>
<td>Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gtg768U@mail.gatech.edu">gtg768U@mail.gatech.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mine Hashas</strong></td>
<td>Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mine.hashas@arch.gatech.edu">mine.hashas@arch.gatech.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jontyl C. Brown</strong></td>
<td>Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jontyl.brown@coa.gatech.edu">jontyl.brown@coa.gatech.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jim Frederick</strong></td>
<td>Georgia Department of Community Affairs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jfrederi@dca.state.ga.us">jfrederi@dca.state.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ying Huang</strong></td>
<td>Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gtg470p@mail.gatech.edu">gtg470p@mail.gatech.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ikroop Kaur</strong></td>
<td>Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gtg037p@mail.gatech.edu">gtg037p@mail.gatech.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jung il Kim</strong></td>
<td>Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gtg0009p@mail.gatech.edu">gtg0009p@mail.gatech.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ross King</strong></td>
<td>Association County Commissioners of Georgia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rking@accg.org">rking@accg.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stacy Lambert</strong></td>
<td>Public Administration and Urban Studies</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stacyatlanta@mindspring.com">stacyatlanta@mindspring.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karen Leone de Nie</strong></td>
<td>Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gtg070n@mail.gatech.edu">gtg070n@mail.gatech.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Al Outland</strong></td>
<td>Georgia Municipal Association</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aoutland@gmanet.com">aoutland@gmanet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alyssa Phaneuf</strong></td>
<td>Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gtg788s@mail.gatech.edu">gtg788s@mail.gatech.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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About Quality Growth

Adapted from DCA’s publication “A Guide to Understanding and Implementing Quality Growth in Your Community”

What is Quality Growth?

“New Discount Retailer Threatens Downtown Businesses”
“Road Widening to Remove Historic Buildings”
“Residents Protest Shopping Center Rezoning”
“Opponents Protest High-Density Project at Hearing”

Headlines like these are typical in many communities throughout Georgia. People are concerned about changes in their way of life — decline in the character of their neighborhoods, encroaching commercial development, increasing traffic, loss of trees, farmland or open space, and water quality or other environmental problems. But community change doesn’t have to be traumatic. Communities can work out ways to guide change and development, making sure that new growth enriches the community and promotes a better quality of life for all residents. This manageable type of community change is called quality growth.

Quality growth, in many ways, means returning to the way we used to build our communities and neighborhoods: places where people could walk to school or the corner drugstore, pursue recreational activities at a nearby park, or just sit on the front porch and get to know their neighbors.

Quality growth can yield a number of benefits for your community:
• Residents will enjoy an improved quality of life, more affordable housing, cleaner water and air, more walkable neighborhoods, and reduced commuting times.
• Developers will experience reduced infrastructure and land costs and more predictability in the development approval process.
• Your local government will benefit from reduced service delivery costs, increased tax revenues, and enhanced economic development potential.

Quality Growth Principles

DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS

Traditional Neighborhoods: Traditional neighborhood development patterns should be encouraged, including use of more human scale development, compact development, mixing of uses within easy walking distance of one another, and facilitating pedestrian activity.

Infill Development: Communities should maximize the use of existing infrastructure and minimize the conversion of undeveloped land at the urban periphery by encouraging development or redevelopment of sites closer to the downtown or traditional urban core of the community.

Sense of Place: Traditional downtown areas should be maintained as the focal point of the community or, for newer areas where this is not possible, the development of activity centers that serve as community focal points should be encouraged. These community focal points should be attractive, mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly places where people choose to gather for shopping, dining, socializing, and entertainment.
Transportation Alternatives: Alternatives to transportation by automobile, including mass transit, bicycle routes, and pedestrian facilities, should be made available in each community. Greater use of alternate transportation should be encouraged.

Regional Identity: Each region should promote and preserve a regional identity, or regional sense of place, defined in terms of traditional architecture, common economic linkages that bind the region together, or other shared characteristics.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION
Heritage Preservation: The traditional character of the community should be maintained through preserving and revitalizing historic areas of the community, encouraging new development that is compatible with the traditional features of the community, and protecting other scenic or natural features that are important to defining the community's character.

Open Space Preservation: New development should be designed to minimize the amount of land consumed, and open space should be set aside from development for use as public parks or as greenbelts/wildlife corridors. Compact development ordinances are one way of encouraging this type of open space preservation.

Environmental Protection: Environmentally sensitive areas should be protected from negative impacts of development. Whenever possible, the natural terrain, drainage, and vegetation of an area should be preserved.

SOCIAL & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
Growth Preparedness: Each community should identify and put in place the prerequisites for the type of growth it seeks to achieve. These might include infrastructure (roads, water, and sewer) to support new growth, appropriate training of the workforce, ordinances and regulations to manage growth as desired, or leadership capable of responding to growth opportunities and managing new growth when it occurs.

Appropriate Businesses: The businesses and industries encouraged to develop or expand in a community should be suitable for the community in terms of job skills required, long-term sustainability, linkages to other economic activities in the region, impact on the resources of the area, and future prospects for expansion and creation of higher-skill job opportunities.

Employment Options: A range of job types should be provided in each community to meet the diverse needs of the local workforce.

Housing Choices: A range of housing size, cost, and density should be provided in each community to make it possible for all who work in the community to also live in the community (thereby reducing commuting distances), to promote a mixture of income and age groups in each community, and to provide a range of housing choice to meet market needs.

Educational Opportunities: Educational and training opportunities should be readily available in each community — to permit community residents to improve their job skills, adapt to technological advances, or to pursue entrepreneurial ambitions.

Regional Cooperation: Regional cooperation should be encouraged in setting priorities, identifying shared needs, and finding collaborative solutions, particularly where it is critical to success of a venture, such as protection of shared natural resources or development of a transportation network. Each community may apply these quality growth principles to meet their particular needs and conditions.
New subdivisions match the mix of housing types and styles of the older, closer-in neighborhoods of the community. Street layouts also match those in older parts of the community and connect to the existing street network at many points. The cul-de-sac subdivisions typical of most suburban areas are discouraged.

Traffic calming measures are employed along major roadways to slow traffic speeds and thereby create a pedestrian-friendly environment. These measures include narrowed street widths, on-street parking, or raised pedestrian crossings.

The community is relatively compact, with new development matching the typical density of the older center of the community. The typical historic sections of Georgia towns have average lot sizes of around one-quarter acre.

Environmental sensitive areas of the community (such as stream banks, flood plains, or steep hillsides) are set aside from development and used as parks or passive recreation areas to be enjoyed by all community residents.

The community has a clear boundary, where town ends and countryside begins. Unattractive rural sprawl along roadways has been avoided by concentrating new housing and commercial buildings in small, well-planned villages, leaving lots of intervening farmland or open space.

Schools and their playgrounds/ballparks are located within the neighborhoods, making it possible for children to walk or bike to school. This also permits neighborhood residents to make use of school facilities (meeting rooms, playgrounds, or ball-parks) when school is not in session.

Sidewalks and bike trails are provided throughout the community to encourage walking and bicycling as an alternative to driving to most destinations.

Street trees are planted throughout the community to enhance appearances and provide shade for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Mix of housing sizes and types in each neighborhood, to provide opportunities for people of different incomes to live near where they work or go to school.
Quality Growth Resources

Adapted from DCA’s publication "Quality Growth Assistance Menu"

Georgia Quality Growth Partnership (www.georgiaqualitygrowth.com)

**Toolkit:** Practical advice to local governments on quality growth tools with step-by-step guides for implementation, considerations about costs, administrative requirements, and example ordinances.

**Resource Team:** Local technical assistance visits, staffed by volunteers from the partnership, the state university system, and public or private sector participants from the design or development fields who help communities develop comprehensive strategies for implementing quality growth practices.

**Georgia Examples:** Web site of mini-case studies about quality growth projects taking place within Georgia, including contact information to help facilitate peer-to-peer sharing among local governments.

**Quality Growth Advisory Clinic:** A panel of experts, made available at major in-state conferences for one-on-one consultation and advice about local quality growth projects.

Atlanta Regional Commission (www.atlantaregional.com)

**Livable Centers Initiative (LCI):** Provides seed money to communities in ARC region working to enhance livability and mobility for their residents.

**Community Planning Academy (CPA):** Provides targeted education in community planning and its many challenges, including training for planning officials and citizens.

**Community Choices Toolkit:** Offers communities customized solutions for their very different needs. Each tool incorporates best practices at work both locally and nationally and molds them into strategies that make sense for the Atlanta Region.

**Developments of Excellence Awards Program:** To showcase truly innovative projects.

**Data Training:** Provides information about data-rich web sites so communities can find demographic and socioeconomic data to help in grant writing and public presentations.

**Census Data Maps** (http://atlantacensus2000.gsu.edu): A collaborative website between Georgia State University Fiscal Research Program and ARC, allowing access and display of population, age, gender, ethnicity, income and household information for the entire United States or for an area as small as a neighborhood of your choice.

Atlanta Regional Consortium for Higher Education (www.atlantahighered.org)

**Higher Education Resources for Quality Growth Directory:** Identifies a wide range of technical assistance, research, and informational resources available through the various Atlanta area colleges and universities to support local quality growth initiatives.

The Georgia Conservancy (www.georgiaconservancy.org)
Works in partnerships such as the Alliance for Quality Growth, and the Georgia Quality Growth Partnership to provide incentives and technical assistance for quality growth efforts.

**Blueprints for Successful Communities:** Technical assistance and education to help communities chart their future in ways that can protect and enhance social, cultural and environmental assets.

**The Georgia Cool Communities (www.coolcommunities.org)**

Provides technical assistance on sustainable development to help mitigate Urban Heat Islands and improve air and water quality using vegetative cover and tree canopy, reflective roofing materials, and lighter colored or pervious paving alternatives. Offers resource materials and links to scientific studies and reports, practical applications of Urban Heat Island mitigation strategies and information about projects in various communities. Conducts seminars and conference presentations, lunch & learn sessions, quarterly information forums.

**Georgia Department of Community Affairs (DCA) (www.dca.state.ga.us)**

**Better Hometown and Georgia Main Street Programs (www.betterhometown.org):** Self-help community development programs designed to improve a community's quality of life through sound planning and implementation for Georgia's small and large cities.

**Downtown Development Resource and Program Guide:** Identifies all DCA resources and programs that are available to assist in the revitalization of Georgia's downtowns.

**Comprehensive PlanBuilder (www.georgiaplanning.com):** A web-enabled computer program for development of comprehensive plans online, with decision support tools, hot links, and an array of data and maps.

**Model Code: Alternatives to Conventional Zoning (www.dca.state.ga.us/planning/modelcode.html):** Provides viable legal alternatives to conventional zoning for smaller local governments with limited technical and administrative capacity, such as sign ordinances, manufactured housing, and subdivision regulations, as well as more innovative tools such as performance standards, design review, and clustering rural development.

**Quality Growth Grant Program (www.dca.state.ga.us/grants/qualitygrowthgrant.html):** State financial assistance for the implementation of quality growth initiatives — any activities that promote better management of growth and development so that growth enhances the quality of life in a community.

**Special Issue Retreats:** Intensive one-or-two-day gatherings of key local officials for hands-on work with a recognized expert in a particular quality growth approach (e.g., innovative site plan review, sign regulations, mixed use zoning).

**Quality Growth Assessment:** A review of local regulations and development patterns to identify local barriers to implementation of quality growth best practices.

**Direct Technical Assistance:** Hands-on expert assistance, provided upon request to communities seeking to implement particular quality growth approaches.

**Regional Offices (www.dca.state.ga.us_regions/index.html):** Arrange technical assistance for local governments interested in implementing quality growth initiatives.
Georgia Department of Natural Resources Coastal Resources Division
(http://crd.dnr.state.ga.us)

Georgia Coastal Management Program (GCMP): Provides technical assistance to local governments and other coastal stakeholders in identifying, protecting, and enhancing public access to natural resources, GIS mapping, researching funding for resource related projects; and linking with other regional and state agencies.

Coastal Incentive Grant Program: Provides financial assistance to local, regional, and state agencies, research and educational institutions for projects that protect or enhance coastal resources.

Georgia Environmental Policy Institute (www.gepinstitute.com)

The Georgia Land Trust Service Center: Works to increase the effectiveness of land trusts and helps land owners protect conservation lands in Georgia and the Southeast.

The Georgia Wetlands Trust Fund: Provides an alternative strategy for meeting wetlands mitigation requirements under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Georgia Forestry Commission Urban & Community Forestry (www.gfc.state.ga.us/Services/UCF/index.cfm)

Financial Assistance Program: Provides money to help conserve, manage, and enhance community forests.

Technical Assistance: Tree ordinance development assistance; Community Tree Benefits & Care; Urban/rural interface assistance; and training.

Georgia Institute of Technology (www.gatech.edu)

Economic Development Institute (www.edi.gatech.edu)

Fiscal Impact Tool for Land Use Planning: Helps local officials, economic developers, and planners to project the fiscal impact of growth under alternative land use pattern scenarios.

Strategic Opportunities Assessment: Provides a community with guidelines and recommendations for a five to ten year strategic plan for economic development, compatible with quality growth objectives.

Research Institute (www.gatech.edu/research/)

Tech Assist Program (www.gtassist.org): Technical assistance in the areas of environment, safety, health, and sustainable facilities to communities and small and medium-sized industries.

Technical Outreach Services for Communities (TOSC) (www.tosprogram.org): Guidance through the environmental cleanup and site reuse process.

Technical Assistance for Brownfields (TAB) (www.tosprogram.org): Technical assistance to communities and municipalities addressing the environmental issues of Brownfield cleanup and redevelopment.

Sustainable Facilities and Infrastructure Program (SFI) (http://maven.gtri.gatech.edu/sfi): Technical assistance and training to public and private institutions seeking to implement sustainability in their capital facility practices.
College of Architecture (www.coa.gatech.edu/)

Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development (www.coa.gatech.edu/cqgrd):
Cutting-edge research on sustainable growth, transportation, environmental protection, quality schools, and community involvement. Outreach and educational program to promote improved quality of life in regions throughout U.S. and abroad.

City and Regional Planning Program (www.coa.gatech.edu/crp): Research focused on growth management, land use, transportation, economic development, housing, and environmental protection in city and regional settings. Accredited master's degree and studio field-level experiences for local communities in quality growth issues.

Architecture Program (www.coa.gatech.edu/arch): Research and studio education in urban design, suburban retrofitting, and pedestrian/walkable environments.

Regional Development Centers (www.dca.state.ga.us/planning/rdc_mapc.pdf)

Planning Divisions provide assistance with the development of local and regional comprehensive plans, preparation of land management ordinances, codification of ordinances, mapping, and review of Developments of Regional Impact.

University of Georgia (www.uga.edu)

Alliance for Quality Growth (http://aqg.ecology.uga.edu): Provides technical assistance on quality growth planning; incentives for smart growth; and smart growth regulation. Offers technical assistance on greenspace/farmland protection; planning strategies, economies of growth management, zoning and regulatory issues. Available library of technical reports and policy papers, and including a speakers' bureau and public presentations.

Carl Vinson Institute of Government (www.cviog.uga.edu)

College of Environment and Design Public Service and Outreach Programs
Institute of Ecology (http://www.rivercenter.uga.edu/service.htm): Undertakes research and policy assistance focused on land-use, biodiversity, water and air quality.

School of Environmental Design (www.sed.uga.edu): Provides landscape Architecture, Historic Preservation and Community Design Services, including: Community Design Charrettes; Corridor Studies; Downtown Revitalization; Landscape Planning; Historic Resource Surveys and Preservation Plans; Historic District Design Guidelines.

Urban Land Institute Atlanta District Council (www.atlanta.uli.org)

Atlanta’s Advisory Services Committee provides professional and technical services to Atlanta region projects and processes through the involvement of local ULI members, including creating local advisory panels and review of local public development and planning initiatives.
About Technology Square

In a previously blighted and vacant three-block area of midtown Atlanta where security was a constant concern and pedestrian activity was nonexistent, Georgia Institute of Technology has overcome physical and psychological barriers to connect the university with the Midtown neighborhood by developing a vibrant, 24/7 urban campus for students and community members alike.

The development, at Fifth and Spring streets, represents the culmination of years of planning. It was the first development to implement Blueprint Midtown, a set of guidelines adopted by the Atlanta City Council as a special zoning district, and the project has set the standard by which...
future development in the area will be judged. It has spurred commercial development at an adjacent Class A office development, thereby enhancing the synergy between private sector technology businesses and Georgia Tech’s research and academic resources. This integrated, mixed-use development consists of 700,000 square feet of office space, approximately 300,000 square feet devoted to research at Georgia Tech, over 100,000 square feet of street level retail space, a 250-room hotel and conference center and 132 residential units.

Consequently, in Technology Square, students, faculty, Midtown residents, businesspeople, and visitors meet and interact, attracted by wide, tree-lined sidewalks with benches and bicycle lanes, shops and restaurants, a hotel, on-street and garage parking, and access to public transportation. It is served by MARTA bus and rail and a free, alternative-fuel Tech Trolley. Using state-of-the-art planning principles, the modern buildings are located in a way that enhances the pedestrian environment while minimizing the impact of cars. Streetscapes include furniture, ample street trees and wide sidewalks to create a strong sense of place. On-street parking and bike lanes are also provided to serve as traffic calming measures on the urban streets. This development is an urban model of public-private partnerships working to overcome obstacles and create great environments that bring people together.

Between Technology Square and the main Tech campus, the university is working with the Georgia Department of Transportation to expand the Fifth Street bridge and create a fully landscaped area over traffic on I-75/I-85. The bridge will be completely remade over the next 24 months.

### At Technology Square

- Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development, a research center to study metro Atlanta as a living laboratory for mixed-use development and related issues.
- DuPree College of Management, with 189,000 square feet of classrooms, offices and learning resource space, including Executive Education and Interdisciplinary Centers.
- Economic Development Institute, devoted to furthering business development and economic growth throughout the state of Georgia.
- Global Learning Center, including 113,000 square feet dedicated to classrooms, computing labs, offices and distance learning.
- The 252-room Georgia Tech Hotel and Conference Center, including an Executive Conference Center with 21,000 square feet of meeting space.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nearby restaurants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5th Street Ribs and Blues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA 30308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Barbeque Ribs, Chicken, and Pork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ami</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817 West Peachtree St. Suite E125 (Cypress &amp; Sixth St., behind Biltmore)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA 30308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 404-815-9243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Elegant sit-down French style flare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apache Cafe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 3rd. St NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA 30308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 404.876-5436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Funky artist/performance cafe, Mexican fare, coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arby's</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744 Spring Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA 30308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-881-8535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Fast food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arcade Cafe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817 W Peachtree St NW # A105 (at Biltmore Hotel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA 30308-1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Southern Cuisine; Sandwiches and Salad Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atlanta Coney Island</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759 West Peachtree Street Suite 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA, 30306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-872-9395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Hot Dogs, Burgers, Gyros, Salads, Sandwiches, and Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bubble Tea and Smoothies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA 30308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Bubble Tea and Smoothies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Checkers (Drive-In)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>989 Spring St NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta GA 30309-3821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 404-892-7717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Burgers, Fries, Colas (Fast Food)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cafe Pharr Out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759 West Peachtree Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta GA 30308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 404-347-8005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Sandwiches and Hot Meals, Specializing in Chicken Salad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Cafe Diner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 10th St., N.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA 30318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-873-6074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Diner with HUGE menu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominos Pizza</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 10th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA 30309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 404-872-3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Pizza, Wings, Chicken Kickers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Einstein's</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1077 Juniper St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA 30309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-875-6634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Flying Biscuit Cafe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 Piedmont Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA 30309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-874-8887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Vegetarian Breakfasts and Lunches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gordon Biersch Brewery &amp; Restaurant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>848 Peachtree St. at 7th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA, 30308-1202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-870-0805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Brewery with mid-priced food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jock's &amp; Jill's</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 10th St., N.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA 30309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-873-5405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: American sports bar and restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joe's On Juniper</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1049 Juniper St., N.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA 30309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404: 875-6634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lil' Dino Subs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537 10th St., N.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA 30318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-873-1677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Sub shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McDonald's</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105 Northside Dr., N.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA 30318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-876-6766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Fast food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marble Slab Creamery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moe's Southwestern Grill</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nickiemoto's Midtown</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Papa John's Pizza</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philly Connection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rocky Mountain Pizza Company</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Charles Deli</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starbucks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tin Drum Asia Cafe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Touch of India</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Varsity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vortex Bar &amp; Grill</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zocalo</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Governments & Growth Presentation Materials
Smart Growth Principles and Reasons
Growing by Choice ..... Not by Chance

Urban Land Institute
Mission: To provide responsible leadership in the use of land in order to enhance the total environment.
Atlanta Regional Growth

- Population: 1980 to 2000, doubled to 4.1 million
- Jobs: 1990s, led the nation in new jobs (671,000)
- Housing: 1990s, led the nation in new housing units (457,557)
- Income: 1990s, income increased by 50%

Impacts of Growth

[Diagram showing Atlanta and downtown Atlanta with Atlanta Airport highlighted]
Impacts of Growth

Time Spent in Atlanta Congestion
annual hours per capita

- 11 hours
- 20 hours
- 25 hours
- 43 hours
- 53 hours

"We have in a short time become a nation in which 30% of adults are sedentary and more than half are overweight."

Winston Churchill

"We shape our buildings, and afterwards our buildings shape us."

We have in a short time become a nation in which 30% of adults are sedentary and more than half are overweight.

Source: CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention & Health Promotion

Impacts of Growth

• Infrastructure
• Services

Georgia's Obesity Trends
By Body Mass Index

Source: CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention & Health Promotion

Impacts of Growth

The cost of moving up
Census: Bigger homes, longer commutes and higher mortgages
• How your state ranks ?

Growing by choice, not by chance

• Growth means development
• Smart growth means development that accommodates growth in smart ways
• "Smart growth seeks to identify a common ground where developers, environmentalists, public officials, citizens, and others can all find acceptable ways to accommodate growth."

**What is Smart Growth?** Urban Land, June 1998
Smart Growth: Three Core Themes

1. Conservation of resources
2. Wider choices
3. Inclusive, public/private, multijurisdictional decision making

Smart Growth: Key Principles

1. Compact, multi-use development
2. Open space conservation
3. Expanded mobility
4. Enhanced livability
1 Compact, Multi-Use Development

- **Benefits:**
  - Open space; "place-making"; accessibility; transportation options; infrastructure and public services costs

- **Compactness Considerations:**
  - Scale; appropriate density; incremental

- **Mixed Use Considerations:**
  - Mix within buildings; mix at centers

- **Quality of Design:**
  - Cannot be overemphasized

...or this
Compact, Multi-Use Development

Reduce land use by adding residential, commercial, and public spaces and add trees and lamps.

ULI Atlanta
1. Compact, multi-use development

2. Open space conservation

3. Expanded mobility

4. Enhanced livability
Open Space Conservation

• Types and uses of open space:
  • Wetlands, floodplains, woodlands, farmland, urban open space

• Benefits of conservation:
  • Energy savings, stormwater, property values, recreation

• Qualities of conservation:
  • Balance development with conservation; integrate open space into development; begin with existing assets; look beyond acquisition; think "infrastructure"
Smart Growth: Key Principles

1. Compact, multi-use development
2. Open space conservation
3. Expanded mobility
4. Enhanced livability

Concerned with physical patterns of development that shape the built environment

Concerned with how the built environment affects, relates to, and meets the needs of people

Expanded Mobility

3

- Must have a coordinated, multi-modal approach
  - Highways, local roads, parking, public and private transit, pedestrian and bicycle pathways
  - Carefully select highway improvements
  - Use highway capacity more efficiently
3 Expanded Mobility

- Must have a coordinated, multi-modal approach
- Shift a significant share of travel to transit
- Make it possible, desirable to walk and bike
- Land use and connections are the keys
Smart Growth: Key Principles

1. Compact, multi-use development
2. Open space conservation
3. Expanded mobility
4. Enhanced livability

Concerned with physical patterns of development that shape the built environment

Concerned with how the built environment affects, relates to, and meets the needs of people

Enhanced Livability

- Key Qualities of Livability
  - Housing choices
  - Educational and employment opportunities
  - Community services and amenities
  - Recognizes social and economic diversity
  - Infrastructure investments in existing and developing areas
  - Distinctive places for people
Enhanced Livability

Building facelifts, reduction of through traffic, infill development

Enhanced Livability

Add street trees, quality sidewalks, traffic calming measures
Enhanced Livability

Before

After

It works in the urban environment...

Infill development, multiple building entrances and windows, add street trees and lamps
It works in the urban environment...
It works in the urban environment...

Urban Advantage
Creek restoration, bike path, infill development with creek as amenity

...as well as in suburban greenfields

Urban Advantage
Curbside islands improve stormwater space

ULI Atlanta
...as well as in suburban greenfields

Add "TND" development to help preserve a green belt around the right side of street

ULI Atlanta

...as well as in suburban greenfields

Before

After

ULI Atlanta
Smart Growth Summary

Three Core Themes:
1. Conservation of resources
2. Wider choices
3. Inclusive, multijurisdictional decision making

Four Principles:
1. Compact, multi-use development
2. Open space conservation
3. Expanded mobility
4. Enhanced livability

10 Principles: Smart Growth on “Fringe”

1. Collaborate on vision
2. Make it happen, don’t let it happen
3. Begin with green infrastructure
4. Protect environment / conserve resources
5. Provide diverse housing types and opportunities
6. Build centers of mixed use
7. Think long-term about transportation
8. Use multiple connections
9. Foster culture of community
10. Make it easy to do the right thing
Smart Growth in the Metro Atlanta Region
Principles and Reasons
Growing by Choice ..... Not by Chance
Livable Centers Initiatives

Governments and Growth
Georgia Tech Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development

Gary Cornell, AICP, Director of Planning
JJG’s LCI Projects

1. City of Duluth
2. Sandy Springs
3. City of Suwanee
4. City of Norcross
5. Gwinnett County
6. NW Atlanta
7. Avondale TOD
8. City of McDonough

Balanced Approach to Mobility

- Build new highways
- Widening highways
- Improve intersections
- Public transportation
- Alternative work hours
- Parking management
- Bicycle improvements
- Sidewalks

LAND USE MANAGEMENT
- Compact development
- Transit-oriented design
- Mixed-use development
- Balance of jobs and housing
LCI Strategy #1: Multi-Use Corridors

- Multi-modal Corridors
- Overcome Barriers to Walkability
- Mixed Use Development
## LCI Strategy #1: Multi-Use Corridors

### Multi-modal Street Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modes</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Overcome Barriers to Walkability

- **Maximum Right of Way for Cars = No-Man’s Land for Pedestrians**
Barriers to Walkability: Transportation Factors
- No sidewalks, discontinuities in sidewalks
- No right of way or space for sidewalks
- No crosswalks
- Long blocks
- High-speed traffic
- High-volume turn lanes
- Too many curb cuts

Barriers to Walkability: Site Design Factors
- Buildings not oriented to street
  - Big setback with parking in front
  - No front doors
  - No windows
- Barriers in pathways
  - Retaining walls, fences and hedges at prop. lines
- No cover or shade
- No streetlights
- No trees or landscaping
LCI Strategy #1: Multi-Use Corridors

Overcome Barriers to Walkability

Solutions for Walkability

- Clustered land uses
- Mid-block crossings
- Pedestrian access plan
- Street orientation/build-to lines
- Grid system with short blocks
- Street trees and landscaping

LCI Strategy #1: Multi-Use Corridors

Mixed Uses Reduce Traffic

24-Hour Day

- Home
- Sleep: 8 hours
- Preparation: 1 hour
- School: 1 hour
- Work: 8 hours
- Shops: 1 hour
- Other: 8 hours
LCI Strategy #1: Multi-Use Corridors

Mixed Uses Reduce Traffic

Reducing Trips Through Mix of Uses

LCI Strategy #2: Power of the Grid

Power of the Grid

Greater Capacity

All trips concentrated on one road
LCI Strategy #2: Power of the Grid

Hawthorne Traffic Equation
Paths(A,B)=(m+n)! / m! x n!

A 4x4 grid has 10 possible paths from A to B

A 8x8 grid has 12,870 possible paths from A to B

Sandy Springs LCI Study
Grid Plan for Roswell Road
to Remove 6,000 cars
LCI Strategy #2: Power of the Grid

Highway Strip
6 Lanes of Capacity - 1 Access Point

Grid Network
8 Lanes of Capacity
4 Access Points!

---

LCI Strategy #3: Connectivity

Typical Driveways on Highway Strip
LCI Strategy #3: Connectivity

Inter-parcel Access

Rear Parcel Access
LCI Strategy #4: Reinvent Parking

Surface parking lots waste land

Shared Parking saves land and construction cost

Diagrams from Glatting-Jackson-Kershner, Lopez.
LCI Strategy #4: Reinvent Parking

Separate parking lots

Shared Parking – a Park Once Environment

Structured parking adds new Real Estate!

Structured parking with wrap-around commercial
LCI Strategy #4: Reinvent Parking

Maximize On-Street Parking - Free Up Land

Parking Shown = 3/4Acre!

Synthesis: Demonstration Nodes
Synthesis: Public Involvement

Hands-on Scenario Building Exercises

Questions? Comments!
To help foster greater livability, mobility and accessibility in activity centers and to help the region better integrate the RTP with the goals and objectives of the Regional Development Plan (RDP), ARC unveiled the Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) program in 2000. The program provides funds for community level planning efforts, as well as money to implement transportation elements identified in these local plans.

Each LCI study is unique since current and future development goals are different for every community. Although LCI studies demonstrate an impressive range of ideas and ways to achieve the program’s objectives, all reflect a few fundamental concepts:

- Connecting homes, shops and offices
- Enhancing streetscapes and sidewalks
- Emphasizing the pedestrian
- Improving access to transit and other transportation options
- Expanding housing options.

**What’s new about the LCI program under Mobility 2030?**

- Expansion to include new communities within the urbanized area defined by the 2000 census
- Eligibility of corridors for study funding awards
  - Intent is to enhance local circulation needs and quality of life, not to solve congestion or regional mobility issues
  - Selected corridors must be a key access route linking activity centers to the surrounding community; approximately one-half mile to four miles in length
  - Priority will be given to corridors which connect existing LCI areas, other major activity centers and transit nodes.
  - Minimal emphasis will be placed on capacity options; the focus will instead be on better utilization of existing infrastructure, including access management, land use strategies, operational improvements and alternative modes
- Additional focus on emerging activity centers
- Extension of the planning program for an additional five years

**How is the program funded and how much money is available?**

- Federal funding comes from a discretionary pot of money (Q23-STP) which ARC programs annually
- Up to $1 million of federal funds available for planning efforts each year from 2005 to 2009
- Over $400 million of federal funds available for project implementation between program inception in 2000 and the year 2030
- Federal funding awards require a minimum 20% match from the local project sponsor
- Commitment represents over one-fourth of all available Q23-STP funds

For more information, including detailed eligibility requirements and the study application, visit ARC’s LCI website at [www.atlantaregional.com/qualitygrowth/lci.html](http://www.atlantaregional.com/qualitygrowth/lci.html).

Atlanta Regional Commission
40 Courtland Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
404-463-3272, Fax 404-463-3254
The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has created a program to help institute and fund county level comprehensive transportation plans in the Atlanta region. ARC will authorize and implement the program to match the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) Comprehensive Plan due dates in order to ensure that development of local transportation plans are conducted within the context of the overall local comprehensive planning process. Each county and its municipalities are expected to develop joint plans under this program. Funding for each eligible jurisdiction will be made available by ARC on a five-year cycle. For the purposes of this program, the City of Atlanta will be permitted to develop its own plan and Fulton County has the option to develop separate plans for the northern and southern parts of the county.

How is the program funded?

Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds, with a minimum 20% local match, will be used to fund these local planning efforts. Sponsors may overmatch the federal funds, if desired, but this will not result in an increase in funds committed by ARC. A maximum federal funding level available to the local jurisdiction will be established using ARC’S most recent population estimates used during TIP development. Maximum federal funding levels (minimum 20% local match not included) range from $100,000 to $1,000,000.

What are the requirements of the planning process?

- Adhere to applicable RTP, TIP and RDP policies
- Support the regional CMS planning process
- Give appropriate consideration to LCI communities and other key activity centers, as well as connections between these areas
- Give improvement priority to regionally significant transit and roadway corridors, as defined in the RTP
- Ensure that appropriate land use considerations are incorporated at the earliest stages of project planning and design, including consideration of development regulations
- Demonstrate an appropriate level of coordination with adjacent jurisdictions to address mobility, safety, design and land use implications of proposed major projects
- Meet all minimum transportation planning standards required by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs (DCA)
One of the new programs introduced in Mobility 2030 is the allocation of funds to conduct a series of multimodal corridor studies around the region. The purpose is to ensure that a thorough alternatives analysis is conducted along key corridors prior to making major capital investments. The studies will consider existing and future land uses, environmental issues, economic development opportunities in determining the most appropriate mix of improvements to address safety, mobility and accessibility needs of motorists, freight carriers, transit users, bicyclists and pedestrians.

**What corridors will be studied?**

Corridors have not yet been identified. ARC will work with local and state agencies to identify facilities of greatest need and potential. Study awards will be made from each year’s allocation as deemed most appropriate. Studies will concentrate on major arterials and other roadway facilities which serve a critical cross-regional mobility function and have documented significant safety and congestion problems. The length of each corridor may be anywhere from a few miles to 25 miles or more.

**How much money is available?**

A total of $600,000 of federal funds is programmed in each of the first two years of the plan (FY 2005 and FY 2006). A 20% match is required to receive federal funding, which would be provided by ARC funds and/or local jurisdictions. ARC estimates that this level of funding is sufficient to address three or four corridors. If the program proves successful, additional funding may be made available in future years to study more corridors.

**What are the anticipated results?**

Corridor plans will identify major capital and operational solutions for the corridor. These solutions will then be used as the basis for making project funding decisions in future RTP updates. Recommendations along a corridor should include:

1) land use policy recommendations  
2) access management plans  
3) traffic flow monitoring technologies  
4) signal coordination  
5) bicycle and pedestrian facilities  
6) bus rapid transit (BRT) services  
7) new parallel reliever roads  
8) intersection realignments  
9) additional general purpose lanes  
10) HOV lanes  
11) toll lanes  
12) truck lanes

ARC intends to consider achievement of land use goals based on these studies in making funding decisions in future Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs).

**Want to suggest a corridor to be studied?** Send us an email at transportation@atlantaregional.com.
The goal of Access Management is to limit and separate traffic conflict points. It can do this by restricting and consolidating access along major roadways, promoting a supporting street system and unifying access and circulation systems. This may include management and regulation of the location, design and operation of driveways, medians, median openings, traffic signals, interchanges and street connections. The result is a roadway that functions safely and efficiently for its useful life, and a more attractive corridor.

Why is Access Management important to the Atlanta region?

By managing roadway access, limiting and consolidating access along major transportation corridors, the region can:

- improve safety by reducing crashes
- extend the life of major roadways
- reduce traffic congestion
- support alternative modes of transportation
- have roadways that function efficiently
- have an efficient street and circulation system
- improve the appearance and quality of the built environment

How will Access Management be implemented?

ARC requires that all new roadway capacity projects programmed in the TIP using Q23 (STP) federal funds include the development of an access management plan during the engineering and design phase of the project. It is hoped that other agencies will adopt this policy for fund categories they program. The access management plans will:

- Be consistent with local and regional land use plans.
- Provide recommendations which enhance regional mobility along the overall corridor and are not just narrowly focused within the specific limits of the project.
- Give full consideration to all reasonable options, such as consolidating and eliminating existing curb cuts, improving interparcel connectivity, providing alternate access points from adjoining streets and reconfiguring signal locations and timing plans.
- Address future ingress/egress for all undeveloped parcels along the project corridor.
- Include landscaping, buffers and other elements to facilitate the movement of bicyclists, pedestrians and transit patrons along and across the project corridor.

Where to go for more information:

Atlanta Regional Commission Mobility 2030 web site: [http://www.atlantaregional.com/transportation/air/mobility2030.html](http://www.atlantaregional.com/transportation/air/mobility2030.html)
Appendix

Articles of Interest
Livable Communities
QUALITY COMMUNITY OBJECTIVES

HERITAGE PRESERVATION
The traditional character of the community should be maintained through preserving and revitalizing historic areas of the community, encouraging new development that is compatible with the traditional features of the community, and protecting other scenic or natural features that are important to defining the community’s character.

SENSE OF PLACE
Traditional downtown areas should be maintained as the focal point of the community, or, for newer areas where this is not possible, the development of activity centers that serve as community focal points should be encouraged. These community focal points should be attractive, mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly places where people choose to gather for shopping, dining, socializing, and entertainment.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
Environmentally sensitive areas should be protected from negative impacts of development, particularly when they are important for maintaining traditional character or quality of life of the community or region. Whenever possible, the natural terrain, drainage, and vegetation of an area should be preserved.

GROWTH PREPAREDNESS
Each community should identify and put in place the prerequisites for the type of growth it seeks to achieve. These might include housing and infrastructure (roads, water, sewer and telecommunications) to support new growth, appropriate training of the workforce, ordinances to direct growth as desired, or leadership capable of responding to growth opportunities.

INFILL DEVELOPMENT
Communities should maximize the use of existing infrastructure and minimize the conversion of undeveloped land at the urban periphery by encouraging development or redevelopment of sites closer to the downtowns or traditional urban core of the community.

LOCAL SELF-DETERMINATION
Communities should be allowed to develop and work toward achieving their own vision for the future. Where the state seeks to achieve particular objectives, state financial and technical assistance should be used as the incentive to encourage local government conformance to those objectives.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES
Educational and training opportunities should be readily available in each community — to permit community residents to improve their job skills, adapt to technological advances, or to pursue entrepreneurial ambitions.

WHY IS A QUALITY COMMUNITY SO IMPORTANT?

Why is a quality community so important? The question is simple; the answer more complicated. Today, Georgia’s communities are competing not only with their neighbor down the road, but with communities around the globe, in a new world of economic opportunity that offers unmatchable prosperity and demands unbounded resources. Locally, these resources are your institutions, your infrastructure, your environment, and your people. But, beyond these physical resources, it is the quality of life in your community which makes you unique and gives you an advantage over the community down the road or on the other side of the globe.

What is Quality of Life?

What is Quality of Life? It is a variety of things — from a vital downtown to public recreation areas and parks, from providing educational opportunities to transportation corridor management, from livable neighborhoods to quality jobs, from preserving a community’s sense of itself to preserving the common threads that bind communities together into a region. Building a quality community involves local leaders stepping up to identify and address these quality of life issues, thus enhancing their competitiveness in the new world of economic opportunity.

The traditional approaches communities have used to encourage growth and development have often led to a number of undesirable consequences — sprawl, decline of older neighborhoods, and degradation of critical natural resources. Traditional approaches are gradually being replaced with new “smart growth” concepts focusing on maintaining and enhancing the quality of life and managing the impacts of growth. To remain competitive, communities will have no choice but to adapt to new ways of handling development and growth issues.

Development cannot happen unless a community is adequately prepared. Communities that choose to grow must be ready to do so in a world where new rules apply. They must have more to offer than an industrial park served by roads and sewer lines, just like their neighbors down the road. Communities that are already growing must be able to accommodate growth in a manner that preserves the quality of life. Because growth management involves a sensitive balance between accommodating growth and protecting quality of life, this is not a simple task. Even those communities that simply do not want new growth will face development challenges. As their citizens become aware of quality of life initiatives in other areas, these communities may begin to feel some pressure to improve their quality of life through similar methods, whether it is improving their downtown areas, or providing more recreational opportunities for their citizens.

As a result of this growing statewide focus on issues of quality of life, several organizations, including the Department of Community Affairs (DCA), have identified a critical need to provide more technical assistance to local governments in implementing new and innovative approaches to managing growth and development within their jurisdictions. Toward this end, several statewide organizations with an interest in smart growth, including DCA, the Atlanta Regional Commission, ACG, GMA, the Georgia Conservancy, the Nature Conservancy, and the Home Builders Association of Georgia, are currently working together to provide communities with solutions and strategies for improving and maintaining local quality of life by:

- Preparing a toolkit to provide practical advice, step-by-step guides for implementation, considerations about costs and administrative requirements, and model ordinances that may be used by local governments in implementing particular smart growth solutions.
- Providing intensive training for local officials and volunteers on implementing particular strategies.
- Sharing case studies and lessons learned from both successful and failed attempts to implement smart growth strategies at the local level.
The smart growth toolkit is available to local governments in both printed form and via an interactive web site at www.georgiaqualitygrowth.com. Topics addressed in the toolkit include:

- Introduction to quality growth
- Gaining community acceptance of quality growth
- Effective public involvement processes
- Reducing existing barriers to quality growth
- Achieving consensus on community appearance
- Visualization techniques
- Managing community appearance
- Tree preservation
- Retrofitting existing corridors
- Approaches to historic preservation
- Fostering compact development patterns
- Strategies for re-use of abandoned buildings
- Strategies for re-use of brownfields
- Attracting businesses your community needs
- Attracting jobs your community needs
- Improving local workforce qualifications
- Developing needed infrastructure
- Alternative approaches to economic development
- Retaining and attracting the elderly
- Protecting environmentally sensitive areas
- Overlay zones
- Storm water management
- Effective management of septic systems
- Strategies for preserving open space
- State and federal development program
- Conservation Subdivisions
- Infill Development Strategies
- Mitigating Heat Islands
- Reducing Barriers to Affordable Housing
- Farmland Protection
- Effective Floodplain Managements
- Water conservation practices
- Mixed-income housing strategies
- Life-cycle housing strategies
- Planning for job accessibility
- Growth management techniques
- Using infrastructure to direct growth
- Controlling your transportation destiny
- Smart transportation solutions
- Congestion management
- Transit oriented development
- Planning for bicycles
- Design for walkable communities
- Encouraging mixed use
- Upgrading downtowns and other activity centers
- Fostering traditional neighborhood development
- Opportunities for intergovernmental cooperation
- Strategies for intergovernmental cooperation
- Alternative land use regulations
- Simplified land use regulations
- One map planning and zoning
- Incentive zoning and density bonuses
- Performance zoning
- Innovative subdivision regulations
- Promoting innovative site design
- Smart Parking Solutions
- Local Government Communications/Marketing
- Strategies For Re-Use of Grayfields
- Accessory Housing Units
- Costs of Growth
- Appropriate School Siting
- Context-Sensitive Road Design

DCA is committed to making additional technical and financial assistance available to support community smart growth initiatives resulting from the toolkit. Where the Department does not offer the specific resources needed, assistance may be arranged through partnerships with the various other organizations interested in promoting smart growth throughout Georgia.

**Housing Opportunities**

Quality housing and a range of housing size, cost, and density should be provided in each community to make it possible for all who work in the community to also live in the community.

**Regional Cooperation**

Regional cooperation should be encouraged in setting priorities, identifying shared needs, and finding collaborative solutions, particularly where it is critical to success of a venture, such as protection of shared natural resources.

**Shared Solutions**

Regional solutions to needs shared by more than one local jurisdiction are preferable to separate local approaches, particularly where this will result in greater efficiency and less cost to the taxpayer.

**Traditional Neighborhoods**

Traditional neighborhood development patterns should be encouraged, including use of more human scale development, minimizing of areas within easy walking distance of one another, and facilitating pedestrian activity.

**Open Space Preservation**

New development should be designed to minimize the amount of land consumed, and open space should be set aside from development for use as public parks or as greenbelts/wildlife corridors.

**Transportation Alternatives**

Alternatives to transportation by automobile, including mass transit, bicycle routes, and pedestrian facilities, should be made available in each community. Greater use of alternate transportation should be encouraged.

**Employment Options**

A range of job types should be provided in each community to meet the diverse needs of the local workforce.

**Regional Identity**

Regions should promote and preserve an "identity," defined in terms of traditional regional architecture, common economic linkages that bind the region together, or other shared characteristics.

**Appropriate Businesses**

The businesses and industries encouraged to develop or expand in a community should be suitable for the community in terms of job skills required, linkages to other economic activities in the region, impact on the resources of the area, and future prospects for expansion and creation of higher-skill job opportunities.
Georgia Quality Growth Partnership

The Georgia Quality Growth Partnership (GQGP) is a collaboration among diverse public and private organizations formed out of the desire to coordinate their efforts at promoting “quality growth” approaches throughout the State of Georgia. The primary purpose of the GQGP is to facilitate local government implementation of quality growth approaches by:

1. Disseminating objective information on the various approaches.
2. Developing tools for implementing these approaches.
3. Sharing of best practices learned from other places, times, and cultures.
4. Promoting acceptance of quality growth by the general public and community leaders.

Founded in March, 2000, the GQGP has grown to more than forty organizations, each contributing time, in kind services, or financial resources to fostering Partnership efforts.

Guiding Principles

The GQGP member believe that fostering livable communities requires innovative solutions that:

1. Ensure equitable access for all citizens to a range of options for education, transportation, housing, employment, human services, culture, and recreation.
2. Create opportunities for citizens to learn more about community planning and actively encourage their involvement in public decision-making.
3. Respect and protect our natural resources – wildlife, land, water, air and trees.
4. Shape appealing physical environments that enhance walkability and positive social interaction.
5. Recognize that community decisions have an impact on neighboring jurisdictions and, therefore, must be made from a responsible regional and statewide perspective.
6. Incorporate practices learned from our local experience as well as from other communities and cultures.
7. Preserve and enhance our cultural and historic places for future generations.
8. Provide for the efficient and economical use of public infrastructure.
9. Employ the principles of sustainability and balance to ensure the economic viability of all communities and to enhance the state’s economic competitiveness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Program Title &amp; Description</strong></th>
<th><strong>Administering Agency/Contact</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Capital Outlay for Public School Facilities Construction | Georgia Department of Education  
Facilities Services Unit  
1670 Twin Towers, East  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334  
William Jerry Rochelle, Ph.D.  
(404) 656-2454 |  
| | [http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/facilities/facilities.asp](http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/facilities/facilities.asp) |
| **Eligible Activities:** Grants for new construction, renovation, and modifications of public school facilities. | **Total Funding:** Determined annually by the Georgia General Assembly.  
**Maximum per Project:** Determined by project application.  
**Match Requirements:** 10% - 25% local matching funds required. |
| Community Development Block Grant — Loan Guarantee Program (Section 108 Program) | Georgia Department of Community Affairs  
60 Executive Park South, NE  
Atlanta, GA 30329  
Office of Economic Development  
(404) 679-4940 |  
| [http://www.dca.state.ga.us/economic/section108.html](http://www.dca.state.ga.us/economic/section108.html) |
| **Eligible Activities:** Loans for:  
(a) Acquisition of improved or unimproved real property, including acquisition for economic development purposes;  
(b) Rehabilitation of real property owned or acquired by the public entity or its designated public agency;  
(c) Payment of interest on obligations guaranteed under the 108 program;  
(d) Clearance, demolition and removal, including movement of structures to other sites, of buildings and improvements on real property acquired or rehabilitated pursuant to activities a and b of this section;  
(e) Site preparation, including construction, reconstruction, or installation of public and other site improvements, utilities, or facilities (other than buildings), which is related to the re-development or use of the real property acquired or rehabilitated pursuant to activities a and b of this section, or for an economic development purpose;  
(f) Payment of issuance, underwriting, servicing, trust administration and other costs associated with private sector financing of debt obligations under the 108 program;  
(g) The acquisition, construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation or installation of commercial or industrial buildings, structures, and other real property equipment and improvements, including railroad spurs or similar extensions.  
(h) The provision of assistance to a private for-profit business, including, but not limited to loans and other forms of support where the assistance is appropriate to carry out an economic development project, excluding those described as ineligible in CFR Part 570.207(a). In selecting businesses to assist under this authority, the recipient shall minimize, to the extent practicable, displacement of existing businesses and jobs in neighborhoods.  
(i) A debt service reserve to be used in accordance with requirements specified in the contract entered into pursuant to CFR Part 570.705(b)(1); and  
(j) Acquisition, construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or installation of public facilities (except for buildings for the general conduct of government), public streets, sidewalks, and other site improvements and public utilities. | **Total Funding:** Twenty percent (20%) of its current and future CDBG allocations  
**Maximum per Project:** $5,000,000  
**Match Requirements:** N/A |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Eligible Activities</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Maximum per Project</th>
<th>Match Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant Program — Regular Round</td>
<td>Grants for housing improvement projects, public facilities such as water and sewer lines, buildings such as local health centers or headstart centers, and economic development projects.</td>
<td>Approximately $37 million available for the annual competition.</td>
<td>Single-Activity: $500,000; Multi-Activity: $800,000</td>
<td>Grants up to $300,000, or grants for single activity housing projects - no matching funds required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community HOME Investment Program (CHIP)</td>
<td>Grants to stimulate the creation of local public/private partnerships whose goals are to expand the availability of decent, safe, sanitary, energy efficient, and affordable housing within the community.</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Development Revolving Loan Fund (DDRLF)</td>
<td>Loans to non-entitlement cities and counties for small and middle-size communities in implementing quality downtown development projects.</td>
<td>Approximately $2.3 million per year.</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Incentive Program</td>
<td>Grants for local projects intended to facilitate and enhance job creation and/or retention, principally for persons of low and moderate income.</td>
<td>Approximately $5 million per year.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Dollar for dollar private leverage minimum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Cities Foundation Program</td>
<td>Loans to cities requesting financial assistance in their efforts to revitalize and enhance their downtown areas.</td>
<td>Not to exceed one-third of the project cost</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Interest Rate: below-market rates. Project collateral and backing by the cities and Downtown Development Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Commission for National and Community Service/AmeriCorps State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligible Activities:</strong> Grants to meet community service needs which match national need areas as determined annually by the Corporation for National Service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding:</strong> Approximately $4.4 million per year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum per Project:</strong> Varies dependent on need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Match Requirements:</strong> 15% local matching funds required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georgia Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) Housing Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligible Activities:</strong> Loans for predevelopment activities (CHDO Predevelopment Loan Program), acquisition, new construction, and rehabilitation of rental housing developments for multi-family, special needs, and elderly tenants of 20 or more units that are targeted to low-income housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding:</strong> Approximately $3.0 million per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum per Project:</strong> $2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Match Requirements:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georgia Heritage Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligible Activities:</strong> Grants to assist eligible applicants with the rehabilitation of Georgia Register-listed historic properties and related activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding:</strong> $300,000 for FY2002, $250,000 for Development Projects, $50,000 for Predevelopment Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum per Project:</strong> $40,000 for Development Projects, $20,000 for Predevelopment Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Match Requirements:</strong> 40% local matching funds required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grassroots Arts Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligible Activities:</strong> Grants to arts organizations and other groups to support Grassroots arts activities that broaden and deepen public participation in the arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum per Project:</strong> $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Match Requirements:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Buyer Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligible Activities:</strong> Loans at fixed, below market interest rates to qualified low to moderate-income home buyers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding:</strong> Approximately $120 million per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum per Project:</strong> Individual maximum loan amounts vary by type of unit (new or existing), location, and type of loan (FHA, VA, RECD, or Conventional).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Match Requirements:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georgia Commission for National and Community Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 Executive Park South, NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia 30329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James P. Marshall, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(404) 327-6844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jmarshal@dca.state.ga.us">jmarshal@dca.state.ga.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georgia Department of Community Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 Executive Park South, NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia 30329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Housing Planning &amp; Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(404) 679-4940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.dca.state.ga.us/housing/index.html">http://www.dca.state.ga.us/housing/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georgia Department of Natural Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 Trinity Avenue, SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia 30303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherie Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(404) 651-5181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:cherie_bennett@mail.dnr.state.qa.us">cherie_bennett@mail.dnr.state.qa.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georgia Council for the Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>260 14th Street, NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia 30318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(404) 685-2787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georgia Department of Community Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 Executive Park South, NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia 30329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Homeownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(404) 679-4940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.dca.state.ga.us/housing/index.html">http://www.dca.state.ga.us/housing/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME CHDO Loan Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum per Project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Requirements:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOME CHDO Predevelopment Loan Program</th>
<th>Georgia Department of Community Affairs 60 Executive Park South, NE Atlanta, GA 30329</th>
<th>Office of Housing Planning &amp; Administration (404) 679-4940</th>
<th><a href="http://www.dca.state.ga.us/housing/chdopre.html">http://www.dca.state.ga.us/housing/chdopre.html</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Activities:</td>
<td>Loans for the predevelopment costs associated with a CHDO Program-eligible project, incurred up to the closing of the CHDO Program loan (construction and permanent debt financing), as listed in the Sources and Uses Form (CHDO-025) in the Application. These costs include, but are not limited to, market study and title search costs which are incurred before applying for CHDO Program funds, and environmental review and appraisal costs which are incurred after being approved for CHDO Program funds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding:</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum per Project:</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Requirements:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOME CHDO Permanent Supportive Housing Program</th>
<th>Georgia Department of Community Affairs 60 Executive Park South, NE Atlanta, GA 30329</th>
<th>Office of Housing Planning &amp; Administration (404) 679-4940</th>
<th><a href="http://www.dca.state.ga.us/housing/pshp_nofa_memo.html">http://www.dca.state.ga.us/housing/pshp_nofa_memo.html</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Activities:</td>
<td>Grants to create the best possible projects recognizing the difficulty of coordinating the activities necessary for special needs populations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding:</td>
<td>$5.2 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum per Project:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Requirements:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Application deadline is December 31, 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOME Rental Housing Loan Program</th>
<th>Georgia Department of Community Affairs 60 Executive Park South, NE Atlanta, GA 30329</th>
<th>Office of Housing Planning &amp; Administration (404) 679-4940</th>
<th><a href="http://www.dca.state.ga.us/housing/homerental.html">http://www.dca.state.ga.us/housing/homerental.html</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Activities:</td>
<td>Loans for construction financing and/or permanent financing for the costs of constructing or rehabilitating rental housing as defined in the State of Georgia's 1999 Qualified Allocation Plan. Rental dwelling units financed through the program must be affordable by low-to-moderate-income households as defined in the State of Georgia's 1999 Qualified Allocation Plan, the OAHD Application Manual, and the HOME Investment Partnerships Program Final Rule (24 CFR Part 92).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding:</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum per Project:</td>
<td>$2,000,000 in non-Rural counties and $2,800,000 in Rural counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match Requirements:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)

**Eligible Activities:** Grants for acquisition of real property and development of facilities for general-purpose outdoor recreation.

**Total Funding:** Dependent upon annual congressional appropriations.

**Maximum per Project:** Varies year to year based on appropriations.

**Match Requirements:** 50% local matching funds required.

### Local Development Fund

**Eligible Activities:** Grants to fund community improvement activities of local governments in Georgia

**Total Funding:** Approximately $617,500 per year.

**Maximum per Project:** $10,000 for single community projects; $20,000 for multi-community projects.

**Match Requirements:** A 50% cash or in-kind match is required

### Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program

**Eligible Activities:** Federal income tax incentives for the following activities:

- **Acquisition** - To qualify for the acquisition Credit, the building must have been last placed in service at least 10 years prior to application — certain exceptions apply — and must involve rehabilitation.
- **Rehabilitation** - To qualify for the rehabilitation Credit, rehabilitation expenditures chargeable to capital account must equal the greater of 10 percent of the building's adjusted basis or average at least $10,000 per low-income unit.
- **New construction.**

**Total Funding:** Approximately $14.2 million of annual federal credit authority with a matching amount of state credit available.

**Maximum per Project:** an annual Credit of approximately thirty percent (30%) of the present value of depreciable basis for developments involving acquisition, and an annual Credit of approximately seventy percent (70%) of the present value of depreciable basis for developments involving new construction or rehabilitation.

**Match Requirements:** N/A

---

**Georgia Department of Natural Resources**

Parks, Recreation and Historic Sites Division

Grants Administration and Planning

205 Butler Street, SE

Suite 1352

Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Antoinette Norfleet

(404) 656-3830

http://www.ncc.nps.gov/programs/lwcf/grants.html

**Georgia Department of Community Affairs**

60 Executive Park South, NE

Atlanta, Georgia 30329

**Rural Development Division**

(404) 679-4940

http://www.dca.state.ga.us/grants/developfund.html

**Georgia Department of Community Affairs**

60 Executive Park South, NE

Atlanta, GA 30329

**Office of Affordable Housing**

(404) 679-4940

http://www.dca.state.ga.us/housing/lihtc.html
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Eligible Activities</th>
<th>Total Funding:</th>
<th>Maximum per Project:</th>
<th>Match Requirements:</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| OneGeorgia Equity Fund Program               | Grants and loans to finance activities that will assist in preparation for economic development. Eligible projects include traditional economic development projects such as water and sewer projects, road, rail and airport improvements and industrial parks as well as workforce development projects, technology development or tourism development proposals, just to name a few. Applications considered for projects in Tier 1, Tier 2 or Tier 3 (with conditions) counties only. | Approximately $10 million per year. | $500,000 | N/A | OneGeorgia Authority  
1202-B Hillcrest Parkway  
Dublin, Georgia 31021  
(478) 274-7734  
http://www.dca.state.ga.us/onegeorgia/funds.html |
| OneGeorgia Regional E-9-1-1 Fund             | Grants and loans to finance activities that assist the mostly rural counties in Georgia that are currently without enhanced 9-1-1 emergency telephone services ("E-9-1-1"). This manual should clearly define the role of the Regional E-9-1-1 Fund as a program to provide financial assistance including grants and any other forms of assistance authorized by (O.C.G.A.50–34-1 et seq.). Such assistance will finance activities to assist applicants in promoting the health, welfare, safety, and economic security of the citizens of the state through the provision of E-9-1-1 services on a regional basis to counties currently unserved or under-served in this area. | N/A | Award limits will be based on the number of counties participating within a particular project as follows:  
a) two counties – maximum of $400,000 per project;  
b) three counties – maximum of $500,000 per project;  
c) four counties – maximum of $600,000 per project; and  
d) five or more counties – maximum of $700,000. | N/A | OneGeorgia Authority  
1202-B Hillcrest Parkway  
Dublin, Georgia 31021  
(478) 274-7734  
http://www.dca.state.ga.us/onegeorgia/funds.html |
| OneGeorgia EDGE Fund Program                 | The purpose of the EDGE Fund is to provide financial assistance to eligible applicants that are being considered as a relocation or expansion site and are competing with another state for location of a project; and, where the EDGE Fund is used when the health, welfare, safety and economic security of the citizens of the state are promoted through the development and/or retention of employment opportunities. | Approximately $10 million per year. | N/A | N/A | OneGeorgia Authority  
1200-B Hillcrest Parkway  
Dublin, Georgia 31021  
(478) 274-7734  
http://www.dca.state.ga.us/onegeorgia/funds.html |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>Eligible Activities</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Maximum per Project</th>
<th>Match Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Grants</strong></td>
<td>Grants designed to provide support to arts organizations and other groups administering arts projects.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>25% local matching funds required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OwnHOME Program</strong></td>
<td>Loans for first-time home buyers with a deferred payment to cover most of the down payment, closing costs and prepaid expenses associated with their home purchase.</td>
<td>Approximately $3 million per year.</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>1.5% personal matching funds required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Library Capital Outlay Grant Program</strong></td>
<td>Grant program providing financial and consultant assistance for the construction of public library facilities.</td>
<td>Dependent upon annual appropriation.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>10 - 15% local matching funds required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Growth Grant Program</strong></td>
<td>Grants for projects directly promoting growth management concepts, infill housing, brownfield redevelopment, or similar projects that discourage urban sprawl; preparation of local ordinances, regulations, or intergovernmental agreements promoting growth preparedness, sustainable development, and other quality growth strategies; public education on quality growth topics; programs to preserve community heritage, sense of place, and regional identity; alternative/multi-modal transportation facilities; preservation of critical environmental resources, wildlife habitat, prime farmland, or sensitive ecosystems; start up cost of new programs for implementing quality growth initiatives; and physical development projects that are particularly critical to local implementation of quality growth.</td>
<td>$150,000 for FY2003.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Dollar for dollar local-matching funds required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other:** Application deadlines each year are: November 15th and May 15th
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Eligible Activities</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Maximum per Project</th>
<th>Match Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Assistance Fund (RAF)</td>
<td>Grants for the purchase of real property, facility development or rehabilitation of existing facilities to increase the local supply of public recreation lands and/or facilities.</td>
<td>Approximately $1 million per year.</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Trails Program (RTP)</td>
<td>Grants for acquisition and/or development (80% federal / 20% local) of motorized and non-motorized recreational trails including new trail construction, maintenance/rehabilitation of existing trails, trail-side and trail-head facilities.</td>
<td>Approximately $1.3 million per year.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>20% local matching funds required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Assistance Program (RAP)</td>
<td>Grants for Regional Economic Development</td>
<td>$1,128,125 per year.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Applicants for construction grants in local governments within Tier 1 counties or in joint development authorities including a Tier 1 county are not required to match the requested grant amount. Applicants for construction grants in local governments within Tier 2 counties or in joint development authorities including a Tier 2 county must match at least one-quarter (25%) of the requested grant amount. Applicants for construction grants in local governments within Tier 3 counties or in joint development authorities including a Tier 3 county must match at least one-half (50%) of the requested grant amount. Applicants for construction grants in local governments within Tier 4 counties or in joint development authorities including a Tier 4 county must match an equal or greater amount of the requested grant amount. Applicants for construction grants in local governments within Tier 4 counties or in joint development authorities including a Tier 4 county must match an equal or greater amount of the requested grant amount. Applicants for grants for multi-county activities that do not involve construction must match at least one half (50%) of the requested grant amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Rental Housing Development Fund (RRHDF)</td>
<td>Construction financing and permanent financing for the costs of constructing up to ten (10) units of new rental housing, including land acquisition, hard construction costs, and soft costs. Rental dwelling units financed through the RRHDF must be affordable by low and moderate-income households as defined in the Manual and this Program Description.</td>
<td>$4.2 Million</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>Required to provide cash equity equal to the level of operating reserves required by underwriting (approximately $20,000).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transportation Enhancement Program

**Eligible Activities:** Federal grants for twelve categories of transportation enhancement activities.

**Total Funding:** Approximately $23 million per year.

**Maximum per Project:** $1,000,000

**Match Requirements:** 20% local matching funds required.

### Title II – Eisenhower Professional Development Program Competitive Grants

**Eligible Activities:** Grants for demonstration and exemplary projects for improving instruction in mathematics and science.

**Total Funding:** Approximately $12,130,000 per year.

**Maximum per Project:** Determined by project application.

**Match Requirements:** 33% local matching funds required.

### Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program

**Eligible Activities:** Grants designed to encourage citizen involvement in creating and supporting long-term and sustained urban and community forestry programs throughout the state.

**Total Funding:** $300,000 annually

**Maximum per Project:** $20,000

**Match Requirements:** The federal funds are awarded on a matching basis. Federal funds must be at least 100% matched by the grantee. The non-federal share of such support must be in the form of in-kind contributions or cash. Sources of the non-federal match must not be used as a match for any other federal cost-share project.

---

**Georgia Department of Transportation**

Planning Division

No. 2 Capitol Square

Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Rhonda Britt, Joy Still, or Cindy VanDyke

(404) 657-6914 or (404) 656-5726

http://www.dot.state.ga.us/dot/planning/projects/transportation/index.shtml#proisel

**Georgia Department of Education**

Division of School Support

1852 Twin Towers East

Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Brendon Long

(404) 657-8300

**Georgia Forestry Commission**

Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program

5645 Riggins Mill Road

Dry Branch, Georgia 31020

Susan Reisch

(912) 298-3935

http://www.gfc.state.ga.us/Services/UCF/FinancialAssistanceProgram.cfm
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ORGANIZATION OF THE POLICY GUIDE

This policy guide is divided into four sections.

I. A motion to adopt a definition of Smart Growth, including a statement of Smart Growth principles.
II. A description of the Smart Growth issue, including an historical overview.
III. Specific policy motions in five categories:
   A. Planning Structure, Process and Regulation
   B. Transportation and Land Use
   C. Regional Management and Fiscal Efficiency
   D. Social Equity and Community Building
   E. Environmental Protection and Land Conservation

IV. A list of outcomes to help readers understand what will be achieved by implementing these policies.

To download a copy of this policy guide click here.

I. MOTION TO ADOPT A DEFINITION OF SMART GROWTH

Smart growth means using comprehensive planning to guide, design, develop, revitalize and build communities for all that:

• have a unique sense of community and place;
• preserve and enhance valuable natural and cultural resources;
• equitably distribute the costs and benefits of development;
• expand the range of transportation, employment and housing choices in a fiscally responsible manner;
• value long-range, regional considerations of sustainability over short term incremental geographically isolated actions; and
• promotes public health and healthy communities.

Compact, transit accessible, pedestrian-oriented, mixed use development patterns and land reuse epitomize the application of the principles of smart growth.

In contrast to prevalent development practices, Smart Growth refocuses a larger share of regional growth within central cities, urbanized areas, inner suburbs, and areas that are already served by infrastructure. Smart Growth reduces the share of growth that occurs on newly urbanizing land, existing farmlands, and in environmentally sensitive areas. In areas with intense growth pressure, development in newly urbanizing areas should be planned and developed according to Smart Growth principles.

Core principles of Smart Growth include:

   A. RECOGNITION THAT ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT, AND THE NON-
   PROFIT AND PRIVATE SECTORS, PLAY AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN CREATING
AND IMPLEMENTING POLICIES THAT SUPPORT SMART GROWTH. Every level of government - federal, state, regional, county, and local -- should identify policies and practices that are inconsistent with Smart Growth and develop new policies and practices that support Smart Growth. Local governments have long been the principal stewards of land and infrastructure resources through implementation of land use policies. Smart Growth respects that tradition, yet recognizes the important roles that federal and state governments play as leaders and partners in advancing Smart Growth principles at the local level.

B. STATE AND FEDERAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS THAT SUPPORT URBAN INVESTMENT, COMPACT DEVELOPMENT, AND LAND CONSERVATION. State and federal policies and programs have contributed to urban sprawl and need to be re-examined and replaced with policies and programs that support Smart Growth, including cost effective, incentive-based investment programs that target growth-related expenditures to locally-designated areas.

C. PLANNING PROCESSES AND REGULATIONS AT MULTIPLE LEVELS THAT PROMOTE DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND SMART GROWTH PRINCIPLES. All planning processes, as well as the distribution of resources, must be equitable. A diversity of voices must be included in community planning and implementation.

D. INCREASED CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN ALL ASPECTS OF THE PLANNING PROCESS AND AT EVERY LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT. Appropriate citizen participation ensures that planning outcomes are equitable and based on collective decision-making. Planning processes must involve comprehensive strategies that engage meaningful citizen participation and find common ground for decision-making.

E. A BALANCED, MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM THAT PLANS FOR INCREASED TRANSPORTATION CHOICE. Land use and transportation planning must be integrated to accommodate the automobile and to provide increased transportation choices, such as mass transit, bicycles, and walking. Development must be pedestrian-friendly. All forms of transportation must be reliable, efficient and user-friendly, allowing full access by all segments of the population to housing, employment, education, and human and community services.

F. A REGIONAL VIEW OF COMMUNITY. Smart Growth recognizes the interdependence of neighborhoods and municipalities in a metropolitan region and promotes balanced, integrated regional development achieved through regional planning processes.

G. ONE SIZE DOESN'T FIT ALL - A WIDE VARIETY OF APPROACHES TO ACCOMPLISH SMART GROWTH. Customs, politics, laws, natural conditions, and other factors vary from state to state and from region to region. Each region must develop its own approach to problem solving and planning while involving the public, private and non-profit sectors. In some areas, this may require a significant change in perspective and culture, but such changes are necessary and beneficial in obtaining the results that Smart Growth aims to achieve.

H. EFFICIENT USE OF LAND AND INFRASTRUCTURE. High-density development, infill development, redevelopment, and the adaptive re-use of existing buildings result in efficient utilization of land resources and
more compact urban areas. Efficient use of public and private infrastructure starts with creating neighborhoods that maximize the use of existing infrastructure. In areas of new growth, roads, sewers, water lines, schools and other infrastructure should be planned as part of comprehensive growth and investment strategies. Regional cooperation is required for large infrastructure investments to avoid inefficiency and redundancy.

I. CENTRAL CITY VITALITY. Every level of government should identify ways to reinvest in existing urban centers, to re-use former industrial sites, to adapt older buildings for new development, and to bring new development to older, low-income and disadvantaged neighborhoods.

J. VITAL SMALL TOWNS AND RURAL AREAS. APA recognizes that inefficient land use and low-density development is not confined to urban and suburban areas, but also occurs around villages and small towns. Many once thriving main streets are checkered with abandoned storefronts while a strip of new commercial activity springs up on the edge of town together with housing and public facilities. Programs and policies need to support investment to improve the economic health of small town downtowns, and rural community centers. The high cost of providing basic infrastructure and services in rural communities demands efficient use of existing facilities, and compact development. Housing choices in rural areas need to take into account changing needs resulting from shifting demographics, the cost of providing services and infrastructure, the cost of services and infrastructure capacity, and must address upgrading of existing housing as an alternative or complement to new development. Smart Growth is critically important in rural and small town economic development initiatives because the limited availability of public funding means each dollar must accomplish more.

K. A GREATER MIX OF USES AND HOUSING CHOICES IN NEIGHBORHOODS AND COMMUNITIES FOCUSED AROUND HUMAN-SCALE, MIXED-USE CENTERS ACCESSIBLE BY MULTIPLE TRANSPORTATION MODES. Mixed-use developments include quality housing, varied by type and price, integrated with shopping, schools, community facilities and jobs. Human-scale design, compatible with the existing urban context, and quality construction contribute to successful compact, mixed-use development and also promote privacy, safety, visual coherency and compatibility among uses and users.

L. CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES. Biodiversity, green infrastructure, and green architecture are integral to Smart Growth. Smart Growth protects the natural processes that sustain life; preserves agricultural land, wildlife habitat, natural landmarks and cultural resources; integrates biodiversity, ecological systems and natural open space (green infrastructure) into the fabric of development; encourages innovative storm water management; is less consumptive and more protective of natural resources; maintains or improves air quality, and enhances water quality and quantity for future generations. Energy conservation is a major benefit and result of Smart Growth, helping to create more sustainable development and allow people to meet current needs without compromising the needs of future generations. Green architecture incorporates environmental protection and reduced natural resource consumption into the design and
construction of buildings, also enhancing the comfort and health of the occupants.

M. CREATION OR PRESERVATION OF A "SENSE OF PLACE". A "sense of place" results when design and development protect and incorporate the distinctive character of a community and the particular place in which it is located. Geography, natural features, climate, culture, historical resources, and ecology each contribute to the distinctive character of a region.

II. THE SMART GROWTH ISSUE

Throughout the history of planning in the United States, there have been national movements that influenced the direction of the planning profession. They include the city beautiful era; the advent of Euclidean zoning; master planning for the automobile-dominated, post-WWII community; the 701 comprehensive plan; advocacy planning in the 1970s; along with environmental protection described by the acronyms of NEPA, CEQA and others. Since the early 20th century, policy makers have offered legislative solutions to communities to manage changes resulting from population growth. In the 1920s, Secretary of Commerce, and later President, Herbert Hoover appointed an advisory committee that drafted the Standard City Planning and Zoning Enabling Acts. Many states subsequently adopted enabling laws based on these Acts.

While many Americans may have benefited from the effects of rapid suburbanization: large yards, proximity to open space, new schools, increased mobility, and the financial appreciation of home values, these benefits have not been universally shared. Professional planners acknowledge that the social, economic, and environmental costs of urban dispersion can be more effectively managed, if not avoided entirely. The nation is now experiencing a heightened concern over the social, environmental, and fiscal quality of our communities arising from development practices that aggravate the decline of many urban communities and older suburbs, congest streets and highways, accelerate the loss of natural resources and the deterioration of the natural environment, and limit opportunities for the retention and creation of affordable housing. Often these problems are simply and collectively labeled, "sprawl." In response, the Smart Growth movement emerged.

Many organizations and individuals are now promoting Smart Growth. Over 60 public interest groups across the U.S. have joined together to form Smart Growth America, a coalition advocating better growth policies and practices. Groups ranging from the Urban Land Institute to the Sierra Club to the National Association of Home Builders have released reports and sponsored forums on the topic. Many communities embrace specific aspects of Smart Growth, such as urban service boundaries, pedestrian- and transit-oriented development, controls on sprawl, compact mixed uses, and the protection of agricultural and environmental resources. Concurrently, implementation in a piecemeal fashion has sometimes resulted in unintended consequences that actually aggravated other adverse aspects of rapid urbanization or dispersion. The APA recognizes that it is necessary to balance the interests of diverse public, private and political groups and to serve the collective public interest. Contained within Smart Growth are many interrelated, and potentially conflicting, elements that need to be organized and prioritized, often on a regional basis. Additionally, many of the single interest Smart Growth proposals omit areas of concern to the APA, especially as they deal with social equity and disinvestments in inner city and first ring suburb infrastructure, community facilities, and services. This situation is a major impetus for creating this policy guide.

APA's 2000 Policy Guide on Planning for Sustainability notes that "Sustainability is the
capability to equitably meet the vital human needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by preserving and protecting the area's ecosystems and natural resources. The concept of sustainability describes a condition in which human use of natural resources, required for the continuation of life, is in balance with Nature's ability to replenish them. The important work done in creating the Policy Guide on Planning for Sustainability provides an opportunity to extend those policies to the arena of Smart Growth. In response to this opportunity, APA embarked upon a yearlong process to craft this policy guide. The effort formally started at the 2001 Delegate Assembly in New Orleans where a survey, Framing the Issue, was distributed to the participants and was later supplemented by input from APA chapters. The survey and a literature review showed that the concepts of "sprawl" and "sustainability" are intertwined throughout the Smart Growth dialogue. Sprawl, in all of its characterizations, is the antithesis of Smart Growth. Today, we must promote fairness in rebuilding inner city and inner suburban areas, in the development of suburban communities, and in the conservation and revitalization of small towns and rural areas.

Smart Growth should not be limited to combating the symptoms of sprawl. The protection of unique and prime agricultural land to avoid premature conversion to urban and suburban uses, as well as ecological and societal considerations, should be addressed. Planners have the tools at hand to create better communities. It is our professional and ethical responsibility to use these tools to produce results that are fair to all community members in the present and in the future. Fairness requires that we reduce inequalities and that we narrow the gap of disparities in the distribution of resources. We recognize that planning decisions influence the social and economic well being of communities. Today, we must promote fairness in rebuilding inner city and inner suburban areas, in the development of suburban communities, and in the growth of small towns and rural areas.

The Smart Growth Policy Guide helps direct APA efforts to influence public policy to meet those concerns raised by the Smart Growth movement, along with the challenges of sustainability and equity. This guidance can influence federal and state legislation that may provide financial assistance and incentives for states to reassess their planning statutes, update them, and to embark on meaningful implementation of community plans. Additionally, APA challenges the private sector, especially the real estate and lending communities, to join us in working to reverse the negative effects of the current predominant pattern of regional growth and to help us advocate for new policies that will lead to well-designed regional communities of lasting value. APA asks them to join with us in the important educational and informational efforts that will be necessary to build support for Smart Growth with elected officials and policy makers, with their constituents, and with the public-at-large.

Finally, planners, legislators, and others should consult this policy guide when reviewing the GROWING SMART Legislative Guidebook, a compendium of statutes for planning and the management of change, as they create proposals for regulatory reform pertaining to planning and development.

III. SPECIFIC POLICY POSITIONS

This section includes policies organized in five categories:

A. Planning Structure, Process and Regulation
B. Transportation and Land Use
C. Regional Management and Fiscal Efficiency
D. Social Equity and Community Building
E. Environmental Protection and Land Conservation
Other adopted policy statements that bear on this topic are Planning for Sustainability (adopted in 2000), Agricultural Land Preservation (adopted on April 25, 1999), Endangered Species and Habitat Protection (adopted on April 25, 1999), the Housing Policy Guide (adopted on April 25, 1999), the Policy Guide on Historic and Cultural Resources (adopted April 10, 1997) and policy statements currently under development or revision, including those for Water Resource Management, Wetlands, and Waste Management.

A. PLANNING STRUCTURE, PROCESS AND REGULATION

1. The American Planning Association and its Chapters affirm that reforming state legislation is necessary to implement Smart Growth.

*Reason to Support the Specific Policy:* States have a leadership role in fostering long-term, smart growth decisions. While land use regulatory decisions are traditionally a responsibility of local government, state programs, policies, and enabling legislation have a profound affect on local planning and decision-making. States should enable local governments to foster more sensible, planned growth through the revision of planning and police power enabling legislation and by facilitating increased communication between state departments and local governments and among local governments within a region.

2. The American Planning Association and its Chapters affirm that effective comprehensive planning, based on Smart Growth principles, is the primary means of implementing Smart Growth.

*Reason to Support the Specific Policy:* Planning, especially comprehensive planning, is central to the implementation of Smart Growth. Absent the collective decision-making processes inherent in effective comprehensive planning, those who would implement smart growth measures are limited to a series of short-term, geographically isolated, and disconnected decisions. The comprehensive planning process achieves this through collective decisions about the intensity, the density, and the character of development and the level of public services to be provided.

3. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support regulations that support land reuse and require new urban growth to be coordinated with the provision of urban infrastructure capacity.

*Reason to Support the Specific Policy:* The benefits of locating new urban growth in existing urban and urban-adjacent areas include preserving farmland, increasing urban densities, utilizing existing infrastructure capacity, and reducing public infrastructure costs. Tools, such as PDRs and TDRs and Land banking, are available to mitigate the affects on landowners outside of existing urban and urban-adjacent areas who seek to convert properties to urban uses.

4. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support the coordination, modernization, restructuring, and consolidation (where necessary) of local governmental units and/or services.

*Reason to Support the Specific Policy:* Modernization and restructuring should be pursued where governmental fragmentation impedes Smart Growth decisions. Smart Growth requires a higher degree of coordination, especially in the areas of spending, eminent domain, taxation and regulation, than is possible under the fragmented patterns of local government prevalent in many states. At minimum, local decisions on the creation of new governmental units, urban growth, capital infrastructure, services and maintenance should be subordinated to an intergovernmental planning process in order to minimize competition for tax base and to reward local governments by
distributing returns from mutually beneficial decisions. Natural boundaries, such as watersheds and valleys, should be respected in designing these comprehensive areas.

5. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support statewide comprehensive planning.

Reason to Support the Specific Policy: Statewide planning is needed to coordinate and integrate actions on such vital areas as transportation, infrastructure, and environmental policy. The most effective planning will integrate these areas with housing, economic development and other areas. Statewide planning should also engage regional planning efforts to create a mutually supported plan at multiple levels so all levels of government are working in concert to achieve Smart Growth goals.

6. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support federal and state incentives and guidance to local governments on the elements to be addressed in comprehensive plans, based on Smart Growth principles. The elements should include land use, transportation, infrastructure, housing, economic development, natural resources, ecological systems, public educational facilities, other community facilities and cultural preservation.

Reason to Support the Specific Policy: Local governments should be required to make land use decisions within a statewide procedural and policy framework, consistent with a long-term vision and early, on-going public involvement. State governments must help local governments by establishing reasonable ground rules for planning requirements, assisting and funding local governments and rural areas, and providing leadership on inter-jurisdictional issues.

7. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support legislation that provides incentives for adoption of a clearly defined comprehensive plan and capital improvements plan prior to the imposition of land use regulations and controls at the local level.

Reason to Support the Specific Policy: Land use decisions made without reference to a well-articulated comprehensive plan have contributed to excessive regulation, requests for special treatment and public disdain for the process. Land use regulation should enhance the predictability for residents, investors and builders. Ad hoc decisions by communities, made outside of effective comprehensive planning processes, undermine that predictability.

8. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support legislation that requires all actions of local government be consistent with the community's comprehensive plan including, but not limited to, zoning and other land use regulations, as well as the provision of infrastructure.

Reason to Support the Specific Policy: Consistency among comprehensive plans, land use regulations, capital improvements plans and implementation are at the heart of Smart Growth. Inconsistencies in these areas undermine public confidence in planning and in planners.

9. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support requiring federal agencies to include the effect of federal actions on urban growth and sprawl in their analyses of environmental impacts and to actively support state and local plans for growth management.

Reason to Support the Specific Policy: Federal policies and programs have a profound effect on local development patterns, yet local communities have little power in identifying, reviewing, or addressing federal actions and projects that may affect their
growth. Changing the National Environmental Policy Act to require federal and state agencies to analyze the effects of proposed projects on growth and directing the Council on Environmental Quality to evaluate these reviews will enhance a local community's ability to respond to federal actions.

10. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support regulatory processes that facilitate, encourage and support Smart Growth while eliminating regulatory barriers that increase the cost of Smart Growth.

**Reason to Support the Specific Policy:** It must be easier to develop and redevelop communities based on Smart Growth principles, and harder to develop in the manner that has led to the problems now evident throughout the country. Barriers to Smart Growth must be eliminated at the federal, state, and local levels. Processes, laws and regulatory procedures should not be another layer of review on top of other laws and regulations. A variety of federal agencies, state governments, regional agencies and local governments are preparing programs, ordinances, policies, procedures and laws to promote Smart Growth. As experience grows, successes should be celebrated, publicized, and presented as models for others.

11. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support increased citizen participation in all levels of planning as a means to accommodate diversity while promoting equity and community.

**Reason to Support the Specific Policy:** In an increasingly diverse society, citizen participation is an important means of developing plans that reflect the needs and aspirations of citizens. Planners have an ethical responsibility to involve citizens in planning, especially those affected by the plans. Participation can help to develop social capital, promote a sense of common goals, and develop citizen involvement in implementation. Better plans are a result.

12. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support the provision of a clearinghouse of advanced planning and geographic information for decision makers and for the public by coordinated regional, state, and federal Internet systems.

**Reason to Support the Specific Policy:** The lack of availability and the fragmentation of basic data -- including GIS maps, technical studies, water resource information, permitting activity, demographic data, and other information -- requires repetitive studies and increases the time required for decision-making. In addition, the information should be made available to the public through a well-maintained web data system.

**B. TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE**

1. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support planning and funding policies that link land use and transportation choices at the local and regional levels. The basis for transportation funding should reflect the true costs and relative efficiencies of various transportation modes with respect to a variety of users. The costs of federal subsidies for transportation should be reflected in evaluations of transportation investment alternatives.

**Reason to Support the Specific Policy:** A multi-modal transportation system n addressing transportation problems in the United States. From a funding perspective, potential investments should be judged on criteria that are unbiased and reflect the true costs of alternatives.
2. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support planning and funding policies that acknowledge the continued importance of automotive transportation and support the automobile within a policy context that provides for mitigating its environmental and resource impacts, while increasing non-automotive transportation choices, carpooling, van pooling and flexible work hours.

Reason to Support the Specific Policy: Automobiles are likely to remain an important form of transportation for many people, but the negative impacts of automobile transportation can be effectively managed. APA supports federal policies that will make automobiles more efficient, less polluting, and less consumptive of fossil fuels. Automobile transportation also provides inter-modal opportunities. APA supports federal and state efforts to combine automobile transportation with other transportation choices (park-and-rides, kiss-and-rides, adequate parking provision at transit stops) and encourage the pooling of automotive resources.

3. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support planning policies, legislation and practices that target transportation investments to correct system deficiencies identified through regular performance monitoring of all transportation modes within the system.

Reason to Support the Specific Policy: Efficient use of transportation funds requires using them to maximize the operational efficiency of the transportation system. Transportation investments made without regard to existing system deficiencies:

- result in sprawling, unplanned development, and allow existing transportation systems to deteriorate
- waste money by allowing funds to be expended for facilities that do not address problems
- lead to redundancies and inefficiencies as construction does not address real needs

A key component of Smart Growth involves the regular performance monitoring of all modes of transportation. Such monitoring identifies system deficiencies and their causes so that transportation investments may be targeted to appropriate infrastructure improvements.

4. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support the development and maintenance of regional and statewide multi-modal transportation plans.

Reason to Support the Specific Policy: Regional and statewide transportation plans are needed to guide the improvement and expansion of the transportation system in a consistent, logical, and economically and functionally efficient manner. These plans should be multi-modal, covering all significant modes of both people and goods movement, recognizing both public and private sector needs. Transportation planning efforts should also be mutually supportive at all levels to ensure the efficiency and continuity of the system. These plans should form the basis for transportation investment decisions at the regional and state level.

5. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support federal and state incentives and local initiatives that encourage locating new development, especially the development of public facilities, in areas that
are supported by a balanced transportation network that provides a variety of transportation choices and supports more active, healthy lifestyles.

*Reason to Support the Specific Policy:* Public facilities should be located so they are accessible by multiple modes, including transit, bicycles, and walking. Such facilities will be more widely used than if accessible only by automobile, and the employers will have more access to people who depend on transit, walking, and bicycling.

6. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support changes to roadway design standards that promote and support the use of transit and non-motorized transportation modes, including walking and biking.

*Reason to Support the Specific Policy:* Smart Growth recognizes the importance of the automobile to transportation, but seeks to support automotive transportation in the context of greater transportation choice, including the choice to walk or bicycle. The design of roadways and intersections can either enhance or discourage transit and non-automotive transportation choices. Roadway design should consider connectivity, accessibility, function, and speed as they affect safety and security of people who choose not to drive. For instance, roadways designed solely from the point-of-view of enhancing automobile transportation sometimes result in roads that poorly accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists who share roads with cars. The current functional classifications for roadways should be restructured to account for the constraints and opportunities these public facilities pose for the full range of transportation choices.

7. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support policies and plans that place street connection as a high priority in the development of transportation systems.

*Reason to Support the Specific Policy:* The efficiency of a community's transportation system is an objective of Smart Growth policy. Efficiency is enhanced when there are consistent and adequate street connections that allow people and goods to move with as few impediments as possible. Gated communities, private road systems, and the introduction of disconnected cul-de-sac systems promote disconnections. Proper street connectivity, on the other hand, reduces miles traveled, increases non-motorized trips, and supports transit use.

8. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support increased transportation choice and mobility to and from work, home, and school, especially for the less advantaged.

*Reason to Support the Specific Policy:* Advocating for equity requires public investment in infrastructure that reduces the need for long commutes and enhances transportation choices for disadvantaged and disabled persons. By locating facilities near transit stops or in mixed-use centers, trips might be consolidated. Planners should promote land use patterns that reduce the need for motorized transportation, increase transportation options, and ensure that infrastructure for non-automotive transportation modes are treated equitably in the planning process.

C. REGIONAL MANAGEMENT AND FISCAL EFFICIENCY

1. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support strengthening and modernizing state, metropolitan, and other regional institutions to facilitate multi-jurisdictional decision-making and problem solving.

*Reason to Support the Specific Policy:* Most major growth-related problems are regional,
not local, in nature. Given the fragmented nature of local governance, individual community success in implementing Smart Growth is likely to shift development to other parts of the region. States have the opportunity to pass modern enabling legislation that promotes Smart Growth planning and development at the regional level.

Regional plans are needed to coordinate local land use decisions and to integrate local decision-making with planning that necessarily crosses municipal boundaries. Transportation corridors, watersheds, air sheds, economic regions and neighborhoods are more appropriate and desirable geographies for planning than the boundaries of political jurisdictions. Given prevalent patterns of development, where jobs are often far from home, affordable housing and public transportation can be addressed effectively only at the regional level. These efforts can simultaneously promote equity by making affordable housing available throughout the metropolitan area and, by supporting economic development, make a labor force available throughout the region.

2. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support federal and state incentives for cooperative planning among local governments to address regional impacts and to pursue desired land use patterns through an integrated system of regional plan-making, implementation and monitoring.

Reason to Support the Specific Policy: Many states have laws that prohibit or inhibit joint planning and/or decision-making by local governments, as well as other entities that make planning and development decisions. Similarly, many local governments have laws, policies, or customs that inhibit cooperation across municipal boundaries. In order to facilitate collaboration among local entities when regional cooperation is needed, these barriers must be removed. Federal and state authorities must encourage cooperation and collaboration by local entities. State and federal grants should encourage cooperative planning and policymaking.

3. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support a wide variety of approaches to accomplish Smart Growth, because its principles can be applied to communities of all sizes and locations.

Reason to Support the Specific Policy: Customs, politics, laws, natural conditions, and other factors vary from state to state and region to region. In addition, problems to be addressed vary from region to region. Each region must develop its own approach to problem solving and planning while involving the public, private and non-profit sectors. In some areas, this may require a significant change in perspective and culture, but such changes are necessary and beneficial to obtain the results that Smart growth aims to achieve.

4. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support increasing the role of regional planning organization in planning for land conservation, cultural preservation, fiscal efficiency and ecological health.

Reason to Support the Specific Policy: Efficient use of land resources is a hallmark of Smart Growth. Compact building forms and infill development help support more cost effective public and private infrastructure than low-density development at the fringe of urban areas. Smart Growth means creating neighborhoods where more people use existing services, such as water lines, sewers, roads, emergency services, and schools. Inefficient land use places a financial strain on communities providing for the construction and maintenance of infrastructure. Regional cooperation promotes efficient use of infrastructure and helps avoid duplication of these very expensive investments. At the same time, regional approaches maintain a healthy environment and preserve valuable natural, as well as cultural, resources. Smart Growth is growth that protects
identity of places.

5. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support policies that favor the utilization of existing infrastructure capacity over public construction of new infrastructure, including the requirement that new development either pay for the services it requires or be consciously subsidized.

Reason to Support the Specific Policy: Policies that increase the number of residents in the urban core or that establish minimum densities for new urban development help ensure that existing infrastructure is fully utilized and that the public is not burdened with the cost of paying for inefficiency. Responsible stewardship over public funds requires that public subsidies be a matter of policy adopted after a public debate of the issue. After debate, local governments may decide to subsidize certain kinds of development and redevelopment in order to advance adopted policies, including the revitalization of central cities.

D. SOCIAL EQUITY AND COMMUNITY BUILDING

1. The American Planning Association and its chapters support a sustained and focused initiative in federal, state and local public policy to reverse the general decline of urban neighborhoods and the trend toward isolated, concentrated poverty through strategies that promote reinvestment within urban communities.

Reason to Support the Specific Policy: Central city vitality remains at the core of Smart Growth outcomes. Central cities are in a trajectory of long-term decline as a result of the migration of labor and capital. According to the Fannie Mae's report, The Housing Policy Debate (1997), most central cities and downtowns are becoming increasingly irrelevant to the future of metropolitan economies, despite signs that population losses have slowed and individual neighborhoods and cities have turned around. Revisions to the federal tax code, renewed federal housing initiatives, local "fair share housing" policies, regional tax base sharing, and the reduction of regulatory barriers that unduly increase the cost of housing are items that need to be overcome.

2. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support increased social, economic, and racial equity in our communities and call on the federal government to increase community development funds to remedy these inequities and to include input from all segments of our population in the planning process, and to ensure that planning and development decisions do not unfairly burden economically disadvantaged groups.

Reason to Support the Specific Policy: Sprawl has aggravated the racial and economic segregation of America's communities by limiting housing choices, transportation choices, educational opportunities, and job access. The spatial distribution of jobs in a region, along with adequate transportation options between work and home, and sufficient housing choice for workers at all levels of compensation, is key to attaining the goals of social, economic, and racial equity. Federal and state government policies should ensure that communities within a region have equitable access to open, natural areas and to community facilities providing recreational opportunities and a range of social services; and should also ensure that no single community is burdened with hosting undesirable but necessary community uses.

3. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support federal and state policies and programs that encourage mixed income neighborhoods as the foundation for healthy regions, including requirements for the provision of affordable housing in all new-growth
areas or through the reinvestment in core communities.

**Reason to Support the Specific Policy:** Affordable housing should be coordinated regionally to limit concentrations of poverty. Growth strategies must specify provisions for production and maintenance of affordable housing through affirmative measures such as inclusionary zoning practices (zoning that includes a variety of housing types for a variety of income levels) that are applied equally and regionally. Advancement of equity means developing a varied housing stock and planning for stable, mixed income neighborhoods.

4. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support the enhancement of public education systems which are an essential component of community building in urban, suburban and rural areas, and which ensure that children have an opportunity for an excellent education in existing communities. In furtherance of creating such opportunities, APA advocates for strategies that increase neighborhoods that are economically and socially diverse.

**Reason to Support the Specific Policy:** If Smart Growth is to work, there must be a sustained effort to improve urban public schools. Otherwise, families will continue to leave cities as soon as they have children. Planners must identify public schools in their community that are at-risk and work with administrators, parents, and neighborhood groups to improve the public school. Planners must advocate for neighborhood diversity, mixed-income housing and educational excellence as the hallmarks of healthy central cities.

In the APA/AICP Millennium Survey (December 2000), the highest concern of voters (76%) was having adequate schools and educational facilities. Moreover, when voters in suburbs and small-to-medium cities were asked what might lead them to live in an urban setting, better schools ranked first.

5. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support planning that identifies the transportation, housing, employment, education and other needs of population change, both with respect to the total number of people expected to reside and also with respect to population groups with special needs such as the elderly, school children, or people of diverse cultures.

**E. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND LAND CONSERVATION**

Other policies listed in this Policy Guide will help to achieve environmental protection and land conservation. For example, transportation and regional planning policies consistent with Smart Growth principles also achieve these ends. See also the related APA Policy Guides on Wetlands, Water Resources Management, Waste Management, Planning for Sustainability, Endangered Species and Habitat Protection, and Agricultural Land Preservation.

1. The American Planning Association and its Chapters encourage public, private, and non-profit cooperation to achieve a new level of partnership to preserve and enhance ecological integrity over the short- and long-term.

**Reasons to Support the Specific Policy:** Environmental protection and land conservation have often been seen as the role of the public sector. However, nonprofit organizations and private property owners also have a role and responsibility in good stewardship of the environment. Cooperation and collaboration among all interested parties are needed to improve and enhance ecological integrity. The basis for all planning must be a sense of stewardship or "caring for the earth", along with an expanded understanding of the long-term implications of daily decisions and the benefits of conservation.
2. The American Planning Association and its Chapters supports land and water conservation, including farmland preservation, soil and wetlands conservation, and brownfield remediation and redevelopment. An important tool is full funding of the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Reasons to Support the Specific Policy: Conservation of land and water resources is important to maintain and enhance healthy ecosystems, and is also an ethical imperative, to protect these resources for future generations. Soil conservation is an important concern and farmland preservation, e.g., with compact development, can be an important result of Smart Growth. The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), which was established by Congress in 1964, is an extremely important tool to create and enhance parks and open spaces, protect wilderness and wetlands, preserve wildlife habitat, and enhance recreational opportunities. The LWCF provides funding to all levels of government as well as the nonprofit sector. See also the policy below regarding water, and APA's other Policy Guides.

3. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support protection and enhancement of biodiversity through the planning process. Planning for biodiversity should use the best available science to assess natural resources and determine areas of environmental vitality as the first step in incorporating "green infrastructure" into human settlements.

Reasons to Support the Specific Policy: Natural systems and biodiversity are critical to the support of human populations. Biodiversity planning should be included in the early stages of land use planning. Planning should include an inventory of natural processes and ecosystems. To the extent such information is available, plans should include identification of natural vegetation, wetlands, arid lands, endangered and threatened plant and animal species, umbrella and indicator species, species that are commercially important in the state, and species habitat (including food sources, denning and nursery areas, and migratory routes). Based upon this inventory, all land use and development plans should incorporate "green infrastructure" based on good science and best available management practices to limit deleterious impacts on fragile ecosystems. Green infrastructure helps to maintain natural ecosystems, including clean air and water; reduces wildlife habitat fragmentation, pollution, and other threats to biodiversity. It also improves the quality of life for people. Tools for preservation of natural open spaces include acquisition of conservation easements by governments or non-profits, transfer of development rights, and conservation design, in addition to land acquisition by public agencies.

4. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support federal and state agencies providing assistance to county and local governments to collect and analyze information on natural communities and processes. County and local governments should supplement this information with local knowledge. Using the combined information, all levels of government should work with non-profit organizations, businesses, and citizens to designate green infrastructure policies and carry them out.

Reasons to Support the Specific Policy: Many local governments, where land use planning takes place, do not have the staff or technological resources to inventory and map biodiversity resources for their communities. Federal and state agencies that have
the resources and scientific/technical knowledge needed on topics such as ecology and biodiversity should provide financial and technical assistance to county and local agencies, which augment the information with local knowledge. A county or local government benefits by obtaining technical information necessary to write a strong plan, while the state and federal governments benefit by enhancing the protection of natural resources through partnerships with local governments and nonprofits.

5. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support a balanced energy policy including conservation and development of renewable energy resources.

Reasons to Support the Specific Policy: A comprehensive energy policy should include reduction of energy consumption, development of new supplies, and use of existing natural resources, such as coal, gas and oil, while protecting sensitive ecosystems. Energy conservation would include transportation policy, development patterns that minimize vehicular miles traveled, and green architecture. Development of new energy supplies should include renewable energy. Use of renewable energy sources will contribute to reduce dependence upon fossil fuels, also helping to reduce concentrations of carbon dioxide and other gases in the atmosphere. Increased use of alternative energy sources will also contribute to healthier, more stable local economies through reduced dependence on one or two energy sources that have an uncertain future. Solar power is likely to become more important in future years and development patterns should balance the need for solar access with the need for dense urban development. Development may be able to take advantage of industrial cogeneration possibilities, utilizing waste heat from industry to heat surrounding buildings. APA's Policy Guide on Planning for Sustainability can provide additional insight on steps that can be taken to develop a balanced energy policy.

6. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support environmentally conscious design and construction, including "green architecture" practices, adoption of LEED Green Building Rating System and the adaptive reuse of buildings, and land recycling.

Reasons to Support the Specific Policy: The U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), a national nonprofit organization representing all parts of the building industry, has documented the environmental impact of buildings. Impacts reported as of January 2002 include, for commercial and residential construction:

- 65% of total U.S. electricity consumption
- 36% of total U.S. energy use
- 30% of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions
- 136 million tons of construction and demolition waste in the U.S. (almost 3 pounds per person per day)
- 40% of raw material use globally.

The USGBC has developed and administers the "LEED" green building rating system to promote "green design" (see www.usgbc.org for details). LEED, or Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, shows great promise to provide benefits such as reducing the impacts of natural resource consumption, enhancing comfort and health, and minimizing strain on local infrastructure while producing financial benefits for building
owners and developers. LEED standards cover site design, conservation of materials and resources including water and energy, and indoor environmental quality. Green design practices include building reuse and preservation, which preserve a unique sense of place in our communities, save building resources, and keep demolition refuse out of landfills. Historic preservation also often saves energy and other natural resources. Green architecture is a growing practice that should be recognized and adopted by all who construct buildings.

7. The American Planning Association and its Chapters support comprehensive water supply, distribution, treatment, and storm water planning to protect water supplies, preserve water quality, and prevent flooding.

Reasons to Support the Specific Policy: Clean and adequate water supplies are indispensable for life. Comprehensive programs are needed to protect both water quality and quantity. Development practices, including design and construction, must protect water resources. A variety of planning strategies, design and development standards, and management practices are needed:

- Xeriscaping and natural, local landscaping that minimizes water usage
- Minimizing of paving and impervious surfaces that inhibit natural water drainage and ground water recharge
- Innovative legislation and regulations -- may include conservation and engineering performance standards, buffers, maximum water run-off, agriculture zoning, etc.
- Minimizing of fertilizer and other chemical usage that produces polluted run-off and affects water quality off-site

IV. POLICY OUTCOMES

This section, not usually included in APA policy guides, is provided here to summarize APA's desired results from the implementation of these policies.

A. In the area of planning process and regulation:

1. Reform of state planning enabling acts to promote proactive planning that encourages regional cooperation, collaborative citizen participation in public life, diverse neighborhoods, the equitable distribution of resources, and fiscal responsibility.

2. Well-designed, enduring communities that are sustainable in the near and the long term.

3. Improved communication and collaboration by the various levels of governments, citizens, developers, and other interested parties to improve efficiency and build better communities.

4. Slowing of low-density sprawl and a reversal in the dispersion of housing and jobs into single-use, land consumptive development patterns in favor of densification and centralization.

5. Growth in areas that can support growth, encouraged by intelligent land use planning. The creation of new urban settlements within planned urban growth areas, or in planned new urban areas, containing nodes of...
high-density development that include higher density housing, the majority of community facilities and jobs, and connected by transit.

6. Federal and State support, in terms of policy and incentives, for local decision-making processes, including comprehensive planning.

7. Development decisions that are predictable, fair and fiscally responsible.

B. In the area of transportation and land use:

1. A major shift from single-occupancy automotive transit to travel by bus, fixed-rail systems, ferries, walking and bicycling in existing settlements and new urban-growth areas.

2. Automobile support that appropriately accommodates other modes of transportation, especially non-motorized modes, including providing for appropriate vehicle storage that does not result in further decentralization and dispersion.

C. In the area of regional management and fiscal efficiency:

1. Improved long-term viability of regions and their constituent local governments.

2. Reordering of regional infrastructure planning and development from fragmented and uncoordinated local governments to regional bodies strengthened by states to exercise this function.

3. Local governments whose taxpayers are not burdened with the costs for financing ever-increasing infrastructure backlogs.

D. In the areas of social equity and community building:

1. Vibrant central cities that have experienced a cycle of renewal and rebirth, whose neighborhoods accommodate a diversity of people with a range of backgrounds, economic capacity, and family structures.

2. Reversal in the centralization of poverty in urban cores and first-ring suburbs.

3. Elimination of regulatory barriers that impede construction of affordable housing.

4. Decreased racial and economic segregation through regulations requiring affordable housing in all new-growth areas.

E. In the areas of environmental protection and land conservation:

1. Improvements in air and water quality and in the preservation of natural areas and wildlife habitat.

2. Provision of green infrastructure (an interconnected network of natural lands, natural areas and wild life habitat, and waterways) in existing settlements and new urban growth area.

3. Slowing in the conversion rate of agricultural and non-urbanized land to urban-type land uses.

4. Protection and enhancement of ecosystems, incorporating biodiversity and green infrastructure into developed areas.
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Mobilizing Support For Smart Growth

Smart growth may be a desirable objective, but achieving it will be neither easy nor inevitable. Smart growth requires fundamental changes in development processes and in public programs and regulations that, up to this time, have produced less than fully satisfactory forms of urban development. By necessity, smart growth will have to proceed by incremental steps rather than wholesale shifts in development processes—and this will take time.

More than time, smart growth will require strong political will, targeted investment, and developer determination to take up new ways of development. Official and community expressions of support for smart-growth principles are not enough. And debates over the fine points—how much density? what conditions make transit feasible?—are inevitable. But the real challenge smart growth poses is one of will: Can the stakeholders—elected officials, developers and associated businesses, and community spokespersons—summon up the dedication that will be required to alter the basic processes of community development?

The blind faith in the ideals of smart growth indulged in by many of its advocates has inspired criticism of smart-growth advocacy. Whether their dissent is based on opposition, cynicism, or pessimism, critics sound a note of healthy realism. Naying raises the ultimate issue: Can enough support for the goals of smart growth be won to make a difference? To put the question more positively: What conditions must be met for progress toward the goals of smart growth to occur?

Donald Priest, a developer and former head of research at ULI, thinks that smart growth could backfire. There is considerable evidence, he says, that higher-density development will attract a significant number of residents only if it is well executed and properly serviced with transportation infrastructure. The difficulty is not a lack of market support for higher densities but the inadequate, rundown condition of transportation infrastructure, both road and rail, in almost every metropolitan area. “These problems can be remedied,” says Priest, “but remedies will require major up-front capital investment.” In his view, the public support necessary to raise sufficient capital for transportation is the Achilles heel of smart growth. Highway funding is beset by fiscal conservatism (and highway proposals face environmental barriers) and transit funding needs considerably more voter support than it has received so far.

Furthermore, noting that smart growth depends on land use decisions that reflect a regional perspective and that the concept of regionalism has been expounded for decades with little effect, Priest concludes that “today there are few signs that the delegation of significant land use powers to regional agencies is the wave of the future.” At the local level, says Priest, the balance of power is firmly in the hands of interests who do not see growth as an inherently good thing. NIMBY resistance eventually
will slow growth in most jurisdictions, he says, "and most smart-growth programs implemented at the local level will inevitably morph into slow-growth strategies." Ultimately, says Priest, the failure of existing jurisdictions to accommodate the development necessary to serve an increasing population will continue to force growth to outlying areas.

Richard Ward, president of Development Strategies Inc. in St. Louis, Missouri, sounds similar cautions about the prospects for smart growth, as follows:

- There is no reason to believe that there will be significant progress in causing metropolitan regions to think and act as a unit in addressing growth challenges.
- Despite increases in gasoline costs, Americans remain committed to automobile travel and consequently they support development patterns that favor that means of travel.
- Investment in transit systems has produced new systems that for the most part consist of single lines that are incapable of adequately serving transit-dependent life styles.
- With few exceptions, regulatory reform has been unsuccessful in creating a more favorable permitting process for smart development.

These are hard realities—and they are realities—to deal with. They challenge all people involved in community development to make substantial changes in their personal living and travel choices and in their professional or institutional behavior. Particularly important is to make progress toward the four major conditions necessary to make smart growth work:

- a positive political climate sufficient to overcome NIMBYist opposition to compact, multi-use forms of development;
- sufficient support for balanced programs of transportation improvements to reduce growing congestion and provide greater access to a variety of travel modes;
- effective regional decision-making processes for the resolution of regional issues such as transportation investment priorities and environmental protection; and
- a regulatory climate that does not unduly constrain innovative approaches to meeting smart-growth goals.

Can society muster the will to make change happen, accepting that it will take effort and time, two precious commodities in today's world. Achieving the principles of smart growth will take leadership, innovation, and collaboration. Leadership needs to focus on smart-growth goals and how to reach them. Innovation is needed in the business of development and in the public guidance of development. Collaboration among all the players involved is needed to determine the shape, location, and character of community growth and change.

This chapter focuses on ways to mobilize the support and secure the commitments necessary to make smart growth work, in particular on ways to usher in the four conditions needed to make smart growth work. Based mostly on discussions in the previous chapters, the many kinds of tools that could be useful are summarized in a table.

Two smart-growth process issues are explored: 1) effective regional guidance (supported, it is to be hoped, by state actions) and 2) collaboration at various levels for building consensus on smart-growth initiatives. Rating systems and scorecards that can be used to evaluate the smartness of development projects and policies and to generate endorsements for smart projects are described. The book concludes with action punch lists for developers, public officials, and civic organizations—lists of who must do what to make smart growth work.

A Toolkit of Smart-Growth Actions

This book has described policies, programs, regulatory devices, developer location choices, project designs, and other initiatives that have generated forms of development reflecting smart-growth principles. Figure 8-1 summarizes these tools for smart growth.

Many of the tools in this toolkit are rather traditional, and some of them are applied almost routinely in some communities—but not necessarily to promote smart growth. To meet smart-growth goals these tools may need sharpening or customizing or more forceful use. For example, planning in advance of growth to improve the policy and regulatory climate for mixing uses or conserving open space is a tried-and-true approach, yet it requires thoughtful definitions of program goals and recognition of specific points of leverage in the development process to generate desired results. If
### Figure 8-1 Tools for Smart Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Tools</th>
<th>Compact, Multiuse Development</th>
<th>Housing Diversity And Affordability</th>
<th>Open-Space Conservation</th>
<th>Multimodal Transportation</th>
<th>Community Livability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUD HOPE VI projects</td>
<td>HUD HOPE VI projects</td>
<td>Funding for open-space acquisition and protection (including the Land and Water Conservation Fund)</td>
<td>DOT capital funding for transportation</td>
<td>Education funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT transit joint development guidelines for development around transit stations</td>
<td>Other low- and moderate-income housing assistance programs</td>
<td>Maintenance and expansion of national parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness areas, scenic rivers, and so forth</td>
<td>TCSP and CMAQ special funding for transportation-related improvements</td>
<td>Economic development assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA brownfields cleanup programs</td>
<td>CRA</td>
<td>Regulatory protection for wetlands, wildlife habitat, and other open areas</td>
<td>DOT transit joint development guidelines for development around transit stations</td>
<td>Water supply and wastewater treatment funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-income housing tax credits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements for state SIPs and regional MPO plans and TIPs</td>
<td>Health and welfare programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic preservation tax credits</td>
<td></td>
<td>DOT demonstration projects</td>
<td>Siting rules and guidelines for federal facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Tools</th>
<th>Requirements for locally designated growth areas</th>
<th>Housing finance assistance</th>
<th>Maintenance and expansion of state parks, forests, recreation areas, and so forth</th>
<th>Prioritization and management of federal and state funding for transportation improvements</th>
<th>Education funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital funding targeted to growth areas</td>
<td>Tax-abatement programs</td>
<td>Funding for open-space acquisition and protection, including greenways and farmland</td>
<td>Management of transit systems (in some states)</td>
<td>Coordination of state agency programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway-access controls</td>
<td>Neighborhood conservation programs</td>
<td>Authorization for the public acquisition of less-than-fee interests in property for open space.</td>
<td>Highway- and road-design standards and transit guidelines</td>
<td>Targeting funding for local facilities to designated growth areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of local growth management policies in siting state facilities</td>
<td>Fair share housing requirements</td>
<td>Grants and authority for local open-space acquisition programs, including farmland preservation</td>
<td>MIS and other studies to determine transportation improvement needs and priorities</td>
<td>Support for regional intergovernmental coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New or model rehabilitation codes</td>
<td>Requirements for local government protection of sensitive lands, for example through designation of urban and conservation areas</td>
<td>Access controls on new and improved highways</td>
<td>Promotion of regional development planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements for links between transportation funding and appropriate land uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8-1 continued on next page**
policies and regulations are adopted to promote compact or clustered development, they must incorporate procedures for considering the compatibility of proposed projects with surrounding development. For another example, a metropolitan transportation planning process takes place in most regions, but to become an effective tool for smart growth, regional transportation planning generally needs to be redirected to truly integrate decisions on transportation improvements with local land use policies.

The tools included in Figure 8-1 are just some of the tools that could be useful—a starting point. Many
federal tax policies and funding programs play a significant role in shaping community growth, and those policies and programs affecting housing affordability, economic development, transportation improvements, and other major components of community life must be changed where warranted in response to the challenges posed by smart growth. States have a decisive role to play, particularly in regard to prioritizing and channeling federal and state programs and funds to promote smart development.

Local governments and regional agencies are on the front line of smart growth, able to promote it...
or put obstacles in its way by means of planning, regulatory requirements, and various programs. Developers and other private sector participants in the development process have an obviously important role to play in smart growth based on their control over project locations, project design, and development programming. Civic and special-interest organizations also play key roles as advocates and watchdogs, participants in development and conservation, and sponsors of research and education.

The Regional Imperative

Many aspects of smart growth—including, for example, integrated transportation and land use planning, the conservation of sustainable open space, and the attainment of a jobs/housing balance—are most logically approached from a regional perspective. A regional forum for prioritizing and targeting investment is conducive to smart growth. Smart growth’s regional imperative arises partly from the fact that regions are becoming “the premier unit of competition in a global economy.”

Many of the goals of smart growth—reducing the outward spread of new development, promoting better use of existing urbanized areas, and creating more connected communities—reach across jurisdictional boundaries within regions. Regional organizations should be in a position to guide local planning to reach regional as well as local smart-growth goals.

In the Washington, D.C., area, for example, a federal planning agency formulated a regional wedges and corridors strategic plan in the 1960s. This plan laid the policy foundation for the comprehensive plans of a number of local communities—including Arlington County, the city of Alexandria, and Montgomery County—that are now focusing development around transit stations in the region’s rail corridors. In the Portland, Oregon, region, Metro, the regional planning and service agency, and TriMet, the regional rail agency, have worked closely with local governments to orient development patterns to the emerging rail system.

Smart growth will be the beneficiary if regional agencies become more active players in determining development strategies and setting standards for balanced and equitable urban growth. This section discusses promoting smart growth through mechanisms for regional collaboration and the range of approaches used in metropolitan regions. It also discusses the role of regional organizations in establishing and protecting regional open-space systems and in reducing fiscal disparities within metropolitan regions.

Promoting Smart Growth Regionally

In terms of making smart growth work, there is no substitute for the forward thinking and day-to-day coordination that regional organizations can provide. The regional context that makes regionalism so imperative is the plenitude of local governments, including special taxing districts, in control of much of the development process, each empowered to act independently in determining and achieving its self-defined objectives. In the spirit of rugged individualism, these local governments tend to be competitive and wary of collaborative actions. Often they are beholden to landed interests that stand to profit from local development. Local governments are fundamentally uninterested in envisioning goals for metropolitan growth, much less in carrying out regional strategies. Thus, reaching agreement on regional solutions is likely to be difficult.

Few regional organizations have yet been very effective in guiding metropolitan development in ways that might achieve smart-growth objectives. Many lack the statutory authority to adopt metropolitan strategies and few have the regulatory powers to implement them. Local governments zealously guard their sovereign prerogatives by constraining the planning and management capabilities of regional organizations. State attitudes toward regionalism and the role of regional agencies have not helped much. In fact, most state growth management programs have paid little attention to metropolitan development issues.

In many metropolitan areas, regional agencies exist primarily as a forum for exchanging information and cooperating on various endeavors of mutual interest—not unworthy functions but far short of strategic planning for metropolitan development. As consultant William Dodge observes: “We still consider regional governance on an ad hoc basis. We seldom think about future visions for governing our regions. Equally rarely do we design and implement collaborative strategies for achieving them.”
Nevertheless, the importance of a regional approach is widely recognized. The National Governors Association, for example, in a report on smart growth, said: "the best solutions for growth problems must be regional in scope." Without a regional blueprint for smart growth, local solutions to growth issues will be piecemeal and likely to fail short of success.

A variety of mechanisms exists for effectuating collaboration among local governments—including regional organizations formed by states, regional councils formed voluntarily by local governments, and metropolitan planning organizations mandated by federal legislation in the 1960s to plan transportation systems and investment in large metropolitan areas. There are organizations sponsored by business groups to promote economic development across local jurisdictional boundaries, such as the Allegheny Conference in Pittsburgh and the Bay Area Council in San Francisco. There are metropolitan service districts and authorities, entities established to manage regional public facilities such as transit systems, airports, and sewer systems.

There is the Regional Plan Association, an independent nonprofit entity established in 1922 that addresses planning and implementation issues in metropolitan New York covering parts of three states—New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. There is the Metropolitan Planning Council of Chicago founded in 1934 by business and civic leaders to promote and implement sensible planning and development policies for its region. And there is the Metropolitan Council in Minneapolis-St. Paul, established cooperatively with the state to provide planning and management services (covering transportation and airports, sewers, water, parks, and low- and moderate-income housing opportunities) for the Twin Cities region.

Some recent regional actions illustrate the range of approaches being implemented:

- the Regional Plan Association's participation in successful multistate efforts to fund the purchase of major open-space preserves in the northwestern sector of the region;
- the publication of the Regional Plan Association's third regional plan;
- the emergence of the First Suburbs Consortium, a government-led advocacy coalition of older suburbs in Ohio dedicated to fighting urban sprawl and achieving greater state investment in existing cities and suburbs;
- a movement among state and local public officials and the business community in southeastern Massachusetts to establish a voluntary, regional strategic development program through a system of interlocking interjurisdictional agreements;
- a federal/state/local program in southeastern Florida to stimulate infill and redevelopment in the urbanized corridor to relieve pressure for development that would adversely affect restoration of the Everglades;
- the efforts by the Greenbelt Alliance, a San Francisco Bay Area citizens land conservation and urban planning organization, to retain a greenbelt of 3.75 million acres around the urbanized region that would channel future growth and reinvestment to existing urban areas;
- the involvement of the Treasure Valley Partnership, a forum of local elected leaders in the Boise, Idaho, region that meets regularly to discuss and resolve regional issues and fashion regional solutions to future infrastructure needs; and
- the adoption in 1997 by the Denver Regional Council of Governments of a metropolitan vision and plan that lays out a long-range growth strategy and calls for governments within the region to voluntarily contain development within a designated growth area; and
- the promotion of economic development in the St. Louis metropolitan area by the Bi-State Development Agency and that agency's management of the construction, operation, and expansion of a regional rail-transit system.

These examples demonstrate that regional organizations offer substantial hope for promoting smart growth. State support for smart growth can provide a useful policy context, but it is regional organizations, many of which are gaining in vitality and credibility, that are most ideally placed to conjure up the kind of intergovernmental collaboration that is needed. Smart growth involves various tradeoffs, or a balancing of various goals—development, environmental quality, and social and economic well-being. Striking that balance requires strong intergovernmental commitment at the regional level.

Most regional organizations are knowledgeable about local issues and experienced (if not fully effective) in fostering cooperation among local...
governments. They can obtain and provide credible information on metropolitan growth issues and work with local governments to define regional needs, fashion regional strategies, assess the mutual and regional compatibility of local development plans and decisions, and manage key regional services. Whatever their authority—state authorization, intergovernmental agreement, or voluntary association—regional organizations are likely to have their ear to the ground politically and to know what’s in the development pipeline.

Furthermore, what regional organizations do—the actions they take—must be conceived as (and perceived as) adding value to the growth and development process rather than as imposing irrelevant and perhaps costly burdens on the process. Regional organizations can add value in integrating planning for transportation and land use and in balancing the growth of jobs and housing, for example. They can also take a significant role in conserving open space and mitigating the impacts of growth, as described in the following sections.

**Preserving Regional Open Space**

To recognize—as is increasingly the case—the value of integrating open space into urban and urbanizing areas and the value of preserving large natural and farmland areas on metropolitan fringes is to recognize the value of a regional outlook in identifying, planning, and preserving open space. For small cities, counties generally can stay on top of open-space planning, but for large multicounty metropolitan areas, the leadership and resources of a regional organization are a necessity.

Portland, Oregon’s Metro plans and conserves outlying regional open spaces. So do the New York region’s Regional Plan Association and several other regional agencies. Many urbanizing counties as well lead open-space preservation efforts. Counties around Chicago, for example, are acquiring forest preserves. Maryland counties are using various tools—the state’s Rural Legacy program, county park acquisition programs, and restrictions on the development of rural land—to piece together sustainable open-space corridors.

A regional perspective permits implementation of a strategy that links development in designated growth areas to conservation in designated rural areas. In some metropolitan areas, regional mitigation banks have been established to accumulate open-space contributions by project developers for the preservation of wetlands, forests, habitat and other natural features being displaced by development in urbanizing areas. Such banks can be established by public agencies, utilities, or private firms.

Two Oregon cities, Eugene and Springfield, exemplify the benefits that can be obtained through interjurisdictional cooperation. For an area within both those cities that is slated for industrial development, 1,019 acres of wetlands is being managed as a wetlands mitigation bank under a plan drawn up in 1992 by the city of Eugene. Jointly managed by the city, the federal Bureau of Land Management, and the Nature Conservancy, the bank accepts land purchased by public agencies and private developers who need to replace wetlands adversely affected by development.

The Trust for Public Land and the Florida Game and Freshwater Fish Commission are collaborating in a statewide mitigation program for losses of upland habitat, involving two mitigation land banks established by the trust and financed by fees paid by developers of projects with regional impacts. In 1999, King County, Washington, established a wetlands mitigation banking program as a better alternative to individual, small mitigation efforts scattered around the county. A private banking program run by the Mile High Wetlands Group serves mitigation needs in the Denver region.

Transfer of development rights (TDR) programs in which rural development rights are sold and used in designated urban areas also lend themselves to regional applications. Certain highly valued conservation areas such as the New Jersey Pinelands and the Lake Tahoe region of California and Nevada use TDRs to preserve open space. Although TDR programs generally have not operated across jurisdictional boundaries, several counties have instituted successful, large TDR programs to preserve farmland and other open space. Montgomery County, Maryland, is well known for its use of TDRs to protect farmland. Riverside County, California, requires the developers of sites in urbanizing areas to purchase conservation credits, and the revenues are used to conserve open space.

Regional agencies could make more use of similar programs linking development to the protection of open space to guide growth and protect open space.
Supportive State Actions

What can states do to promote smart-growth actions by local jurisdictions? The National Governors Association recognizes the opportunities that states have to "improve statewide planning to enhance and shape economic development, protect natural resources, and preserve each community's quality of life." The association has compiled a list of potential supportive state actions based on programs already underway in some states. These actions emphasize the leadership role that states can take in three areas—leadership and public education, economic investment and financial incentives, and government collaboration and planning strategies.

Leadership and Public Education
- Articulate a statewide vision for growth and quality of life that meets the goals of citizens, local governments, and private organizations.
- Produce and provide access to information—of use to the general public, state and local agencies, and interest groups of all types—documenting trends in the use of land, infrastructure needs and conditions, open-space conservation, and other issues connected with growth.
- Create tools to support local actions, including grants, technical assistance, and sources of information that spur local and private initiatives.
- Foster collaboration on growth strategies by encouraging, supporting, and even leading efforts to improve decisions about growth.

Economic Investment and Financial Incentives
- Enlist state agencies to support statewide development goals through better coordination of their planning and action programs.
- Target state funds to support statewide development goals—such as guiding growth into designated growth areas and reinvigorating existing neighborhoods and business centers.
- Revitalize town centers and neighborhoods through financial and technical assistance, tax abatements and tax credits, and other programs.
- Integrate brownfield redevelopment efforts with broader initiatives for community development and redevelopment.
- Acquire and encourage the preservation of contiguous land areas that make up green infrastructure and regional green spaces.

Government Collaboration and Planning Strategies
- Recognizing that the ability of local governments to deal with some regional issues is limited, help them coordinate infrastructure investments, enforce compliance with local plans, provide planning resources, involve the general public in setting goals and priorities, and remove regulatory barriers.
- Reduce barriers to development in targeted areas by, for example, adopting "smart" codes and proactively preparing sites for development.

Examples of state efforts to promote smart growth include New Jersey’s commitment to put new life into its state plan and dramatically increase funding for the conservation of open space, Maryland’s Smart Growth program targeting capital investments to designated growth areas, Georgia’s Smart Growth toolkit Web site, Illinois’s main street revitalization program, Wyoming’s program to educate landowners about conservation options, state construction codes in New Jersey and Maryland tailored to infill and redevelopment, the new Office of Smart Growth in the Colorado Department of Local Affairs, the Envision Utah initiative (see pages 153–164), and the executive orders issued by a number of governors (Maryland, Washington, Oregon, and other states) to urge state agencies to make more effective use of state resources in developing smart communities.

Note

Compensation for Development

Compensatory mechanisms for development impacts across jurisdictional boundaries are a tool for smart growth to the degree that they discourage fiscal zoning and development decisions that ignore nonlocal impacts. Fiscal zoning lures land uses that generate high tax revenues, such as shopping centers and office buildings, while it leaves little room for land uses that generate net spending by city governments, such as affordable housing. The kinds of development favored by fiscal-impact analysis often produce effects in neighboring jurisdictions—traffic, employee housing, and other conditions—that require public expenditures.

Tax-sharing arrangements can help. The Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities (Minneapolis-St. Paul) administers a regional tax-sharing program that earmarks 40 percent of property tax increases from new development for a regional pool. Funds in the tax pool are distributed to jurisdictions according to population and other factors. Although this approach has been widely admired as a useful means of balancing fiscal disparities, other metropolitan regions have not adopted it.
Some states help to equalize fiscal disparities among jurisdictions by collecting a state tax and distributing it to local jurisdictions according to need.

Another mechanism is the regional evaluation of developments with multijurisdictional impacts, called developments of regional impact (DRIs) in some states. Such evaluations can determine fiscal impacts and findings of impact can activate interjurisdictional compensatory mechanisms. Several regional organizations, including the Atlanta Regional Commission, the Metropolitan Council (Twin Cities), and all Florida regional planning agencies, are empowered to review DRIs and recommend measures to mitigate their impacts, but these agencies have relatively little power to enforce mitigation measures.

A possible compensation mechanism that might be more acceptable to local jurisdictions is agreements among local jurisdictions that provide for compensation for the impacts of certain kinds of development near jurisdictional borders. Regional agencies could formulate a model agreement for use by local governments, including definitions of developments that would trigger compensation, methods for measuring impacts, and types of compensation.

Collaborative Approaches

A solid commitment to smart growth on the part of many people and groups with a stake in community growth and change is what will make smart growth work. And securing widespread commitment means accommodating widespread interests. Smart growth must be approached collaboratively.

Community planners have a great deal of experience with consensus building and collaborative planning. This experience arises out of long-range community planning and other growth management efforts; efforts to deal with regional issues, such as air quality or economic development; efforts to resolve disputes over specific development projects in specific neighborhoods; and efforts to meet the planning-process requirements in such federal programs as transportation funding. This experience provides lessons in how to seek advice from a broad constituency of interests and how to make decisions through a collaborative process.

The collaborative approaches discussed in the sections that follow illustrate consensus building for comprehensive plans and other public initiatives, intergovernmental collaboration, and smart-growth ratings for securing community support for projects that incorporate smart characteristics. The work of the Santa Ana River Watershed Group, a multiparty, multitask entity that has had considerable success in dealing with regional issues, is discussed.

Building Consensus on Public Initiatives

Policy planning and implementation for community development generally takes place in a context of broad participation. Rarely is a major policy decision made without the input of specially constituted committees, task forces, and blue-ribbon groups and without feedback from numerous community and neighborhood meetings. Broad participation in planning and implementation helps educate civic leaders and the general public on issues of community growth and change and can forge consensus on desirable future courses of action, whether regulatory or programmatic in nature. Some widely used approaches to building consensus are described in the following sections.

Visioning Exercises

Visioning or goal-setting exercises have been conducted in many communities (and some regions) to guide the subsequent preparation of a general plan or zoning ordinance. Participants, usually representing a cross section of community interests, are asked to agree on the most desirable character of the future community or on objectives for the future development of the community. The focus of a number of visioning exercises has been on the broad goals of smart growth applied to specific regional or local concerns and conditions. In a typical visioning process, meetings may occur monthly and occasionally weekly for several months or even years, discussions are guided by trained facilitators, and the group is divided into committees and subcommittees to pursue solutions to specific issues.

The strategic program developed by Long Beach, California, in the 1980s to promote economic recovery and improve quality of life serves as an example of such a process that is notable for its long-standing value in directing community development. Long Beach fell on hard times when defense industries closed down in the 1960s, and
its downtown, waterfront, and inner neighborhoods spiraled downward.

In 1984, city leaders organized citizen task forces to draft suggestions for improvements in transportation, economic development, housing and neighborhood development, infrastructure, quality of life, education, and human services. Working for almost two years, the task forces identified current problems and issues in each area of concern, framed appropriate policies, and recommended specific actions by the city to implement the policies. A strategic plan was the result. It contained 98 recommendations for action: the reorganization of city departments, the refocusing of some city programs, the establishment of new development plans and programs, the creation of new organizations for implementing housing and neighborhood improvements, more financial support for the construction of public facilities, and so forth.

The city council adopted 15 general policy statements that signaled the city’s intent to pursue the strategic plan’s economic and social objectives. Annual reports were prepared to indicate progress toward the completion of projects and achievement of administrative changes. The first strategic plan and others that followed have promoted and guided community development efforts over many years. Results include a rebuilt downtown, rejuvenated waterfront, and redevelopment and renovation in Long Beach.

In 1995, Flagstaff, Arizona, undertook a similarly comprehensive effort to try to come to terms with the rapid growth and associated economic, demographic, and social dislocations of the 1980s and 1990s and to try to get out of the crisis mode that characterized the city’s responses to these changes. The Flagstaff 2020 visioning process sought to build a community vision around shared purposes and to use this vision as a proactive foundation for guiding community growth and change.

The visioning process was designed by a management committee that included representatives of five public entities and four private organizations and a private citizen. A project management team composed of city, county, chamber of commerce, and Grand Canyon Trust representatives met regularly to provide day-to-day oversight of the management committee’s activities. A project coordinator and a facilitation consultant were hired.

The ideas and comments received during numerous public visioning meetings and surveys were evaluated and consolidated by a task force made up of 37 people representing a cross section of community interests. The task force’s draft vision statement was reviewed in 50 public meetings before being finalized in June 1997. Seven action teams were assigned the task of identifying five-year and one-year (early success) actions for implementing the goals and strategies in the vision statement. Some 5,000 citizens took part in Flagstaff 2020, not including hundreds of students who participated in youth visioning programs. To keep people informed, three newspaper inserts were published and distributed to more than 23,000 households in greater Flagstaff.

The Flagstaff 2020 vision document describes goals and actions for strengthening and sustaining community ties, improving housing and livability, protecting the environment, fostering human development, managing growth, promoting family life, promoting health and safety, and providing economic opportunity. Under the “protecting the environment” rubric, for example, 14 goals from healthy forests to low-impact recreation are stated along with various recommended actions. Actions recommended to promote environmentally sensitive lifestyles, for example, include learning about and practicing environmental lifestyles, establishing community gardens and adopt-a-tree programs, revising building codes and zoning to provide incentives for energy-efficient buildings, and using a market-pricing system for resource consumption.

Envision Utah is an example of a visioning process at the regional scale. This process for rethinking regional development in the Greater Wasatch region (Salt Lake City) was set in motion in 1997 by the Coalition for Utah’s Future and began with formation of the Utah Quality Growth Public/Private Partnership, a group of more than 100 community leaders. The partnership’s job was to come up with a growth scenario that could guide development, focused especially on the rapid growth taking place in the Greater Wasatch region. A survey of residents on the values they held for their communities kicked off the Envision Utah process.

Over almost two years, a series of more than 100 workshops and meetings allowed residents to identify their desires for regional development. The workshops (see under “Charrettes” on page 165)
Fed ideas into four growth scenarios depicting conventional and more compact patterns of development. The scenarios were tested for fiscal, environmental, and other impacts, and then in 1999 they were configured into a single regional plan, the quality growth scenario. The quality growth scenario now guides the community development actions of cities and suburban communities in the region, as well as state actions.15

Visioning can be a useful tool for defining and expressing goals, but it works best when structured to produce concrete recommendations that can be folded into planning and implementation programs already in place. Visioning efforts are often misguided in championing wide participation and interaction to achieve broad consensus rather than seeking the production and implementation of specific action plans.

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) recently evaluated the results of that region’s Vision 2020 process from July 1991 through September 1995. It found that much of the visioning process was “very effective in promoting interpersonal interaction on topics it identified as important,” but that it “yielded few clearly significant, immediate results from its list of action initiatives, produced no plan capable of providing ‘a roadmap to the vision,’ and required the commitment of $4.4 million.”16

Among the mistakes of the Vision 2020 program, according to the ARC study, are that it set process objectives rather than outcome goals, required consensus without a means of stimulating compromise and change, and de-emphasized substantive planning expertise without providing an alternative standard and without providing a credible alternative source of data. Thus overall goals were blurry, timeframes for action undefined, proposals not well evaluated, and participation spotty over the lengthy process. Furthermore, how the Vision 2020 conclusions were related to ongoing local and regional planning programs was not fully explored or made explicit.

Small-Area Planning Committees
Development or revitalization planning for smaller areas such as neighborhoods, business districts, historic districts, and transportation corridors is also frequently a collaborative group effort. These groups often are asked to agree on goals for the development of the area under consideration and to make specific recommendations about the character and location of the major components of development. Rather precise goals and even detailed designs can emerge from this process.

For example, the development of Bethesda Row and associated transit-related projects in Bethesda, Maryland (see page 129), were implemented according to a sector plan that had been prepared by a community planning committee for the commercial center. Appointed by the county planning board, the committee members represented a broad continuum of interests. After lengthy discussions, the committee agreed on a plan that included specific goals and design guidelines for development in the commercial center.

In Charlotte, North Carolina, the region’s 14 chambers of commerce were convinced that the region required a multimodal transportation system, so they worked to establish the public/private Business Committee for Regional Transportation Solutions to promote planning, funding, design, and development of a coordinated regional system of highways and transit. In particular, the group has worked closely with state, county, and city officials to back planning for rail-transit facilities in five corridors and for designing and implementing transit-supportive development patterns near proposed station areas. (The Business Committee for Regional Transportation Solutions also sponsored ULI advisory panels to recommend appropriate land use patterns and actions in each of the five corridors and a concluding symposium to educate the community about the findings and recommendations of the panels and encourage a dialogue about transportation and land use strategies in the region.)

The sponsors of small-area planning committees and ad hoc task forces can be city councils, planning commissions, or many other entities. Their purview can be equally varied, from the streamlining of development regulations to the creation of a regional parks authority or transportation authority, the resolution of an interjurisdictional land use dispute, or the establishment of a mixed-use zoning district. Although they may begin with vision and goal statements, such task-oriented groups typically produce detailed recommendations as well. In some communities, ad hoc task forces and committees have become a fairly stan-
standard way of addressing special concerns, and at any given time several such groups will be in the process of investigating and making recommendations on various subjects.

Charrettes
A charrette is an effort concentrated in time to understand conditions and issues, define development goals, and propose courses of action. Charrettes engage a broad array of residents and special interests and have become a popular method for reaching consensus on future growth and change, particularly in relatively small, contained areas such as small towns, neighborhoods, and business districts. Led by professional facilitators (who frequently are planners or urban designers), charrettes are carefully organized to proceed from a discussion of general concerns and objectives to participants' recommendations for specific plans, designs, and actions. Charrette meetings may be scheduled to last only over a single weekend or they sometimes may involve several two-day sessions over a month or two. Whatever the format, the emphasis is on intense, focused deliberations that can produce results within a short time frame.

For example, the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (covering Palm Beach, Indian River, Martin, and St. Lucie Counties in southeastern Florida) managed a series of charrettes in the mid-to late 1990s in small communities along the coast to define desirable components of future development in the town centers. Each charrette took place over a weekend or two, sandwiched by prior studies and follow-up detailed design work. They proved highly popular among townspeople and produced some interesting new ideas for parks, waterfront uses, business area improvements, and other aspects of town center development. Many of these ideas were incorporated in later revisions of communities' comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances.

Envision Utah (see "Visioning Exercises" on pages 163–164) organized a series of workshops similar to charrettes to encourage people to plan the future course of development in the region. In the first workshop, for example, participants were given regional maps and stacks of chips representing the amount of land required for future growth, and they were asked to put the chips on the map where development should occur. (Depending on the subarea, from almost half to more than three-quarters of the chips ended up on infill and redevelopment sites.) Additional workshops further defined the character and location of projected development, eventually leading in the second year of the effort to a regional plan for the Salt Lake City area.

Intergovernmental Collaboration
Local governments hold the power to plan and regulate development. The limitations of this jurisdictional focus have become all too evident. Local communities operate within a regional context of economic, social, and environmental forces—and sometimes within a state, national, or even global context. Economic, transportation, environmental, and other systems transcend local boundaries, are interrelated, and involve a complex network of public entities. Smart-growth advocates recognize the interrelatedness of urban systems and their transcendence of local boundaries, and endeavor to spread the word. For smart growth to work, collaboration among the many agencies and departments engaged in making communities livable is essential—essential although difficult.

Relationships between local governments and the federal establishment tend to make the difficulties of intergovernmental collaboration evident. A large part of the problem has to do with the consciously narrow focus of many federal agencies. Their missions are hard to decipher—defined by Congressional mandates, agency regulations, and court cases—and colored by the attitudes of whatever administration is in power and the attitudes of long-time agency professionals. Even departments and agencies within the federal establishment and offices within single agencies and departments may fail to collaborate with one another. Cooperative endeavors between federal agencies and nonfederal governmental entities are the exception rather than the rule, despite what agencies may say about the value of collaboration and the frequent willingness of individual staff members, especially in the regional offices, to be involved in collaborative ventures.

There are three federal planning processes for areas of special concern that offer opportunities for collaboration:

- Advance identification of wetlands. Under Section 230.80 of the EPA 404(b)(1) guidelines, EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers may
carry out studies and, in advance of application for permits, designate wetlands as suitable or unsuitable for disposal of dredged or fill material.

Special-area management plans. To protect natural resources and allow reasonable coastal-dependent development in specific areas, the 1980 amendments to the Coastal Zone Management Act allow the Corps, in conjunction with federal, state, and local resource agencies, to develop special-area management plans (SAMPs) that contain comprehensive statements of policies and criteria to guide land use.

Habitat conservation plans. Under the Endangered Species Act, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service can approve habitat conservation plans that allow some development to occur on land that is habitat for endangered species, if the development will not substantially reduce the survivability of any endangered species.

These three planning mechanisms attempt to balance conservation with development in a way that reduces future conflicts, improves the predictability of potential development, and protects important natural areas. Also, all three mechanisms involve processes requiring close working relationships among federal, state, and local agencies, developers, and special-interest groups.

State agencies are little better than federal agencies in working collaboratively among themselves but they are more apt to join in collaborative enterprises with local governments, perhaps because of proximity. State agencies typically develop local constituencies across the state, which may stimulate collaborative undertakings. Administering growth management laws routinely involves state agencies in a dozen or so states with local planning and development authorities.

The Maryland Rural Legacy program represents an effective approach to state/local collaboration. Authorized in the state’s 1997 Smart Growth legislation, the Rural Legacy program provides state funding for local acquisition of conservation easements to preserve open space. Local governments compete for funding by proposing projects that meet state goals for protecting areas large enough to preserve multiple natural qualities of value. The state especially welcomes collaborative proposals from two or more local governments, for example to preserve extended natural corridors, and proposals that incorporate other conservation funding to augment the Rural Legacy funds. In the first three years of the program, the state committed approximately $100 million in grants to conserve 47,000 acres of land.

Collaborative Planning for Private Projects

For private projects today, particularly for large projects, the developer’s collaboration with government agencies, community interests, and special interests on program and design details is a fact of life. Neighborhood and community groups are likely to want to especially examine less conventional project proposals that adhere to smart-growth principles. NIMBYism is one component of activism toward development in many communities, but another component is the public’s interest in assuring development that in character and quality adds to—and does not detract from—neighborhood and community livability and value.

A 1994 ULI publication sees collaborative project planning as stemming from several changes:

No longer is it possible to consider the public and private sectors as independent actors. Tight budgets have caused public agencies to act simultaneously as regulators of and partners in private development; interest groups have become stronger and more sophisticated; and the diversity of participants has increased.

Public involvement in development decisions need not be adversarial. A collaborative approach allows private developers and public officials to focus their energies on planning the development rather than on outwitting their opponents. And, to the extent that collaboration reduces project delays and risks and assures a more orderly development process, overall project costs may be contained.

Engaging in collaborative discussions about proposed projects is especially important in the following circumstances:

- The proposed project raises complex issues that need detailed examination to be resolved.
- The issues are negotiable. In other words, established policies and regulations allow some leeway.
- The project affects or involves many parties or more than one local jurisdiction.
- The parties and jurisdictions are willing to participate in collaborative planning.
When time is of the essence, when fast action is required and the time to work through tough problems is not available, collaboration is a less feasible option. But frequently time itself can be stretched in time-constrained situations and decisions postponed—to allow constructive discussions among the interests to take place.

Developers can do missionary work to advance their interests, seeking out public support for their developments. Even before they apply for permits, they can talk with community leaders to determine community attitudes toward development and identify potential issues. They can organize neighborhood meetings to describe proposed projects and obtain feedback. Such meetings provide opportunities to work out compromises before attitudes become hardened and issues become crises. Developers can identify what neighborhood or community concerns might be addressed or resolved by their projects. They can supply the community with credible facts and figures before damaging rumors start. Effective collaboration on smart development proposals hinges most clearly on public officials having done their job in establishing a positive policy context for smart development. Clear and repeated signals from public officials that they support smart types of development will allay developers’ worries about the possibility of collaborative discussions becoming contentious rather than constructive.

The major expansion of the 1950s Prudential Center in downtown Boston involved the kind of collaborative approach that increasingly is required for development. In the mid-1980s, Prudential Development wanted to act on the market opportunity to add some 3 million square feet of office and retail space to the 7 million-square-foot Prudential Center. The developer planned to transform the aging center into a destination complex that could compete with its highly successful neighbor, Copley Place, and to improve street and pedestrian access within the redeveloped complex.

When the plan was announced, local residents raised major concerns about potential impacts on adjacent neighborhoods. Mayor Kevin White stepped in to recommend a new planning approach that eventually involved 22 neighborhood, civic, and business groups empowered to establish guidelines, evaluate design concepts, and assess impact mitigation. Robert Walsh, Prudential’s chief representative in the planning process, explained Prudential’s willingness to take this new road: “For us to leverage our investment, we had to create greater density and for that we needed to work with our neighbors.”

The developer reconstituted the planning team to include firms experienced in inclusive design processes. The mayor, the Boston Redevelopment Authority, and the developer combined to launch PruPAC, the collaborative planning group. A facilitator was hired to promote an open dialogue among the participants. Hundreds of meetings took place, some with the whole group and others with key individuals and task groups.

The plan that took shape accomplished the developer’s principal objective of expanding the asset base of the center, although at a smaller scale than first designed, and added community value by fostering connections with adjacent areas and strengthening existing assets. The expansion was designed to create a lively and accessible mix of uses, to constitute a memorable addition to the city, and to integrate Prudential Center into the surrounding neighborhoods.

The final expansion plan included 1.8 million square feet of new office space, residential buildings, a new retail area, and an enclosed pedestrian walkway connecting to the existing retail arcade—an investment totaling approximately $1 billion. PruPAC has continued to guide decisions on project design and changes. In the summer of 2000, it approved changes in the master plan to allow development of a hotel. Prudential’s willingness to participate in this lengthy process was a key to a successful project.

**Smart-Growth Ratings and Scorecards**

Project rating systems and endorsement systems can be an innovative tool for securing community backing for proposed developments that advance smart growth. Some communities have used rating systems for many years to guide permitting decisions. Some communities use more recently adopted community indicators to gauge their progress toward smart growth.

Indicators in this context are shorthand, measurable data points used to assess important community
conditions and qualities related to smart growth, such as the net density of new development, transit ridership, acres of conserved open space, and the number of affordable housing units. By tracking changes in the indicator measurements, community leaders can determine which programs are working to meet smart-growth goals and which need strengthening or redirection.21

The city of Austin, Texas, uses indicators contained in a Smart Growth Matrix that was adopted in 1999 to assist the city council in analyzing development proposals in its designated desirable development zone. The desirable development zone includes downtown and the urban core and certain neighborhoods. Projects that significantly advance the city's goals (chiefly its infill and redevelopment goal) may be offered financial incentives to offset the high cost of developing in built-up areas.

The Smart Growth Matrix is contained in a 23-page application package. Eleven types of project characteristics are evaluated and points awarded up to a maximum number of points for each characteristic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Maximum Number of Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood planning and design reviews</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical mass (density)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of other agencies</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban design</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal transportation elements</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing affordability</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local economic effects</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable building practices</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of these characteristics, the matrix spells out criteria and standards, which are assigned weights and a maximum number of points. Evaluators multiply points awarded by weights to arrive at scores for each criterion or standard. For example, a project's location in the desired development zone earns points if the location is consistent with a transit-station-area plan and gains points if it is close to a bus stop. A project can earn up to 45 points for a downtown location, 28 points for a location in the urban core, and 12 points for a location in the desired development zone. For a location in an area of economic need or in an untested (trail-blazing) market area, projects can earn up to 42 additional points. For another example, a project can earn points for its multimodal transportation elements if it offers an interface with or proximity to transit (three points) or pedestrian-friendliness (up to 24 points).

Up to 635 total points are available. A project must obtain more than 225 points to merit approval. The number of points above 225 will determine the extent of financial incentives offered by the city, such as fee waivers and infrastructure funding.

Use of Austin's smart-growth rating system is at the option of developers, who presumably are attracted by the potential financial incentives. By mid-2001, 11 projects had been evaluated using the matrix, and eight had been approved, mostly for fee waivers. That amount of activity may seem insignificant but in fact it represents investment totaling more than $350 million. According to George Adams, the city's chief administrator for the rating process, another eight projects are going through matrix evaluations as of late 2001.

But indicators and Austin's Smart Growth Matrix represent top-down measures of the quality of proposed development. Typically, indicator programs are administered by the jurisdiction's planning staff. A number of environmental and urban advocacy organizations—such as San Francisco's Greenbelt Alliance and the 1000 Friends of Washington—have suggested a more collaborative approach to evaluating the smart-growth qualities of proposed development.

This approach is called endorsement rating. Endorsement rating programs are structured to provide a means for community groups—and developers—to do two things: 1) evaluate the extent to which proposed developments meet smart-growth goals and 2) obtain support for projects that score high on the evaluation. The sponsors of smart projects need all the help they can get given the fact that such projects—compact, mixed-use, transit-focused, and affordable—often encounter the stiffest opposition from neighbors as well as higher-than-normal regulatory hurdles. Endorsement ratings help developers as well to discover what project qualities their potential supporters consider important.
Endorsement rating systems are intended especially for the use of nongovernmental special-interest groups and civic groups that seek assurances that proposed developments advance smart-growth principles. One recent example is the Smart Scorecard for development projects formulated by planners Will Fleissig and Vickie Jacobsen in collaboration with the Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU) with funding from EPA.\textsuperscript{22}

The Scorecard, the latest draft of which was completed in January 2002, is intended to help all the parties that are involved in project decisions—elected local officials, developers, investors, neighborhood groups, and project designers—make better decisions. It contributes to better decisions by fostering more effective communication about the common objectives of communities and developers. The Scorecard’s authors hope that by using it communities will be able to find the point at which community goals, site opportunities, and economically viable development intersect. Communities using the Scorecard can determine the emphasis to be given various criteria.

The Scorecard evaluates ten critical project characteristics (the percentages state the share of the total score for each characteristic):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of Total Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to existing and future development and infrastructure</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix and balance of uses</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site optimization and compactness of development</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility and mobility choices</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community context and site design</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine-grained block, pedestrian, and park network</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental qualities</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of uses</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuse and redevelopment options</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process collaboration and predictability of decisions</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of these project characteristics, the Scorecard identifies critical factors and possible measures of those factors. For example, to evaluate the first characteristic—proximity to existing and future development and infrastructure—the following critical factors are to be measured:

- distance to roads, water service, and sewer service;
- walking distance to transit;
- for residential development, proximity to services (grocery shopping, convenience retail, personal services, schools, daycare, recreation centers);
- for commercial development (including employment uses), proximity to housing, restaurants, entertainment;
- time before additional support services become available; and
- location within designated development or redevelopment areas.

Each critical factor is rated according to specific measures. The project is awarded points for each factor depending on its rating as excellent (four points), preferred (three points), acceptable (two points), or minimal (one point). For the critical factors relating to proximity just listed, for example, the first four factors are rated in miles, with adjacency earning four points (excellent), less than one-third mile earning three points (preferred), one-third to one-half mile earning three points (acceptable), and one-half to one mile earning one point (minimal). The fifth factor on this list is rated in years, with before two years earning four points (excellent) and six to eight years earning one point (minimal). No measures are provided for the sixth factor, because a site is either in a designated area or not in one.

The Scorecard also lists city responsibilities for each of the project characteristics. City responsibilities for the proximity characteristics, for example, include adoption of a capital improvements program tied to comprehensive and district plans, a transportation master plan, a water management master plan, a stated policy not to subsidize infrastructure for leapfrog projects that require the extension of infrastructure outside service areas, and the designation of mixed-use village centers near residential areas.

Special-interest groups interested in endorsing a proposed project can use the Scorecard to evaluate how well it satisfies smart-growth objectives. The Scorecard can be adapted to meet the information and rating needs of specific organizations. For example, it was used by the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Denver to create a Green Builder Scorecard for master-planned communities.

In late 2001, the Chesapeake & Potomac Regional Alliance (CAPRA), a Washington, D.C., area non-
profit regional action alliance working toward a better regional future, issued a three-part project rating method that is somewhat less complex than the CNU Smart Scorecard. CAPRA proposes that this method be used as an endorsement tool for projects that meet smart-growth goals.

The CAPRA method poses a series of questions (see box). Part 1 provides a short-form checklist to determine if a project prequalifies by meeting the most basic criteria of smart growth. Yes or no questions pertain to the project's 1) proximity to existing urbanized areas, town centers, transit stops, and current or planned public water and sewer systems; 2) accessibility by existing roads, and by walking and biking; 3) avoidance of harm to local streams and bodies of water bodies, and minimal effect on wetlands, forests, and agricultural land; and 4) contribution to balance in the mix of local jobs, housing, and services.

If a project passes muster in the part 1 analysis, and an organization wishes to consider further evaluation leading to a potential endorsement, that organization can use part 2 to determine the strategic significance of the project in terms of 1) size;
2) locational relation to community growth or re-development objectives; 3) mix of uses (including affordable housing); 4) community benefits such as parks, tax base, and transportation improvements; and 5) the developer’s working relationship with local groups.

Projects that collect at least 50 points from positive answers to the part 2 questions can be considered for the detailed analysis presented in part 3. Project characteristics scored during this evaluation include location, density, transportation access, land use mix, community benefits, environmental effects, community connectivity, respect for historic places, respect for existing residents and businesses, and the developer’s track record in producing projects meeting smart-growth standards. Projects for which 80 percent of the answers are in the affirmative are eligible to receive an endorsement as pro-smart growth and those with a 70 percent score may receive a conditional endorsement. Any projects that are rated 0 in more than one category should not be endorsed.

CAPRA’s rating process, like the Smart Scorecard, is intended to serve as a starting point for responses to proposed projects. It can be adapted and elaborated as appropriate for local conditions and concerns. CAPRA suggests that the development and adoption of a uniform rating chart by a coalition of organizations would be the most effective method of endorsement and the most effective way of gaining influence over decision making about development.

CAPRA also believes that the use of its matrix to rate proposed projects can enhance opportunities for dialogue between developers and community groups about project characteristics. The opportunity to gain endorsements through this process will give developers an incentive to revise their proposals to more closely achieve smart-growth goals. At the same time, developers can use the matrix rating system to present the merits of their projects to community groups that might be persuaded to endorse or actively support them as contributions to smart growth.

The credibility of project ratings and endorsements based on smart-growth ratings will be enhanced if the group leading the process ensures that it is an open process structured to engender a climate of trust and collaboration. Making the process an open one may mean including various members of the community in it. Evaluation processes that result in the credible endorsement of projects that meet smart-growth goals can help gain approval for projects that might otherwise face formidable community opposition.

The Smart Growth Alliance—a collaborative enterprise to research, identify, and encourage land use development and transportation policies and practices that will support smart growth in the Washington, D.C., region—including a smart-growth endorsement program. Initiated by the Washington, D.C., UIJ District Council, the alliance includes among its partners the district council, the Coalition for Smarter Growth, the Greater Washington Board of Trade, the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, and the Metropolitan Washington Builders’ Council. A “Smart Growth Alliance Agreement” spells out the mission, objectives, and structure of the alliance. Criteria have been developed for a smart-growth endorsement program, which will recognize project proposals that meet smart growth criteria. The alliance has tested proposed evaluation criteria on several project proposals and is now moving ahead with the endorsement program.

Procedures and Issues in Collaboration

Certain steps are important to take in any collaborative process—whether it is publicly or privately directed and whether it is a community planning effort or a proposed development project. These are as follows:

△ Define the issues and the desired outcomes. This means assessing the types of concerns likely to be raised by the planning effort or the proposed development project, and clarifying the desired results of the process (the indicators of success or failure).

△ Identify the parties with interests in the plan or project and in the outcome of the process. Interested parties include individuals or groups with authority to make decisions on the matter, with a direct or indirect stake in the decisions, and with the means to influence decisions.

△ Design an organizational format and decision-making structure. The format and structure should focus on educating participants, instilling a level of trust and respect among participants, and promoting agreement on the goal of resolving issues and making decisions.
Gather and communicate to participants knowledge of conditions, trends, and existing policies affecting relevant issues.

Work to reach consensus or agreement on specific recommendations, policies, and actions. All agreements forged should be documented.

These steps are important but not easy. Who should be involved, for example, is a question ripe with political nuances and practical implications. Frequently, the first draft of a list of participants misses individuals who can play a key role in decisions and whose omission even may render the outcome of the process irrelevant.

Who should be involved hinges sometimes on how likely they are to stick with the process over the long term. The longer the process, the less predictable the attendance of participants. Visioning exercises and comprehensive plan revisions may involve dozens of meetings over many months or even years—and when the planning phase is complete, participants may be reluctant to sign up for follow-up efforts to devise action programs. Participants representing business interests may tire quickly of seemingly interminable discussions, and unless they are directly affected by the results of the process they may drop out. Other participants may drop out because of changes in their personal lives and professional duties.

High dropout rates can necessitate constant adjustments in the process to accommodate and educate replacements. Some turnover among participants involved in community planning is no doubt healthy, but too many fresh faces can mean revisiting previously made decisions. The participants most likely to remain involved over time tend to be representatives of groups with a strong interest in one kind of issue or another. Some are close to being professional meeting attendees and, in the end, their continued participation may lead to decisions unreflective of larger community interests.

In this regard, Debra Stein, author of two ULI books about winning approvals for development, comments that the effectiveness of charrettes as collaborative design processes depends on having “the right people sitting at the table.” People opposed to any change rarely cooperate to shape a workable project. Charrettes, she says, “are enjoyable for rational thinkers . . . and lineal thinkers who appreciate the constant refinements and revisions of the design process.” But some legitimate stakeholders, notes Stein, often including young and old people, cannot engage constructively in this type of thinking.

Stein points out another weakness of any collaborative process, which is the tendency of many participants to concentrate on protecting the existing quality of their lives and the current character of the community—and to not consider the possible benefits of change and future development. This tendency may account for the underwhelming results of many collaborative exercises in which the recommendations reflect a fixation on keeping things as they are.

An example occurred in Minneapolis some years ago. Planners exploring possibilities for initiating regional rail-transit service proposed using an existing rail line to bring capital costs within a feasible range. They organized a series of discussions involving residents of neighborhoods along the proposed line. One after another, the neighborhood meetings produced great support for rail service. But they also insisted that the new rail line be placed underground to avoid impacts on the adjoining neighborhoods. This solution raised construction costs well above available funding and killed the project. Having failed to imagine that outcome, the planners had neglected to set limits for changes to the proposed project.

Many visioning and planning processes are structured to reach consensus among multiple interests and across multiple issues. Thus, too many of these processes produce little but vague generalizations about future development. It is important to define carefully the expected outcomes of a collaborative process and to formulate procedures to reach them. If agreement on specific policies and detailed action recommendations is desired, consensus (the full commitment of all participants) should not be a goal. Decisions on rules for voting and even dissenting reports should be made early in the process to reflect desired outcomes.

The Santa Ana River Watershed Group illustrates a process consciously designed to avoid many of the problems that are common in collaborative approaches. Initially formed in 1998 to work out solutions to the environmental impacts of about 270 dairy operations and 350,000 dairy animals in the 50-square-mile Chino Basin, the Watershed
Group incorporates a wide array of interests. It soon found reason to broaden its work to encompass issues of urban and economic development.

The Santa Ana River watershed comprises 2,650 square miles extending 80 miles from the San Bernardino Mountains to the Pacific Ocean, including parts of three counties (San Bernardino, Riverside, and Orange) and numerous local jurisdictions (including several water and wastewater utilities). The Watershed Group brought together representatives of the local governments, the dairy and utility interests, environmental organizations, and state and federal agencies to explore issues in the watershed and collaboratively determine potential solutions. This collaborative process was termed “shared governance.” It evolved from a need to involve a wide and shifting constituency of interests and to coordinate a variety of local efforts to deal with development and conservation issues.

The Working Group has been involved in a dozen or more initiatives over the past three years. Some results of efforts to date include collaborative planning for manure management in the Chino Basin, preparation of a scoping report for a conservation program for 10,000 acres upstream of the Prado Dam, proposals for an information bank for the watershed, and a conservation strategy for protecting the threatened Santa Ana sucker (a fish). A major result is the unprecedented degree of collaboration that has evolved among a wide variety of interests in the watershed.

Commitments Needed

This chapter began by underscoring the need for people and agencies to move past the broad principles of smart growth to change the ways regions, communities, and neighborhoods develop. Everyone involved in community development—developers, builders, urban designers, planners, public officials at all levels of government, and representatives of civic and other interests—needs to commit to the pursuit of smart growth at every step of the community-building process.

This chapter ends with lists of actions that 1) developers and associated professionals, 2) public officials, and 3) special-interest groups can take to promote smart growth—and must take for smart growth to flourish. Unless developers, public officials, and special interests commit to taking these actions—unless they become responsible for pursuing smart growth—smart growth will remain an empty promise. Community developers broadly speaking must commit to taking the following actions, because the success of smart growth absolutely depends on their doing so.

Developers, builders, lenders, planners and designers, and other providers of real estate services must:

△ Study examples of smart development, learn its nature, and seize every opportunity to adapt, refine, and experiment with applications of smart-growth principles in project locations, siting, design, and construction.
specifically define and evaluate the costs and benefits of potential smart features in the location, siting, design, and construction of development projects.

- Find ways to incorporate considerations of long-term value (operating costs, appreciation, durability) in making decisions about project siting, components, and design.

- Seek to physically and functionally connect developments with nearby neighborhoods and to expand the lifestyle, work, and travel choices available within communities and regions.

- Find ways to evolve organizational strategies for building and development with the goal of examining potential opportunities for diversifying product lines in terms of scale, form, and uses.

- Work proactively with public officials, civic groups, and other organizations to establish a public policy and regulatory context favorable to smart development and to transform widespread antigrowth attitudes into pro-smart-growth attitudes.

Public officials and administrators at all levels of government must:

- Using collaborative decision-making processes, define the specific qualities of 1) compact, multiuse development, 2) open space, 3) mobility, and 4) livability that are most desirable for the state, region, and community and adopt those definitions as goals and guidelines for future development.

- Incorporate smart-growth principles in the plans adopted to accommodate growth within regions, communities, and neighborhoods.

- Incorporate smart-growth principles in capital facilities planning and funding, paying particular attention to the adequacy of funding to meet needs, the location of planned infrastructure investments, and the siting and design of facilities in relation to surrounding development.

- Recognize and plan for social and economic needs in smart-growth initiatives and orient social and economic development initiatives to also promote smart growth.

- Adopt development policies, regulations, and approval processes that emphasize the importance of high-quality, fine-grained connectivity in the planning and design of neighborhoods, business centers, and development projects.

- Program investments in regional components of growth and development—multimodal transportation systems, green infrastructure systems, and so forth—through regional planning and agreements that are collaborative, intergovernmental, and multiparty, and that abide by smart-growth principles.

- Prioritize investments by state and regional agencies to support and encourage smart growth at the local level.

- Recognize the essential importance of natural and other open land for sustainable environments and for sustainable and livable communities.

- Innovate and experiment in promoting smart development, including demonstration projects, zoning and financial incentives, and public/private approaches.

- In all decisions regarding growth and development, seek to relate the physical, social, and economic aspects of community development and to broaden living, working, and travel choices.

Civic organizations and special-interest groups must:

- Constructively endorse programs, policies, and projects that promote smart growth, taking care to ensure that the endorsements are for programs, policies, or projects that truly represent the interrelationships of smart-growth principles.

- Collaborate with private sector developers and public officials to better define the specific qualities of 1) compact, multiuse development, 2) open space, 3) mobility, and 4) livability that should guide supportive actions in each region, community, and neighborhood.

- Become educated about development issues, development opportunities, and the development process in order to better inform decisions on opposing or endorsing specific policy proposals and proposed development projects.

- Recognize that growth and change occur in all communities and that growth should be accommodated in the smartest way possible.

- Conduct research to identify ways in which growth and change can take place with minimal undesirable effects on neighborhoods and communities and with maximum value-added for those same neighborhoods and communities.

- For specific areas of special concern, identify in advance of possible development the qualities
of growth and change that would be most compatible with existing land uses.

Making good on such commitments will require determination and effort. Proponents of smart growth can benefit from regional thinking and collaborative action to overcome NIMBYist fears and the inertia of business as usual. Naysayers insist that the smart-growth glass is half empty, that its principles are too ambitious to be feasible of achievement. Proponents of smart growth must work on the premise that the glass is half full and capable of becoming fuller.

Smart growth needs us to use existing tools better and to innovate and experiment with new ways of development. Urban development has adapted to changing circumstances since cities and towns came into being. Smart growth means moving again in the right direction, better attuning the built environment to the changing needs of the society and the economy.

Notes
10. See South Florida Regional Planning Council and Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, Building on Success: A Report from Eastward Ho! (Hollywood, Florida: report prepared for the Governor’s Commission for a Sustainable South Florida by the South Florida Regional Planning Council, December 1998).
22. Smart Scorecard for Development Projects is available on the Congress for the New Urbanism website at: www.cnu.org/cnu_reports/no_formula_Scorecard.pdf.