1. A Region in Balance: Building Livable Communities

1.1 INTRODUCTION

While communities can use many of the planning tools highlighted in the companion section to this manual, *Tools for Towns,* to effect partial change in growth patterns, the truth is that a community acting alone cannot fully achieve livable communities and desirable, balanced growth. This requires tools and policy changes with a broader reach than those available to municipalities alone. In the following pages the Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) presents ways to achieve this and bring balance throughout a region.

Our national research shows and experience from other metropolitan areas maintains that the absence of regional governance and stewardship combined with over-reliance on the property tax for funding municipal services often encourages sprawl[1].

Regional governance, regional stewardship, and "fiscal zoning" are the framework we use here to discuss balanced regions. In the following pages, we:

1. Show a few of the ways that fiscal zoning encourages sprawl;
2. Describe some regional governance and stewardship remedies employed elsewhere in the United States;
3. Report what we learned from others;
4. Provide near-term recommendations; and
5. Conclude with a long-term roadmap.

Let's start with our definitions of these framework terms.

[1] A list of resources and source material is attached.

FISCAL ZONING

Fiscal Zoning is a by-product of Connecticut's state-local tax system in which local governments are under a constant imperative to grow grand lists. It describes the use of zoning powers to make decisions that are driven on the basis of revenue need rather than community development goals, often regardless of the appropriateness of the development for a particular community.

> Municipalities across the country rely heavily on property taxes to raise revenue for services. Recent studies, however, show that CT's cities and towns are even more dependent on local property tax than other states. CT ranks 3rd among all states for property tax burden per capita ($1,577), nearly twice the U.S. average ($838). (U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Government Finances 1998 to 1999*. Issued Sept. 2001). Over 80% of towns and cities increased their property tax rates in 2001 (CT Conference of Municipalities).

The problems of fiscal zoning were articulated in a recent document of the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities: "Connecticut's state-local finance system doesn't work. It forces cities and towns to rely on high property taxes to fund local government services. It forces municipalities to aggressively pursue development in order to grow their grand lists. This in turn causes destructive 'sprawl', development that devours open space and agricultural lands, causes stultifying traffic congestion, and requires unnecessary public expenditures for new infrastructure – roads, sewers, and schools."

REGIONAL STEWARDSHIP

Regional Stewardship is the process that occurs when people committed to the long-term well being of places come together. To paraphrase The Alliance for Regional Stewardship, a national organization, "Stewardship means the careful and responsible management of something entrusted in our care. Regional stewards are leaders who cross boundaries of jurisdiction and interest to address complex regional issues such as sprawl, equity, education, and economic development. They see the connection between economic, environmental, and social concerns. Today's communities face challenges in workforce, transportation, housing, open space, and social inclusion that cannot adequately be addressed by traditional political boundaries and jurisdictions. Economic development, for example, extends beyond cities to regional economic clusters, environmental issues exist within bioregions, and social issues cut across neighborhoods. Regions are where the action is and must be today."

REGIONAL GOVERNANCE

Regional Governance is not regional govern<u>ment</u>. Again from the Alliance for Regional Stewardship: "A distinction exists between regional government, governance, and stewardship. *Government* is the formal structure that makes policy decisions and allocates public resources. *Governance* is the informal process of business, government, and community collaboration that shapes decisions and actions in a region. *Stewardship* is the commitment of regional leaders to the region." The informal process of governance can have a significant impact on the actions that determine the physical and socioeconomic status of a metropolitan area.

1.2 THE FISCAL ZONING TRAP

An increasing number of communities and residents are starting to recognize the "growth" dilemma. Around the country, many entities have documented both direct and indirect costs of sprawl. These costs are numerous, ranging from inefficient use of existing public infrastructure (roads, sewers, schools) to environmental degradation (air, soil, and water) to social inequity (concentration of poor households in very few municipalities).

Numerous studies have shown that different land uses generate different levels of net income per tax dollar collected. A 1995 study of the *Costs of Community Services in Southern New England* showed Connecticut's average ratios of municipal expenses to revenues to be:

Open Space	$ 0.44:1.00
Residential	$ 1.14:1.00
Comm./Industrial	$ 0.30:1.00

The ratios above are a simplification of complex relationships. They should be used to enlighten but not as the guide on development/conservation decisions.

It is not that growth is bad, since it can provide jobs, increase property value, improve quality of life, and more. Yet because it is a complex equation, this is exactly why community goals and vision should drive development decisions rather than revenue needs.

Connecticut has not undertaken a statewide analysis of sprawl—either the costs or the changes to our landscape. In the Capitol Region, we estimate that from 1990 to 2000, even with nearly static population growth, almost 6,000 acres of undeveloped land converted to housing subdivisions. This is equivalent to an area half the size of the town of Andover. At this time, because Connecticut has not had a standardized system to track land use changes in a meaningful way over the short or long term, we do not have an estimate of undeveloped land consumed by non-residential development. Neither do we know what previously developed land now lies vacant. We do know that statewide, from 1982 to 1997, nearly 15 percent of Connecticut's active agricultural land was lost.

FISCAL ZONING OUTCOMES

There are several ways that the heavy reliance on local property taxes for stocking the community chest leads to local and regional land use decisions driven more by revenue needs than by conservation and development goals. For example:

- Because residential development looks to be a net revenue loser, costing more to provide municipal services, especially education, than it brings in, residential development is becoming more and more controversial. This has a couple of by-products. One, it tends to foster a pull-up-the-drawbridge attitude that may restrict access for new residents. Two, it curtails housing choice for all by limiting the full range of "housing opportunity" essential to meet households' needs, particular higher-density housing.

> Housing Opportunity means:
>
> 1. Housing affordable to households ranging from the low-income to the well off; and
>
> 2. A full range of type and style of housing. A full range includes single-family, accessory apartments, duplex and larger multi-family (both owner and rental), active adult and assisted living, and group homes. This selection recognizes housing as a basic necessity and provides for all from our young adult to senior years.

- Commercial and industrial developments are perceived to bring more revenue than they cost, becoming economically desirable regardless of their unquantifiable costs: traffic congestion, loss of open space or habitat, and community character.
- Mixed-use developments that include residential and commercial/office use are discouraged largely because of the practice of separating uses — appropriate or not — but also in part because of an unwillingness to water down tax income from commercial development with residential growth. This practice not only exacerbates the need for automobile transport, it also limits housing choices. A significant segment of the population wants places where they can walk from home to stores, work, and school but few new developments are situated and designed so that walking is possible.
- Competition for new developments generating local tax revenues pits communities against each other, consuming staff and financial resources (grants and tax abatements), and discouraging innovation.
- Development often has impacts beyond one municipality's border but these impacts are seldom factored into local decisions.
- The local drive for property taxes precludes thinking about where development is appropriate from a regional infrastructure perspective.

ALTERNATIVE MUNICIPAL BUDGET SOURCES

Municipal budgets are funded in a variety of ways around the country. However, New England states standout for the near-exclusive reliance on local property taxes. This system began in colonial days when property, including personal property, was a significant measure of wealth. Other ways to fund municipal budgets include drawing from different revenue sources and having more of local operations paid for by the state. Many entities and organizations suggest we need to reform the way Connecticut funds local budgets. Below are excerpts from a report titled *Property Tax Reform Options* (2001-R-0759) by the Connecticut Office of Legislative Research.

Property tax reform options:

- **Tax relief measures** ease the burden on individual taxpayers, such as elderly homeowners and manufacturers through exemptions, rebates, and credits against other taxes.

  Example. New York's $50,000 school tax exemption for low- and moderate-income homeowners and $30,000 for all other homeowners.

- **Funding shifts** substitute state funds to pay for education or other local government cost, thus reducing the level of government expenses the property tax must cover.

  Example. Michigan disconnected school funding from the local property tax and then gave voters the choice of replacing the revenue source with sales or income taxes.

- **Assessment reforms** address the way municipalities assess property taxes in an attempt to apportion the tax burden more fairly among types of property.

  Example. Minnesota has 70 classes of properties, including separate classes for various types of housing.

- **Growth restraints** limit the amount of property taxes municipalities can levy to restrain increases in property taxes.

  Example. Montana capped assessment growth at 2% per year for the next 50 years and allowed additional levies only if the voters approve them.

- **Revenue diversification** allows municipalities to levy other taxes in addition to property taxes, thus reducing the property tax burden. Connecticut does not allow towns to levy taxes other than the property tax.

  Example: Missouri allowed municipalities to levy a .5% sales tax for parks and storm water control.

1.3 REMEDIES FROM AROUND THE COUNTRY: WHO'S GROWING SMART?

Across the nation it is being proven that regions that cooperatively solve problems, manage land in a more environmentally equitable manner, and show unity ***ultimately attract real long-term growth in the form of expanding and new businesses***. Places where people want to live equate to places with a strong employee base and are therefore places that are good for business.

Smart Growth is a development pattern that includes:

- preservation of open space, working agricultural lands, and the environment in all its aspects (air, water, soil, habitat)
- reinvestment in and revitalization of central cities and inner suburbs
- more compact, mixed-use form in the developing suburbs
- social equity and balance, that is communities of people of differing incomes, races, and ethnicities.
- a wide range of housing opportunities throughout a region
- fuller utilization of existing infrastructure (transportation, utilities, schools)
- a more balanced transportation system that provides for all users, whether in vehicles or on foot
- better integration of land use, economic development, and transportation

STATE ACTIVITIES: A VARIETY OF ACTIONS

While the expression 'smart growth' is an evolving one that incorporates both old and new theories, a look across the nation shows that no matter what the name, the concept of redirecting growth to take advantage of existing under-utilized infrastructure while simultaneously saving farmland, open space, and undeveloped land has become a guiding principle. Over half of the nation's states have some 'smart growth' initiatives, and many more are on the table for discussion. Why? Part of the reason may be the growing realization that most planning and zoning laws are based on models created in the 1920s; yet, the economics, politics and environment of land use has fundamentally changed. **The 1920s zoning model no longer works. In the year 1999, over 1,000 land use reform bills were filed and about 200 passed, prompting the American Planning Association to issue a press release declaring the old land use system to be officially broken, with "laws that no longer worked."**

> From the State of Maryland's website (www.mdp.state.md.us/smartgrowth):
>
> "Smart Growth has three straightforward goals:
>
> 1. to save our most valuable remaining natural resources before they are forever lost,
>
> 2. to support existing communities and neighborhoods by targeting state resources to support development in areas where the infrastructure is already in place or planned to support it, and
>
> 3. to save taxpayers millions of dollars in the unnecessary cost of building the infrastructure required to support sprawl."

State legislative leaders across the country are addressing growth issues. Governors of every political persuasion are creating executive level councils and empowering administrators to examine standard funding practices within state programs that unwittingly create sprawl-inducing development. What else are Governors and State Legislatures doing?

- Funding and demanding regional and local involvement and coordination on land use planning
- Coordinating all levels of **state planning** that affect growth patterns
- Supporting **brownfields redevelopment** in environmentally-tainted lands
- Creating **incentives for urban infill** development
- **Redirecting funds that subsidize sprawl**: highways, sewers, etc.
- Funding **open space** acquisition
- Linking and creating **support for the assets that contribute to state and local character**, such as history and natural resources
- **Targeting growth** to specific areas by regulatory or funding incentives
- Examining active models of **regional revenue sharing**

The initiatives span states as diverse as Florida and Montana, Oregon and Ohio, including five of the six New England states.

With some of the earliest and most publicized programs, the states of **Maryland** and **New Jersey** are generally the East Coast 'poster children' of smart growth. Their innovative programs confirm what many local government officials already know: sprawl is not simply a local issue. Their governors were convinced by strong arguments proving that not only quality of life, but also economic well being, are threatened by sprawl. They also recognized that the power of local governments to transform land use planning is limited. Since most of the major activities driving growth are regional and statewide, the same must be true of the solutions.

Success stories are still in the making. Although a few states created strong growth management programs over a decade ago, more are now adapting parts of these earlier successful models and adding new initiatives whose effects will be measured in years to come. Experience has shown us that real progress takes at least a decade. States that have taken action decided that they could not wait for tested results, since part of their future is disappearing with the land that vanishes under development each passing day. The names may differ but the mission is common:

- **Pennsylvania's** 2000 Growing Greener Laws and 2001 Growing Smarter Laws were proposed by the governor (after receiving the report of their 21st Century Environment Commission) and supported by the 10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania, who are becoming a model for land-use activism.
- **Massachusetts'** 'Planning for Growth' Executive Order dovetailed with a state-funded build-out analysis for every town, with $30,000 additional for each community to repair local zoning based on results. This gives the state of Massachusetts data in a standard format to evaluate carrying capacity and potential build-out statewide, a critical planning tool for the short and long term.
- **Maine's** governor initiated a program titled *Smart Growth: The Competitive Advantage* that proposed a ten-year plan to recognize the interrelationships of quality of life issues and start to address them.
- **Rhode Island's** Growth Council was created by executive order of the governor in his 2000 state of the state speech. Its mission is to work with cities, towns and the sometimes conflicting interests representing economic development and the environment, to guide and balance local land use issues. Transit improvements, open space acquisition, home ownership opportunities in cities and historic rehabilitation are priorities to begin to tackle issues identified from the 1999 *Cost of Sprawl* study.

> Connecticut stands alone as the New England state with the least regional or state planning oversight and assistance to communities, and with the least state government attention to the costs and consequences of sprawl.

- '**Illinois** Tomorrow' is a balanced growth initiative resulting from a gubernatorial campaign promise to usher a new era of smart growth -- investing money in distressed urban areas, creating a Linked Development program, and a Corridor Planning Grant Program, all led by a 'Balanced Growth Subcabinet.'
- Front-Porch **Florida** focuses on 20 prototype neighborhood revitalization plans and Florida Forever commits $3 billion towards water conservation, protection and supply through public lands.
- **Virginia's** 'Regional Competitiveness Act' passed in 1996-97 established financial incentives for counties, cities and towns to compete economically as a region with the cooperation of business, government, education and civic leaders. They proved that other metropolitan regions that could work together did far better economically than those that put up barriers.

METROPOLITAN ACTIVITIES: INTERMUNICIPAL REVENUE SHARING AND REGIONAL ASSET DISTRICTS

At the metropolitan level, two important tools are revenue sharing and asset districts.

Regional Revenue Sharing

Many states have supported intermunicipal revenue sharing agreements. Connecticut in 2000 passed a law enabling communities to create such agreements, but municipalities have yet to utilize this authority.

One of the longest running and most successful revenue sharing agreements is the **Minneapolis-St. Paul model**, which, although it has yet to be exactly replicated, embodies principles of tax equity mechanisms. Minnesota's Fiscal Disparities Act of 1971 recognized the implications of tax revenue 'chasing' on land use planning. That 1971 act created a regional revenue sharing mechanism where 40 percent of the tax base <u>increase</u> in commercial/industrial property assessments went to a metropolitan 'pool' for redistribution based on population and overall tax base. Success is evident -- when this act was implemented, the central cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul were net receivers of funds. Over time Minneapolis became a net contributor of funds. St. Paul is not far behind.

In 1998, the shared pool of revenue amounted to approximately $367 million, 20 percent of the regional tax base. The American Planning Association documents that the distributed pool of funds has decreased tax-base disparities on a regional level from 50:1 to 12:1 – significantly reducing the gap between wealthy and struggling communities. Small rural and suburban communities in this 187-town metro area have benefited most from the infusion of funds, allowing them to enact growth controls and resist sprawling commercial development that would otherwise have been sought to infuse capital into local tax bases.

In the 1990s, this concept of fiscal revenue sharing for commercial and industrial development was taken to a new level in the "Metropolitan Fair Tax Base Act." With a broad coalition of unlikely partners, the act called for sharing the tax generated by the value of homes above a certain level. After considerable dispute and negotiation, the final distribution formula was to share the *growth* in value of homes above $200,000.

Some points of the Twin Cities campaign are important for Connecticut to consider:

- 83% of the region would receive a tax cut under the bill and 17% an increase. The "bill represented a property tax cut and better services to 83 percent of the region's residents."
- Because the bill only targeted the *growth* in tax value of homes above $200,000, no community would lose current tax base.
- By targeting the growth, no one could portray this as a tax increase.
- Tackling only the growth was also said to stem "the increasing polarization of the region's tax base."
- They used easily obtained state data to counter accusations of "robbing" the wealthier suburbs where large homes were being built, documenting accurately how these same suburbs historically receive a disproportionately higher percentage of highway and sewer infrastructure spending.

This revenue sharing model was not employed in isolation – it worked in tandem with strengthened regional institutions with control over some land use factors, and the 1971 mechanism to share revenues from commercial and industrial properties as regional assets.

The American Planning Association documented another example of regional revenue sharing in **Ohio**. Ohio allows communities to develop 'joint economic development zones and districts,' with a variety of communities taking advantage of the program. The **City of Springfield and Green Township in Clark County** used this to create a system to extract revenue from the multi-jurisdictional land adjacent to an airport. That program is run by a district board with the power to assess income tax on profits in the airport district, turning the dollars back to benefit the district.

Montgomery County, Ohio, uses a fund to distribute county tax dollars to support development projects, by collecting a portion of increased property and income tax revenues, redistributing it among participants in the program. Since 1992, this voluntary revenue-sharing program with Dayton, Ohio, called the Economic Development Equity Fund (EDGE) has been operating to assist communities with their economic health. Funds can be used to support new business creation or expansion seen to benefit the larger area; they also support general economic development in the receiving municipalities.

Regional Asset Districts

Regional asset districts recognize the metropolitan value of certain large attractions that can only be located in a single community. Regional asset districts are designed to provide a 'significant and stable source of revenue' that support key regional civic, sporting or cultural facilities. Even more important, they create a revenue source dedicated to easing the extra costs of maintaining such a facility that is paid by local property tax in the host community, such as extra traffic management, parking, policing, and road and sidewalk maintenance. Often these regional assets are non-profit institutions that pay no property tax into the host town's coffers.

The concept is simple: use of these centers benefits the entire region, but often a particular public entity bears a disproportionate cost. In states that have adopted the concept of regional asset district, a portion of the sales tax collected in a region is dedicated to go to the regional asset district.

There are a number of models. **Denver** created the first regional asset district back in 1982 after a fiscal shortfall for civic facilities. The six counties in the Denver area approved a referendum that created a special district levying one-tenth of a one-percent sales tax to support civic facilities. By the close of 1996, the tax generated $14 million per year, with funds distributed by a formula agreed upon by institutions and local governments.

Denver's success spawned interest in **Allegheny County in southwestern Pennsylvania**; they created a tax-restructuring mechanism with the City of Pittsburgh and its county. The Allegheny Regional Asset District distributes 50 percent of the share of a countywide one percent local option sales tax among the 128 municipalities in the region for property tax relief, and uses the other 50 percent for regional assets. The regional assets that benefit range from libraries and parks that cross communities as well as major sports facilities and over two dozen cultural institutions, most but not all of which are in the city itself. In 1996, the distributions of the regional assets funds were as follows:

- Libraries received 32%;
- Parks received 29%;
- Three Rivers Stadium received 18%;
- Special facilities received 16%;
- Other cultural entities received 4%; and
- Administration received 1%, an amount limited by mandate.

The regional asset district concept is based on the recognition that the entire region benefits from major regional assets, but an individual city cannot afford to support such investments and infrastructure alone. The Pittsburgh model, by coupling the concept of tax sharing to help equalize property tax burdens in a municipality, carefully blends several solutions to municipal fiscal inequities.

Connecticut policymakers have actually seen two examples of similar cooperative ventures. In the early 1980s, Connecticut legislators allowed a portion of the sales taxes on hotel and restaurants to be used to form tourism districts. Also allowed by state law in the early 1980s was the creation of municipal special services districts as sub-districts within towns that levy property tax on top of the municipal mill rate to offer special services to the area owners. The concepts are not dissimilar to intermunicipal revenue sharing and regional asset districts.

Why did these and other state and metropolitan initiatives come to pass? In each of these states, public officials came to understand that maintaining a good quality of life for all required them to acknowledge *the importance of regional governance and regional stewardship —'the careful and responsible management of something entrusted in our care.'*

Citizens' coalitions engaged leaders and the general public to enable a better understanding of the problems of current patterns of growth and the imminent need to seek common ground towards better land use decision-making. They worked with state governments to restructure and support better planning, allocating technical assistance and money for local government guidance, **based on a blend of 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' initiatives for a long-term vision.** And they recognized the important benefits this approach offers in regard to metropolitan equity concerns.

CASE STUDY: MANUFACTURER-LED COALITION FOR REGIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

One interesting metropolitan remedy comes to us from California's Silicon Valley. Here a manufacturers' group representing some of the most esteemed high technology companies, led by Hewlett-Packard, created an unusual coalition of interests that actively transformed many land use planning and fiscal practices in their region.

The Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group united the resources of 27 CEOs and 200 member companies to take the lead in tackling concerns about recruiting and retaining employees amidst the growth-related deterioration of the quality of life. Taking a 'big picture' look at the top issues, including traffic, housing, education, environment and energy, the group used corporate leadership to make fundamental change. This included spearheading a successful voter campaign to increase the sales tax by half a cent to support transit improvements. This effort placed them in the forefront of making the case on transit, a major element of 'smart growth.'

Likewise, they convinced corporate executives of the importance of testifying for low/moderate-income housing, turning the 'NIMBY' model on its head. Citing the difficulties of finding affordable housing, the group first educated and then encouraged executives to testify on behalf of affordable housing developments, even working with architects to point out the value of linking transit and compact development to open space. The group prepared reports encouraging high density housing in parts of the county to balance dedicating other lands to open space, documenting how compact housing development can successfully house employees over the next two decades without destroying all the remaining land.

Going even further, the group is now working with the Santa Clara County Housing Trust to capitalize loan funds so those who keep communities working – daycare workers, firefighters, police officers, and teachers – can afford to buy homes. In each of its four campaigns for public change, the group succeeded in seeing regional projects through to referendum. They exemplify individual and corporate responsibility for stewardship.

This unique message for an industry group embraces 'the call for us to act regionally rather than community by community,' asserting that their members 'have the biggest stake' in the problems surfacing with the intense growth in the area. They accept controversy and understand that it is necessary to foster change in housing, transit, energy issues, and land use.

Essential to their success is the requirement that CEOs be on the board rather than staffers, promising 'minimal time and maximum impact.' Carl Guardino, the Silicon Valley Manufacturers' Group's CEO, asserts that their mission statement could serve as a model for organizations elsewhere. *"The SVMG is organized to involve principal officers and senior managers of member companies in a cooperative effort with local, regional, state and federal government officials to address major public policy issues affecting the economic health and quality of life in Silicon Valley."*

1.4 LEARNING FROM OTHERS: FIVE PRINCIPLES FOR REAL CHANGE

As part of the Capitol Region Council of Governments Best Practices research, results from scores of state and regional programs were scrutinized. From Cleveland to the Silicon Valley, from Minneapolis-St. Paul to Rhode Island, literature and state reports and case studies and conversations were used to define some of the elements common to all successful ventures. We distill the results below into five principles that appeared over and over in comparable metropolitan areas.

1. Successful cities make for successful regions and both benefit from regional cooperation among unlikely partners with a shared vision.

2. Regions that begin by advocating solutions without consensus building lose momentum and authority.

3. Involvement of state gubernatorial and legislative leaders is absolutely critical after or concurrent with the coalition building.

4. Regional stewardship allows parties to find common ground and share in growth.

5. Successes among the varied models showed step-by-step progress over many years.

1. Successful cities make for successful regions and both benefit from regional cooperation among unlikely partners with a shared vision.

The relationships among communities in the vast majority of our nation's metropolitan areas follow common patterns: an urban core, surrounded by inner ring suburbs, outer ring suburbs and rural fringes. Over time, as the area expands, the growth issues move outwards as well – a declining urban core eventually leads to a declining inner ring of suburbs. The metropolitan boundary stretches out to rural fringes as farmland disappears under housing tracts.

Therefore, the issues of urban decay, sprawl and growth are inter-related and demand regional attention. But, successful regions realize that sprawl is not just about political boundaries and geography. Social, economic, and environmental factors come into play.

Effects of sprawl are felt by the watershed group that advocates for open space, by the farmers that bring produce to a local market, by a church whose parishioners are more impoverished as jobs exit the urban core, by a company that cannot find the workers it needs in its exurban setting. Workable solutions must come from multidisciplinary groups that create a unique political agenda for change.

2. Regions that begin by advocating solutions without consensus building lose momentum and authority.

Beginning a process by stating a solution is fraught with danger. *Growing smart ultimately requires such profound changes in long-held assumptions about land rights and public financing and interrelationships that the coalition must be allowed the time to evolve its own solutions.* Although some steps towards solutions must be made along the way, it is a cumulative and incremental process.

3. Involvement of state gubernatorial and legislative leaders is absolutely critical after or concurrent with the coalition building.

Although the most successful examples across the nation are 'bottoms-up' coalition-driven planning processes that unite different and sometimes competing interests, the truth is that legislative change is ultimately required. Therefore, the earlier the governor and/or legislative leaders become intellectually and politically committed, the faster real progress towards a new way of doing land use and municipal finance will occur.

4. Regional stewardship allows parties to find common ground and share in growth.

Whether it comes from the political, business, or other parts of the community, the goal of stewardship is for metropolitan areas to see the systemic links, and to begin to think as regions, instead of as distinct groups with distinct economic and political and environmental/resource agendas. **The concept of regional stewardship underlies every example of metropolitan success in recent years**. Stewardship is a philosophy derived from the intersection of moral, political, and economic reality. Affordable housing, transportation links to jobs, and environmental degradation stop being looked at as 'someone else's problem.' The process must allow groups to understand their common interests. There is no getting around the fact that we're all in this together. Only then, as proven in areas as disparate as Colorado and Georgia, do local governments find long-term solutions to common problems and growth.

5. Successes among the varied models showed step-by-step progress over many years.

This is not a one-year, nor a three-year, nor even a ten-year process. Instead it is a fundamental change in how land use decisions are made, guiding communities and showing results over time. In each successful region, decisions were made to publicly articulate the problems of current patterns of growth and the need to seek common ground towards better land use decision-making. Next a series of changes were made, taking patience and even multiple political administrations to see this through. It demands long-term vision.

1.5 NEAR-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS

Using these strategic lessons from across the nation, Connecticut's communities may begin to tackle the issues of economic disparity and sprawl. By evaluating and following the examples described in earlier sections, proponents of sustainable communities and smarter growth may dovetail with current efforts underway on a variety of fronts.

> One: Continue to support and publicize existing coalition efforts.
>
> Two: Begin to address issues of metropolitan equity.
>
> Three: Encourage the Governor and Legislature to support new land use policies.
>
> Four: Continue to encourage municipal actions in support of smart growth.
>
> Five: Don't forget non-traditional incentives for change.

These recommendations address easily identified issues that can be managed over the next few years and the final section addresses the need for concurrent action towards the long-term restructuring of the laws and regional characteristics that promote sprawl and inequity. That section outlines a roadmap for change that draws from the experiences of metro areas throughout the nation.

ONE: CONTINUE TO SUPPORT AND PUBLICIZE EXISTING COALITION EFFORTS.

Already there are the beginnings of public engagement and coalition building around this issue. Continue to support the existing efforts and to publicize all efforts so that links can be fostered to engage more people. Groups already involved include:

- The Archdiocese of Hartford's Office of Urban Affairs (OUA) leads a major initiative, the **CenterEdge Project**. This coalition is seeking members from all walks of life within the state and is working with Yale University to examine solutions to growing economic inequity. They defined the region as the entire state of Connecticut, given its relatively small geographic size. They are working on a public education campaign to engage people from all sectors in this topic and its implications for the long-term prosperity of Connecticut and its people.
- The **Connecticut Regional Institute for the 21st Century** is a coalition of public, private and institutional leadership formed to develop a framework for understanding the economic activity and organization in the state. Their first analysis was the 1999 report *Connecticut Strategic Economic Framework* (often referred to as the Gallis report). The newly formed state Transportation Strategy Board (TSB) is one of their early successes. The Institute will commence in early 2002 to create a "Shape of Things to Come" report on growth trends in Connecticut. Their decision to focus on Smart Growth as their topic of 2002 illustrates the scope of the business community's concerns and perceptions about the future of Connecticut.
- The **Connecticut Conference of Municipalities** (CCM) is Connecticut's association of cities and towns with 147 of the 169 municipalities as members. Property tax reform and smart growth are two high-priority initiatives. CCM developed *10 Principles for Smart Growth in Connecticut*. CCM's web site states, "If Connecticut is to succeed economically it must grow smart. Such managed growth is particularly important as the State contemplates an ambitious transportation investment program. Development should occur first where the infrastructure to support it already exists. Open space, agricultural land, and other environmentally sensitive properties must be preserved. Key elements of such a smart growth approach are lessening municipal dependence on the property tax to fund local services, and reducing destructive intermunicipal competition for economic development and grand list growth. Intermunicipal and regional cooperation should be encouraged, supported, and rewarded." Three of CCM's top legislative agenda items are property tax reform, transportation and smart growth.
- The **Connecticut Chapter of the American Planning Association** has a working subcommittee for smart growth advocacy strategies. Their experiences working at the micro-level throughout the state can link 'real-world' issues within the state planning framework to the long term solutions advocated by the American Planning Association in their call for reform of state and local land use laws.

TWO: BEGIN TO ADDRESS ISSUES OF METROPOLITAN EQUITY.

In 2001, the General Assembly passed and the Governor signed into law An Act Concerning Municipal Fiscal Disparities. The law required that the Office of Policy and Management prepare a list of municipalities that meet four criteria of distress related to tax rates, property wealth per capita, household income and population decreases. When cities or towns meet all of these criteria, the State and municipalities in the affected planning region must recommend ways to address the fiscal capacity of the distressed community.

Since the City of Hartford (along with Bridgeport and Waterbury) met all four criteria of distress, the law required chief elected officials in the Capitol Region to submit recommendations to "address the problems of the municipality including intermunicipal collaboration and action…" These were submitted to the Governor and the General Assembly's Planning and Development Committee by the deadline of December 31, 2001.

Most important, the law also requires the State's Office of Policy and Management, together with the region's chief elected officials to prepare a strategy to "address the fiscal capacity of the municipality". This plan must be submitted to the Governor and the General Assembly's Planning and Development Committee by December 31, 2002. It must be revised annually until the municipality in question no longer meets the four qualifying standards for municipal fiscal disparities.

Based on a series of meetings of Capitol Region chief elected officials, preliminary recommendations to address Hartford's fiscal disparities were drafted and organized under broad goals. They support partnerships that address the fiscal disparities criteria, which ultimately underlie issues of growth and equity. A brief description of the goals follows.

- **Goal: Improve the capacity of local governments to provide cost effective, quality municipal services. Give priority to initiatives that focus on Hartford and promote assistance from and collaboration with other towns.**
- **Goal: Decrease reliance on the property tax for funding local public services, particularly public education.**
- **Goal: Provide that Connecticut's state-local fiscal system, its building codes and its investment policies all insure that every municipality has the resources to meet public service needs in their community without over burdening residential and business property tax payers.**
- **Goal: Increase educational options for all students and support improvement of schools in Hartford.**
- **Goal: Build livable communities by achieving better socioeconomic balance in Hartford and our towns.**

THREE: ENLIST THE GOVERNOR AND LEGISLATURE TO SUPPORT NEW LAND USE POLICIES.

There is a multitude of improvements that could be made in the short-term to address the weak state support for planning efforts. Support can be technical, financial, and coordinating. Most of the other New England states offer good models for state involvement. At a minimum, there is need to:

- Ensure better coordination among state, regional and local plans of conservation and development utilizing the American Planning Association's (or similar) principles of 'growing smart.'
- Begin to delineate areas where the state will support growth. These areas should reflect careful consideration of growth impacts and resources from both a local and a regional perspective. The state can use its infrastructure and other investments to spur development in desired areas.

Financial assistance and fiscal policies that support growing smart are being modeled by the American Planning Association and by other states across the nation – it would benefit Connecticut practitioners to use these to fully support the creation of a new focus on technical and financial support for planning in Connecticut. Certainly the Massachusetts model of community assistance with build-out analysis and funds to improve zoning bears consideration. The long-term savings to the state by identifying these critical planning issues more than balances the up-front costs.

A spring 2001 research project by students at the **Graduate School of Design** at Harvard University and overseen by the nationally noted professor and regional expert Robert Yaro resulted in a ***Connecticut Smart Growth Study***. The study lists four keys to successful smart growth:

- Increasing densities needed to support transit services along current and proposed transit routes
- Creating ways to balance controls on housing with housing affordability
- Developing programs to target growth to appropriate areas and preserve open space
- Implementing strategies to reduce reliance on property taxes that promote sprawl.

The models are out there; the work has been done in many states. Connecticut's municipalities just need to be given the tools.

FOUR: ENCOURAGE MUNICIPAL ACTIONS IN SUPPORT OF SMART GROWTH.

The collaboration on land use decision-making that has proven to work across the nation cannot succeed when communities or states work on land use in a vacuum. While seeking regional solutions to the financial and planning dilemmas that face the metropolitan area, it is crucial to support municipal efforts to curb inappropriate land use practices. After all, municipalities are the front-line of development.

The companion section in this toolkit, *Tools for Towns*, offers strategies to help municipalities reassess and revise their growth patterns and controls. There are many other resources cited in the resource appendix. It is imperative for Greater Hartford communities to work on these at the same time as the 'big picture' is examined for regional cooperation and change.

FIVE: DON'T FORGET NON-TRADITIONAL INCENTIVES FOR CHANGE.

There are a number of mechanisms that have been considered to ease the property tax and growth dilemmas, each recognizing that much of the existing municipal finance and land use structure no longer works. To that end, a short list of options tried across the nation is provided below. The list includes many public policies with the power to affect growth patterns while the 'big picture' of growing smart is considered.

- Fiscal incentives for people to live near their work
- Incentives for transit use
- Location-efficient mortgages (Home loans that factor a home's proximity to a transit line or within walking distance to work into the borrowers budget. With lower car costs, a household has more available income.)
- Developer impact fees that increase as the development moves towards and into greenfield sites
- Split-rate property tax where land has a different rate than buildings to reward dense building and discourage urban property owners from maintaining vacant land

1.6 A SUGGESTED ROADMAP FOR LONG-TERM CHANGE

Driven by the recognition of city-suburb inequities, a disquieting sense of erosion of community character and newspaper editorials and opinion pieces lamenting the tax-revenue-driven need to accept development at all cost, Connecticut business, academic, governmental, and citizen groups are discussing the sense that the region – and the state – is out of balance. The good news is that there are many efforts already underway that may help the Greater Hartford region to work as a unit towards building and maintaining livable communities. Groups are already forming in at least four distinct efforts to address the most elemental aspects of metropolitan sprawl.

Step One: Document the True Costs of Sprawl and Its Consequences

Step Two: Educate and Unite People on the Regional Fiscal Impacts of Sprawl

Step Three: Build Coalitions

Step Four: Engage Government At All Levels

Step Five: Define Solutions and Action Steps

The lessons from other regions are equally applicable to community leaders, businesses and citizens. By isolating the critical steps to success it is possible to see how a multi-faceted, multi-year effort can bear results. **This is a long-term process but comprises the heart of the recommendations for the future of the Greater Hartford region.** Evidence from metropolitan areas across the nation supports these principles.

The steps below set up a structure for change that has been proven to influence public and political opinion as to the importance of patterns of growth. Even though the outcomes differ from area to area, the ultimate benefit is to successfully enable regions to grow smart and equitably.

There is one overriding principle that governs the success of this path: leaders must be working on this from the top down at the same time that the citizenry is calling for change from the bottom up. It requires real leadership and broad consensus.

STEP ONE: DOCUMENT THE TRUE COSTS OF SPRAWL AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

Local and state leaders must have the data to comprehend how land use choices accumulate over time and alter the region's landscape, eroding community character along with the qualities that many think define our New England environment. Hence**,** Step One is to define and quantify the problem in terms that can be compared to the prospective costs of a solution. There are three general types of analyses, all of which offer some value for our region. The first is ***an economic breakdown of the actual cost of sprawl***, the second is a ***mapping*** project that visually illustrates the change, and the third is a ***build-out analysis*** that documents community-by-community how specific zoning allowances inadvertently contribute to sprawl.

Economic analysis of costs of sprawl: The first type of economic analysis is exemplified by the State of Rhode Island's 1999 *Cost of Sprawl* study. This study proved that the cost of continuing sprawling development was $1.5 billion over the next twenty years, an amount equal to the annual state budget. It documented that at the same time as the cities were declining, more land was consumed by development over a single decade than in the first 325 years of the state's existence. Farm acreage was halved over a 30-year period; 11,500 acres of farm and forestland were developed from 1988 to 1995.

While Rhode Island's cost calculation chose to document direct costs, which are more easily measured, to truly capture the costs of sprawl, a study should also include less-quantifiable costs, known as externalities. Examples include: air and water pollution, loss of rural character and agricultural traditions, social impacts of urban core poverty, time lost in traffic congestion, abandoned investments in older neighborhoods and loss of community fabric to anonymous development. These 'externalities' are associated costs not always quantified in traditional economic cost-benefit analysis. Ultimately, they affect a region's capacity to attract and retain business in the state due to deterioration in quality of life

Mapping: Since people often prefer visual analyses to dry fiscal analyses, many metropolitan areas have discovered that **'user-friendly' data maps foster a better mental and visual understanding of growth and change**. One example of how mapping can work is in Minneapolis-St. Paul. The Twin Cities senator and law professor Myron Orfield, who undertook a mapping analysis is his region, is already mapping Connecticut under the commission of the Catholic Archdiocese of Hartford. His maps document social and economic trends that we need to understand and address.

Build-out analysis: The third way to quantify what sprawl really can mean for a community or an area allows a peek into the future, using a build-out analysis. Before tackling the issue of growth management in a meaningful way, it is important to understand what growth is allowed by current zoning regulations that comprise most community land use laws. In its more comprehensive form, it translates those projections into the future impacts on traffic, pollution, housing values, school needs, etc. Although some Connecticut communities have completed a build-out analysis as part of their Plans of Conservation and Development, they have not been done in a cohesive manner and rarely to a uniform standard that would allow a regional or statewide analysis of results.

The Connecticut Regional Institute for the 21st Century is scheduled to complete a build-out analysis for the state of Connecticut, called the 'Shape of Things to Come.' Connecticut may learn from the usefulness of local build-out analyses, courtesy of our neighboring state of Massachusetts.

Massachusetts, working closely with local communities, has undertaken what could be the most comprehensive examination of the local effects of current zoning and state laws within New England. The results are that every Massachusetts town has an analysis *in an identical format* for comparison purposes. Funded by four cooperating state agencies under gubernatorial Executive Order 418, Massachusetts paid regional planning agencies and private contractors to generate a build-out map for every community. This GIS map showed the maximum development that could take place in a community based on local zoning and state laws. Accompanying the map was an analysis with population projections (from school age to elderly), commercial development, and water consumption. Once the communities had a chance to review the analysis within public meetings, the state allocated a grant of $30,000 per community to develop a Community Development Plan, "image-based" and consisting of "pictures, maps, diagrams and text."

By tackling the issue head-on and creating a data system allowing growth to be compared across regions and the state, Massachusetts is leading the way. A similar goal would serve Connecticut well.

STEP TWO: EDUCATE AND UNITE PEOPLE ON THE REGIONAL FISCAL IMPACTS OF SPRAWL

Figuring out who is affected by regional growth issues is easy. From the regional business groups to the faith community, from citizens on transit advocacy groups to the leaders of the governor's Transportation Strategy Board, from school PTO's to neighborhood groups, similar frustrations are surfacing. As stakeholders discuss and try to make changes, interests and concerns are intersecting and colliding. Already in our region, economic development and environmental advocates find themselves seated on the same side of the table discussing adverse effects of growth.

Once the data collecting is done and the real costs of our current growth patterns known, the list of people and organizations affected by regional economic health will become even clearer. Whatever the driver for action – political frustration, community conflict about housing or commercial development, infrastructure inefficiencies – partnerships for change can be motivated and directed. It is not a single group's issue – **evidence from other regions makes absolutely clear that <u>there can be no single champion for growing smart.</u>**

Using the data generated in Step One, Step Two is to begin a cooperative effort that adheres to the concept of regional stewardship. Stewardship – the recognition that the more people take responsibility for a region's long-term livability, the more we all benefit – will be the principle that underpins the process. As has been proven across the nation, once people identify the commonality of concern, unified action, even of groups with once-competing interests, can create effective partnerships.

Governance – a shared process that integrates diverse interests – becomes the organizing mechanism for stewardship. Although one entity may spearhead change, the convergence of common interests and common concerns sows the seeds for the next step.

STEP THREE: BUILD COALITIONS

Coalitions around issues of growth exist in every part of the United States and according to the American Planning Association they are increasing exponentially with each passing year.

What's so important about that? It's that the coalitions unite groups that have never before found common ground on issues of this nature. There is a national recognition that growth issues mandate a consensus for regional governance to stop sprawl and ameliorate its consequences. Coalitions are what make it happen. What do we mean by coalition building? One of the more powerful models from a city very similar to Hartford illustrates the point.

EcoCity Cleveland: A unique consortium for land use planning and regional equity called EcoCity Cleveland has attracted the attention and support of the American Planning Association for its potential for success. Advocating the concept of ecovillages, the group has spearheaded a Smart Growth Agenda for all of Ohio.

In a city that has seen hard times but that is now known as the 'Comeback City,' a union of the faith community, mature suburbs, and a diverse group of organizations in-between and on the fringes have united to redesign the land use methodology that leads to sprawl. Chief elected officials of older suburbs in the metropolitan areas of Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton and Toledo created an organization called Ohio's Mature Suburbs – their members were instrumental to advocating that EcoCity Cleveland lead the charge for a Smart Growth Agenda for Ohio.

This powerful consortium saw an unusual alliance. Cleveland inner ring suburbs authorized their elected officials to unite with others in similar communities to fight the state's use of transportation, sewer and school funds that supported exurban sprawl. They were aided by Cleveland's most powerful religious leader, Bishop Anthony Pilla, who led the faith community's educational process and unity of concern about the 'moral implications of sprawl.' Bishop Pilla's work in Cleveland not only gave the coalition the advent of a new strategy employing the suburban faith community's moral impetus, but he parlayed his message to fellow bishops across the nation.

Lessons for Greater Hartford's Future: So how can this happen in Hartford?

- Let participants come together to define the problem. One way to do this may be through a recent proposal of the Gathering Place and the Capitol Region Council of Governments. Together these entities propose to work towards the creation of a Regional Citizens Network that will enable discussion and a means for citizens to help shape the future of our region.
- Next, the coalition looks across the nation at various situations and solutions.

- Then the coalition shapes the organizing body and chooses its own set of tasks, all oriented towards the goals.
- The coalition then accepts advice from some of the more savvy groups across the nation, for instance, 'once a coalition is underway, it must choose achievable first steps and look for quick victories.' This advice comes from the architect of the Twin Cities 1990s regional reorganization, Myron Orfield. There are many, many groups that have publicly documented their winning strategies.
- Finally, the coalition must create key milestones along the path towards solutions and keep moving.

STEP FOUR: ENGAGE GOVERNMENT AT ALL LEVELS

A major task for a coalition working on sprawl will be to assess the role that Connecticut's state legislature, governor and administrative offices can play. Educating, supporting, and enforcing sustainable development requires a sustained effort at all levels.

While not advocating a 'top-down' approach, researchers find that gubernatorial leadership, ideally in concert with strong legislative leadership, has been critical in those states that achieve a comprehensive program for growth issues. At some point, the state has to be the catalyst for action. Without such central attention the political strength to make some of the big decisions is absent.

It is a fine balance. Top-down mandates for regional governance generally fail. People must be empowered to identify their own goals for the places where they live. *Since this movement will outlast most political terms of office, across the nation it has been shown that those already dedicated to sustainability and equality must give a long-term commitment.* This is not easy for public officials who must run for election every few years.

Unlike other New England states, Connecticut State government has not taken an interest in supporting local planning with technical or financial assistance. Therefore, as both a near-term and long-term policy, coalitions such as the Connecticut Regional Institute for the 21st Century and others could encourage more state involvement by:

- Assessing the state's current role in planning and development including using the State Plan of Conservation and Development update to bring the importance of land use planning to public attention and opinion leaders;
- Recommending ways in which the state can partner with communities to get technical assistance directly or through regional planning;
- Adopting an incentive-based program to coordinate the relationship between local, regional, and state land use planning;
- Establishing a digital data base mapping system on which to analyze these current and future land use decisions; and
- Performing a build-out analysis of what Connecticut would look like in 25, 35, 50 years if the land use planning system is left unchanged and in the same time periods if smart growth principles are used.

Other states have demonstrated that state leaders must be partners in the process. They hold the purse strings; they can use state funding and laws to encourage different planning strategies. **Government must be engaged at all levels**.

STEP FIVE: DEFINE SOLUTIONS AND ACTION STEPS

There is a wealth of information from communities and regions across the nation. Although Connecticut is somewhat behind compared to most of its counterparts in the Northeast, as issues of growth become more visible and more acute, it will benefit from the lessons learned from its counterparts. **Still,**

solutions are long-term, and with each year, time is being lost along with community character and prosperity.

The solutions will not work unless communities recognize that regional thinking is necessary to address regional challenges.

The attached reference section identifies a host of resources to inform cities and towns and entrepreneurial stewards of the ways in which to build and maintain livable communities and future prosperity.

1.7 CONCLUSION

Across the nation communities are proving that the creation of livable cities with healthy commuting and living patterns demands a unique level of inter-municipal cooperation. More and more are casting aside traditional boundaries and embracing regional solutions. As they do so, many are gaining a new sense of excitement. Why do some cities seem so interesting and livable? Evidence is growing that success comes from collaboration and seeking common ground. This can lead to:

- a more active citizenry in decision-making;
- unique coalitions that bridge institutional and political barriers and challenge traditional thinking;
- fiscal ground rules that support cooperative undertakings, with some element of revenue sharing;
- different adaptations of elements of existing growth strategies (for instance, denying funds for new sewer and highway structures, redirecting funds to dense areas); and
- emphasis on governance, rather than government as the key

In the last few years, the other five New England states have made real strides towards governmental recognition of the problems of current patterns of growth. It's not about taking away local power. It's about building collaborations and connections with local power.

As so articulately stated by the Alliance for Regional Stewardship in their October 2000 Monograph 1, entitled *Regional Stewardship: A Commitment to Place,*

"In a seeming paradox, place has become even more important in the New Economy. Although we have become a global economy and the Internet has collapsed space and time, we have also discovered that most innovation still happens face-to-face in real places. Place matters because people matter in the New Economy. Skills and knowledge are the keys to economic progress. Skilled and knowledgeable people tend to locate in communities that have a good quality of life and great social, cultural, and natural assets.

Regional stewardship is about residents, businesses, government, educational institutions, and community organizations acting as a 'network of responsibility.' The basic values underlying regional stewardship are evident. We want to create:

- broad prosperity;
- a healthy, attractive environment;
- and inclusive communities for ourselves and the next generation.

The essence of regional stewardship is taking responsibility to ensure that we pass on a better place to our children."

1.8 RESOURCE GUIDE FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

SOURCES ON REGIONAL LAND USE PLANNING AND SMART GROWTH

The ***American Planning Association*** has numerous resources on line and in print. Access information at their web site, **www.planning.org.** Of particular note are the following resources, available in PDF version on line or in print:

- Growing Smart[SM] Legislative Guidebook: Model Statutes for Planning and the Management of Change, 2002 edition.
- Planning for Smart Growth: 2002 State of the States: A Survey of State Planning Reforms and Smart Growth Measures in Order to Manage Growth and Development, February 2002.

Both ***The Brookings Institution*** in Washington, D.C. and the ***Lincoln Institute of Land Policy*** in Cambridge, MA have been examining regional land use practices and revenue issues for many years, using practitioners and academics. Both groups' web sites contain numerous papers and links to best practices. The Brookings Institution's Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy web site is **www.brookings.edu.urban** and their address is The Brookings Institution, 1775 Massachusetts Avenue NE, Washington DC 20036 [telephone 202-797-6139]. The Lincoln Institute of Land Policy web site is **www.lincolninst.edu** and their address is 113 Brattle Street, Cambridge, MA 02138 [telephone 617-661-3016].

The ***Connecticut Chapter of the American Planning Association*** has also created a web site with links to smart growth materials. Their site can be accessed at **www.ccapa.org --** users should then go to the smart growth link.

The ***National Governors' Association*** web site at **www.nga.org** allows users to link to scores of documents on smart growth measures throughout the country. The user should go to the home page and do a search using the 'find' box on smart growth (being sure not to place quotation marks around the words smart growth.)

The ***National League of Cities*** has also established an information-rich web site at **www.nlc.org.** Their address is National League of Cities, 1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20002. One recent document with information on the importance of local decision-making is:

- *Building Quality Communities: Making Local Land Use Decisions by Choice and Not by Chance*, 2001 Futures Report by the National League of Cities
- The ***Urban Land Institute*** has also placed a number of documents from their studies on regional issues onto their web site. ULI membership is required for access to some of the documents, but others are available for public perusal. ULI's address is 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW, Suite 500 West, Washington DC 20007-5201. The site is **www.uli.org.**

SOURCES ON REGIONALISM AND METROPOLITAN INITIATIVES

The ***Alliance for Regional Stewardship***, *Regional Stewardship: A Commitment to Place*, Monograph Series 1, October 2000 by Alliance for Regional Stewardship, 350 Cambridge Avenue, Suite 200, Palo Alto, CA 94306 [telephone 650-614-0230]. For more information on this movement towards an ethics-based link of business, government and community, see their web site at **www.regionalstewardship.org.**

This 1997 book published jointly by The Brookings Institution and the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy has been a watershed in public understanding of the relationship between fiscal zoning, municipal revenues, and sprawl across the nation. Authored by Myron Orfield, the book is ***Metropolitics: A Regional Agenda for Community and Stability*** [Brookings Institution Press and The Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 1997].

- Orfield's work has fostered a new academic debate, and the best early analysis of how the academic community has responded to his theories and conclusions can be found in: Rosalind Greenstein and Wim Wiewel, Editors. *Urban-Suburban Interdependencies*

(Cambridge, MA, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 2000).

- For more information on Orfield's newer work and his new book entitled *American Metropolitics*, see **www.metroresearch.org,** the web site for his consulting firm the Metropolitan Area Research Corporation.

In the Urban Land Institute's seminal work on smart growth, an article by ***Linda E. Hollis*** entitled "Smart Growth and Regional Cooperation," in *ULI on the Future: Smart Growth: Economy, Community, Environment*. [Washington, D.C., Urban Land Institute, 1998] sets the tone for the regional imperative for metropolitan futures. It is available on the web at **www.uli.org.**

Bruce Katz, Director of The Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy is known for his expert work on the regional movement across urban America, and has spoken in Connecticut on several occasions. Some citations for work by him can be seen at the Brookings Institution web site and at:

- "Brookings National Issues Forum on Metropolitan Solutions to Urban and Regional Problems," May 28, 1997, full text at **www.smartgrowth.org/library**.
- For an extremely well written and accessible description of this movement, perfect for public dissemination, see the December 1999 issue of *Atlantic Monthly* with an article by Bruce Katz and Jennifer Bradley, "Divided We Sprawl," available on the web at **www.theatlantic.com/ issues/99dec/9912katz.htm**

The ***Center for Neighborhood Technology in Chicago*** has been at the center of a body of research examining real world examples of practices underlying metropolitan cooperation. Their address is 2125 West North Avenue, Chicago, IL [telephone 773-278-4800]. A 1997 draft paper by Julia Parzen entitled "The Metropolitan Initiative: Innovations in Metropolitan Cooperation," (Chicago, The Center for Neighborhood Technology, 1997) offers a valuable insight into the diversity of initiatives being undertaken in this field – her paper feeds into further work that was presented to practitioners in the field. To get a copy of this and related work by her and others, go to the web site at **www.cnt.org** and scroll to Innovations in Metropolitan Cooperation**.**

Architect and urban planner, and advocate/founder of the New Urbanism, ***Peter Calthorpe*** has written a book entitled *The Regional City: Planning for the End of Sprawl*, co-authored with William Fulton, that tackles regional issues from the perspective of design. The 2001 book is published by Island Press [800-828-1302 or **www.islandpress.org**]

The Winter 2002 edition of the ***Connecticut Law Review***, [volume 34 number 2 published by the University of Connecticut School of Law, 65 Elizabeth Street, Hartford CT 06105] contains the papers presented at the 2001 Gallivan Conference on Sprawl, many of which introduce and document concepts highlighted in this manual.

SOURCES ON CONNECTICUT'S LAND USE, FISCAL ZONING, & TAXATION

A study of Connecticut by the planning department of the ***Graduate School of Design at Harvard University*** examined the issues facing smart growth and advocated regional solutions. The report, edited by Robert D. Yaro, with assistant editor Julio Poblete, is entitled "Promoting Smart Growth in CT," Graduate School of Design, Harvard University, July 2001. The report is available from the Capitol Regional Council of Goverments at 860-522-2217.

During the work undertaken as part of the Millennium Project, several studies were completed that dealt with regional issues and concepts related both to financing and to underlying issues of growth controls. Reports are available from ***the MetroHartford***

Economic Growth Council at 860-525-4451. See:

- Fred Carstensen, Murat Arik and Stan McMillen. “A Tale of Eight Metro Areas: Comparative Policy Analysis of MetroHartford and Similar MSAs,” Connecticut Center for Economic Analysis, November 3, 1999.
- Mt. Auburn Associates, *MetroHartford Millennium Project: An Economic Development Action Agenda*, January 19, 1998 for the Connecticut Capitol Region Growth Council, Inc. Appendix E contains preliminary maps of growth and suggestions for the first outline of a growth boundary to channel development to appropriate locations.

An explicit analysis of the problems facing the MetroHartford area was presented by Brookings Institution urban expert, ***Anthony Downs, Ph.D***. The full text of his speech, “A Future Growth Strategy for the Hartford Region,” on June 6, 2001 is available on **www.anthonydowns.com**.

The ***Connecticut Conference on Municipalities*** has been actively collecting information and pursuing policy changes related to fiscal zoning and sprawl, with emphasis on the problems inherent in taxation. For more information:

- See the CCM web site at **www.ccm-ct.org** for a excellent publications’ list with detailed reports and other links to taxation and land use planning issues.
- The report on a CCM cosponsored conference held in New Haven in 1996 illustrates the complexity and longevity of this issue. See Joan Youngman. “Local Property Tax Reform: Prospects and Politics.” *Land Lines [of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy]*, July 1996, Volume 8, no. 4.

The Capitol Region Council of Governments has a host of materials detailing issues in Connecticut. Go to the publications page on the CRCOG web site at **www.crcog.org**.

SOURCES ON NEW ENGLAND STATES AND SMART GROWTH

The best access point for information on all six New England states initiatives is the site at **www.sprawlwatch.org.** By scrolling to their category “In the States”, users can link to specific legislation, groups and initiatives in any of the states. This site also links to specific state reports by the American Planning Association.

Sites of specific interest on items mentioned in this manual for New England states are listed here.

- Rhode Island’s cost of sprawl study, *The Costs of Suburban Sprawl and Urban Decay in Rhode Island*, prepared for Grow Smart Rhode Island by H. Planning Consultants, Inc. and Planimetrics. LLP, December 1999 can be downloaded in Adobe Acrobat format on the web site, **www.growsmartri.com.** GrowSmart Rhode Island, comprised of CEOs and presidents of corporate, university, financial sector, media, environmental groups, and a host of divergent groups work from their base in Providence [telephone 401-273-5711] to create the impetus for enough land use planning that the American Planning Association called them ‘the little state with a big planning program.’
- Although Vermont’s innovative land use laws date to the 1970s, they were inadequate to address fully problems with sprawl. The Vermont Forum on Sprawl at 110 Main Street, Burlington, VT 05401, [telephone 802-864-6310] has commissioned a variety of studies and offers links to a host of sites at **www.vtsprawl.org**.
- For information on the Massachusetts buildout analysis undertaken for all the

communities in the state, see **www.state.ma.us/mgis/mgpres2.htm.**

- Massachusetts has a number of initiatives in regionalism underway, but one very interesting example is the Mayflower Compact II – a group of southeastern communities that voluntarily chose to work together once they analyzed the results of the buildout analysis. For more information, see **www.srpeed.org/compact.htm** or call SRPEED at 508-824-1367.

SOURCES ON SMART GROWTH IN OTHER STATES

This web site by the Sprawl Watch clearinghouse allows complete access to information on all state initiatives: **www.sprawlwatch.org.** By scrolling to their category "In the States", users can link to specific legislation, groups and initiatives in any of the states. This site also links to the American Planning Association report, *Planning for Smart Growth: 2002 State of the States: A Survey of State Planning Reforms and Smart Growth Measures in Order to Manage Growth and Development*, February 2002. Another important summary report found on this site is Barbara Wells report on *Governors' Smart Growth Initiatives*, for the Northeast-Midwest Institute, July 2001.

Since Maryland and New Jersey are usually considered to be some of the more advanced smart growth states in practice, their web sites deserve mention.

- Maryland: **www.op.state.md.us/smartgrowth**
- New Jersey: **www.state.nj.us/osp**

Envision Utah is a public/private partnership formed in 1997 to guide the development of a broadly and publicly supported Quality Growth Strategy. The partnership has developed a Toolbox, "Urban Planning Tools for Quality Growth" aimed at the needs of municipalities. Using examples of local and national development codes, design standards, and innovative planning strategies, the Toolbox is designed to assist communities as they plan for the future through various types and stages of development. Topics include: protecting sensitive lands, meeting housing needs of residents, creating pedestrian-friendly residential and commercial development, re-using our underutilized lands, increasing public safety through street design, conserving water resources, using energy wisely and enhancing urban forests in our communities. Go to: **www.envisionutah.org**

Information on Ohio's regional initiatives can be found in a number of locations.

- Stuart Meck, AICP with Jason Wittenberg, "A Smart Growth Agenda for Ohio: Working Paper," is available through the American Planning Association site at **www.planning.org** and through its sponsor's web site, the site for EcoCity Cleveland, at **www.ecocleveland.org.**
- Information on the Montgomery County initiatives can be found in the report by Julia Parzen for the ***Center for Neighborhood Technology in Chicago*** entitled "The Metropolitan Initiative: Innovations in Metropolitan Cooperation," (Chicago, The Center for Neighborhood Technology, 1997) found at the web site at **www.cnt.org** as noted above**.** Further information can be found in the American Planning Association's *Growing Smart*^{SM} *Legislative Guidebook: Model Statutes for Planning and the Management of Change, 2002 edition*.

REFERENCES TO NOTED EXAMPLES ON COALITION BUILDING

There is a growing movement of coalition building in the nation with newcomers modeling themselves on the 1,000 Friends of Oregon [**www.1000friendsoforegon.org**.], the premier land-use group working statewide for reforms. Pennsylvania, recognizing the need for long-term advocates for the land, developed the 10,000 Friends of Pennsylvania [**www.10000friends.org**] that have created impetus for some landmark legislation; Maryland's organization has assisted in that state's successes – information is available for viewing on the web at **www.friendsofmd.org**. Minnesota has a web site that is working to link groups across the nation under an umbrella 1000 Friends organization.

Cleveland's initiatives in smart growth are well documented within the web site for the EcoCity Cleveland group, as well as on the American Planning Association site. Their battle is not concluded, despite a growing sense of the need for smart growth – information on their work can be found on the EcoCity web site at **www.ecocleveland.org** as well as through the organization at 2842 Scarborough Road, Cleveland Heights, OH 44118 [telephone 216-932-3007].

Connecticut's new initiative at coalition building, known as the CenterEdge project, can be contacted through **www.oua-adh.org**. Information will also be available eventually on consultant Myron Orfield's web site at **www.metroresearch.org,** the web site for his firm. The project is being coordinated by the Archdiocese and Bishop Peter A. Rosazza through their Urban Affairs Office at 82 Saltonstall Avenue, New Haven, CT 06513, telephone 203-777-7279.

Information on how the Silicon Valley Manufacturers Group harnessed members for regional initiatives on nontraditional issues such as transit, housing, and open space can be found at **www.svmg.org,** as well as in the paper by Carl Guardino published in the Winter 2002 edition of the ***Connecticut Law Review***, [volume 34 number 2 published by the University of Connecticut School of Law, 65 Elizabeth Street, Hartford CT 06105.]