WHO WINS? WHO LOSES?
SOCIAL EQUITY IN PLANNING

A Series of Articles by the California Planning Roundtable

Contents

PREFACE

Social equity is a contentious and vital issue for planners and our society as a whole. What is it? Why is it important? How does it affect us? Why should we care?

These are among the questions addressed in the following series of articles written by Members of the *California Planning Roundtable*. Each article presents a different perspective in the search for understanding, and implementing the concept of social equity in California planning.

The *California Planning Roundtable* is an organization of experienced planning professionals who are members of the American Planning Association. Membership is balanced between the public and private sectors, and between Northern and Southern California. The Mission of the Roundtable is to promote creativity and excellence in planning by providing leadership in addressing important planning issues in California.

The Roundtable first entered the social equity debate in the summer of 1992, when it participated in sponsoring *A Planners Forum: Social Equity and Economic Development in Planning*. The forum was a two-day workshop held in the wake of civil disturbances in the Los Angeles area following the announcement of the verdict in the Rodney King case. Since then, members of the Roundtable have grappled with understanding social equity and how our profession can promote greater equity in the public and private decisions that shape the planning process.

INTRODUCTION: SOCIAL EQUITY IN PLANNING

By Edward Blakely, Melanie Fallon, and Stanley Hoffman, AICP

Social equity is a contentious and vital issue for planners and our society as a whole. What is it? Why is it important? How does it affect us? Why should we care? As the first in a series of articles written by members of the California Planning Roundtable, we will explore these questions and begin to suggest answers to them.

Why is Social Equity Important?

As planners we must address issues that will effect the betterment of our communities. Currently most of our attention is given to physical development and land use. To ensure equitable results and influence the allocation of resources, comprehensive planning must take on a new approach. Rather than separating the analyses of economic, environmental and fiscal impacts, all planning activities should consider their social implications so that all parts reinforce the planning goals.

We believe that the achievement of social equity in planning leads to the expansion of opportunities and the creation of more choices not only for those in need, but for the broader community as well. As we approach the 21st Century, there are probably very few of us that are not touched by the effects of the widening gulf between the enfranchised and disenfranchised segments of society.

California is Changing

California is changing. From 1980 to 1990, California grew by 26 percent, or about 6.2 million persons, reaching 29.9 million by 1990. About 54 percent of this growth was due to immigration, much of it from foreign countries. From 1990 to 2000 our population is projected to increase by almost 22 percent, which represents about 6.5 million persons (see Figure 1). By 2010, California population is projected to reach 42.4 million, or about 6.0 million more. By 2040 California is projected to more than double, growing to over 63.0 million persons.

California is also becoming a place where no racial or ethnic group will have a majority. The characteristics of the population are changing rapidly and becoming more racially and ethnically diverse. Most of the increased population will be among Hispanics or Asian-Pacific Islander groups. The black and white populations will both continue to increase, but will comprise smaller percentages of the total state population.

The white population, which comprises 57 percent of the total in 1990, is projected to drop to about 46 percent by 2000 and about 33 percent by 2040. In contrast, the Hispanics are projected to increase from about 26 percent in 1990 to 36 percent by 2000 and about 50 percent by 2040.

Income, education and age characteristics are also changing dramatically. As presented in Table 1, real per capita income in California grew from $21,185 to $22,768 from 1980 to 1990. This is an average annual rate of only 0.72 percent, while inflation grew at a 5.1 percent average rate over the same period. From 1990 to 1993, the UCLA Business Forecast shows that real per capita income has declined to about $20,476, less than 1980 in real dollars.

While these income trends are for the total population, clearly the unemployment differences suggest that the various racial and ethnic groups are differentially impacted. According to the California Research Bureau, in 1990, the unemployment rate in California for the white population was about 7 percent compared to 11 percent for Hispanics and 12 percent for the black population.

Along with the income changes, the educational attainment levels of the labor force are also changing significantly. According to the UCLA Business Forecast, the labor force is projected to increase by about 45 percent over the next 20 years while the increase in the workers who have not completed high school is projected to be over 50 percent. This is coming at a time when school enrollments are surging.

And finally, the age structure is shifting dramatically. It is projected that by 2003, when the leading edge of the baby boom population will reach 55, we will have almost 75 percent more people turning 55 than we do today.

Responding to Change

These changes in the state's demography have enormous implications for planning and public policy. Yet, in spite of these changes, there is no clear understanding of these changed dimensions. Public policy, even planning policy, is organized on the past plurality and the past notions of the public good. The template for planning assumes that middle class white values are the core of what is and what will be in the best interest of all Californians. Thus, we are marching forward using the past as a guide.

We need to understand the differing perspectives that form the bias for planning and policy making in the new California. There are real perceptual and contextual differences in our cultural plurality. These differences are deep and

not easily communicated. We as a profession must be better prepared to respond to this situation.

What is Social Equity?

While Webster's dictionary provides selected definitions of equity as "the quality of being fair or impartial; fairness, impartiality," and social "of pertaining to the life, welfare and relations of human beings," these words are not linked together in a unified concept suitable for guiding planning. This leaves the planning profession to create its own working definition to respond to the evolving conditions which we now face.

In looking to our own profession, one of the best working definitions, that also strongly influenced planning policy in Cleveland through the 1975 *Cleveland Policy Planning Report* was fashioned during the tenure of Norman Krumholz as planning director, and read:

"As significantly, we use 'equity planning' here as a shorthand to refer to planning efforts that pay particular attention to the needs of poor and vulnerable populations, populations also likely to suffer the burdens of racial and sexual discrimination, both institutional and personal." (*Making Equity Planning Work; Leadership in the Public Sector*, Norman Krumholz and John Forester, 1990.)

Rather than narrowly defining social equity at this time, the Roundtable has chosen to ex-plore the multiple dimensions of social equity, all of which have relevance to the future of our cities. Some of these dimensions, addressed in the following articles, include: economic equity, equity of opportunity and access, equity of results and public service delivery, and cultural equity. We hope readers will find these articles provocative and informative, and that the discussion they encourage will provide some guideposts for the evolution of the planning profession into the 21st Century. We do not see this as necessarily leading to legislative change, but rather toward influencing the way we do planning and inform decision makers. And we certainly do not see this as an easy task. Our profession must constantly deal with inertia, and resistance to change which becomes an impediment to the evolution of our society.

Where Do We Go From Here?

At the heart of this discussion are questions of who wins and who loses. What is the role of government? What are the responsibilities of the individual? How can business be part of the solution while remaining competitive in the world economy? We must evaluate our decisions for their unequal impact on different groups and we will advocate that planners assume the responsibility for advising decision makers on this

issue and suggesting remedies and needed resources.

_____
Edward J. Blakely is Dean of the School of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Southern California; he is also the author of Separate Societies.

Stanley Hoffman, AICP, is president of Stanley R. Hoffman, Associates, an economic consulting firm in Los Angeles.

Melanie Fallon is the Community Development Director for the City of Huntington Beach, and was previously Deputy Planning Director for the City of Los Angeles.

COMMENTS

By Paul C. Crawford, AICP

Blakely, Fallon and Hoffman note that the continuing evolution of California toward a more multicultural, ethnically and racially diverse society is inevitable. Among the many challenges facing us in this process is the need to recognize that the past is not a useful guide to the future, particularly when past planning policy decisions have been directed primarily by one segment of the population.

A successful multi-cultural society must embrace diversity and ensure that all members have equal access to its resources. Disillusion-ment with affirmative action initiatives to the contrary, we must also pay better and particular attention to the nurturing of "vulnerable" populations, and their access to the economic, housing, and information resources that the more advantaged share.

From the "macro" perspective of this intro-duction, we shift focus to the community of Richmond, California, and specific equity issues involving the sometimes conflicting needs of industry, low-cost housing, and community access to land use decision-making.

_____
Paul C. Crawford, AICP, is president of Crawford Multari & Starr, consultants in planning, economics and public policy, based in San Luis Obispo. He is also an instructor at Cal Poly University.

SOCIAL EQUITY FROM A GRASSROOTS PERSPECTIVE

By Val Alexeefff

The concept of social equity was developed because disproportionate, negative impacts occur in certain geographic areas. The basis for impacts may be historical, economic, governmental, or social. Affected areas suffer from environments, including toxic levels and violence that other segments of society do not tolerate.

The community movement in the sixties and seventies forced the planning process to accept increased public involvement. In areas such as North Richmond, public hearings and neighborhood meetings have not been enough.

In an effort to review social planning equity issues from a grassroots perspective, I interviewed Mr. Henry Clark, Executive Director of the West County Toxics Coalition, an organization formed in 1986 to respond to actions of local industries.

Interview with Henry Clark

VAL: Zoning is supposed to protect residents from uses that are not compatible. In Richmond, you have the residential coming right up to the industrial. In many areas, low income residences were allowed in the industrial zone while the industries were allowed to proliferate. Who was here first?

HENRY: We are not arguing about whether the industry was there first or the community. It just indicates to us some poor planning and the land use decisions occurred to allow a situation where the community residential area is located so close to these industries.

VAL: If you were to demonstrate lack of social equity in planning (planning meaning land use), what would you point to?

HENRY: I would point to the experiences that I've had with this planning process. The community has complained many times about not getting proper notice when our projects were going through the planning process. We hear about projects being permitted or actions taken after the fact. We are disturbed about the continuing string of hazardous waste or chemical facilities in our community. North Richmond area has taken its fair share. The continued siting of these types of facilities in the community contributes to environmental racism or environmental injustice.

VAL: The planning process has a standard way of notifying people. They notify within 300 feet of a project. Notices are sent to groups that have submitted an interest, and ads are put in the paper. What else would you like them to do besides that?

HENRY: Well, you know the legal requirements are one thing and that may be fine if it would work, but as far as our experience is concerned, there are projects in our community that no one seems to know how they got there, or when they went through the planning process. Certainly the more active people in the community, including myself, were not aware of them, so in terms of whether there is a process set up, I guess it comes down to the question of how that legal process is being implemented.

VAL: When you have had contacts with planners, what has been your experience?

HENRY: Our experience with planners depends on the project. If it's a housing project, if it's some type of commercial project where there's not a lot of community resistance, the relationship probably is cordial. The planners certainly provide information. When it comes to the petrochemical industry, it's a different story in terms of siting facilities or expanding facilities of that nature. It's basically the company ends up getting exactly what they want in opposition to the concerns and the needs, and the desires of the communities.

VAL: Did the planners or the planning process try to deal with your concerns or did they try to brush them off? How did they respond?

HENRY: We don't think that they adequately addressed the concerns. The community did not want the facility at all because of the fact that we had taken our fair share, the planners position was basically to sell us the project with some type of mitigations or conditions that would be acceptable or that would make the project happen in spite of the community's wishes.

VAL: So the planners were trying to make the project acceptable and the community's position was that the project was not acceptable and could not be made acceptable.

HENRY: That was correct.

VAL: How would you change the planning process?

HENRY: There's a lot of political leverage that petrochemical related companies and the developers have with the political process that tends to sway decisions, we believe. There is also the concern of recognizing the legitimacy and the

needs of the people in communities of color, lower income communities which tend to be not properly organized and don't have the political leverage and therefore discounted in terms of considering the needs of the community when siting a facility. These concerns have to be addressed.

VAL: You have an area that indicates heavy industry and the heavy industrial zoning is open to whatever uses are proposed. What direction do you have for the Planner trying to choose between stimulating economic development and preserving the area?

HENRY: First of all, we don't adhere to any particular planning decision or policies that have set some land use pattern that basically puts our community at risk. There are some discriminatory factors in that. We don't accept that as a condition that we need to live with. So to perpetrate that does not follow that it is fair or represents social justice. We want some buffer between us and those facilities that exist. Certainly we want zoning to prevent additional hazardous waste facilities and petrochemical companies. They should not be located in those areas that have already taken their fair share.

VAL: To what extent is government the problem and to what extent is industry the problem?

HENRY: The government is the decision maker, not the industry. The industry brings projects before the government to be screened and go through the permit process. The industry, because of contributions to officials, the tax base, jobs and others exerts an overwhelming influence on government and gets what they want through the planning process.

VAL: How do you see government being the solution?

HENRY: Well, government can be the solution to the extent that it is held accountable to the needs of the community based on some fair, equitable planning process and siting process. There are studies that verify social inequities. President Clinton has just come out with his Executive Order basically recognizing that environmental impacts and environmental injustice has in fact been a reality and directing the Federal agencies to correct any practices they have been engaged in and show how they will not contribute to that problem further. Local and regional planning bodies need to be aware of this new charge and act locally.

VAL: Are you optimistic that existing and potential heavy industries in your neighborhood will pay greater attention to the needs of the community?

HENRY: Well, I'm optimistic that every industry will pay attention to the needs of the community as long as the community is organized and watchful and holds industry accountable to do so.

VAL: What do you think are compatible industries for your neighborhood?

HENRY: The community of North Richmond has gone on record that we do not want any more of the pollutant smoke stack hazardous waste type of industry, but something connected with the transportation opportunities of this North Richmond corridor.

VAL: If industries are precluded from expanding, do you feel that your residents will lose jobs?

HENRY: Well, no, I don't feel that our residents will lose jobs if we are depending upon the petrochemical industry because they hire very few residents. What we should focus on is attracting other types of businesses to the community.

VAL: How would you expand community influence in a way that was acceptable to industry?

HENRY: The trend now is for companies in our community to establish community advisory panels consisting of local residents that work directly with the company and meet with them on a periodic basis to discuss issues and concerns related to the company and the community.

VAL: What do you feel are the strengths and the weaknesses of the environmental movement with regard to your situation?

HENRY: Our community has been on the front line of the chemical assault. We need technical assistance to wade through many of the documents that the companies provide us and ongoing support to continue to do the organizing job that needs to be done. We have support, technical assistance from groups like the Sierra Club, Citizens for a Better Environment and Greenpeace to an extent because of the industries, but basically that's pretty much it.

_____

North Richmond is located on the east side of San Pablo Bay, surrounded by Richmond. Its population is 2,300 with an income level one-fifth of the County median, one-half of the households living below the poverty level, 40% of the population under 18. Owner occupied units are 28.5% and less than 10% of the jobs in the community are filled by community residents. Within the community, 234 acres are residential, 118 acres are commercial and 300 acres are industrial. Community leaders are attempting to reconcile neighborhood issues such as absentee landlords, high dropout rate, drug battles, gangs and the struggle for identity. Over the past two years, there has been an increase in coordination of

public activities and interaction between government agencies and the community.

_____

Val Alexeefff is the Director of the Growth Management and Economic Development Agency for Contra Costa County.

COMMENTS

By Paul C. Crawford, AICP

Affordable housing is often found in the least desirable areas of our communities, where conflicts with non-residential land uses are likely. Low income residents in these areas may receive far less political attention and repre-sentation than neighbors who appear more criti-cal to the local government's revenue stream. This problem can be even worse when outdated "cumulative zoning" policies allow both housing and industry to be developed in the same zoning district, without the extensive design review requirements and performance standards com-monly applied to mixed-use projects in more contemporary commercial zones. "Catch-all" zones that allow residential development but are nominally industrial invite disenfranchisement. Some of these places may look industrial on the zoning map, but a *community* is often there too. And when a local government attempts to eliminate problems of land use conflicts in such areas, the focus is usually on relocating resi-dents, not industry.

Interviewed by Val Alexeefff, Henry Clark noted that one community-based advocacy group found that the residential populations who could be most adversely affected by land use decisions often did not receive adequate advance notice of such decisions. This is not surprising, since state law requires that development project public hearing notice be provided to owners of property within 300 feet of a proposed development site. Low income residents will not normally be among those property owners, and few local governments pursue the extra effort of giving notice to residents.

If we look carefully at other zoning regulations and related procedures, how many other examples will we find where the process directly or indirectly works to ignore, disen-franchise, or otherwise exclude affected popu-lations from the decision-making? Why does the development review portion of the planning process, which is fundamentally asking the question of each discretionary project, "Is this a good idea?", reach decisions inconsiderate of the

needs of *any* affected group? A lack of exper-ience in thinking about zoning and development issues from a social equity perspective, and a lack of attention in planning education to the importance of social equity may partly answer those questions. The following article by Marge Macris, AICP, explores the potential of planning education in defining and solving social equity problems.

PLANNING EDUCATION AND SOCIAL EQUITY

By Marjorie Macris, AICP

What is the role of education in improving planning practice so that it meets human needs, particularly for those most lacking in resources? Some would argue that the planning schools, like the planning profession itself, have failed to acknowledge new, more culturally diverse conceptions of beauty, order and community life.

There are four aspects to consider: the curricula of planning schools, the diversity of the student body, educational activities for practicing planners and community education. I have based these observations in part on my experience as a member of site visit teams for the Planning Accreditation Board.

Planning School Curricula

The Spring 1994 issue of the Journal of the American Planning Association contains a special section on "Advocacy Planning in Retrospect". One author, John Forester, states, "So planning education must complement model-building in labs with community-seeing in fieldwork....." Other authors recommend courses on the methods of "equity planning" and closer ties between the schools and practitioners who are addressing equity issues.

Certainly it is clear that planning schools should educate students to evaluate the social, as well as the physical, environmental and economic impacts of planning decisions. Course content should include and strengthen subjects directly affecting social equity, such as race and ethnic diversity, multi-culturalism, social ecology and gender equity. Students should understand the importance of community organization and community-based planning/economic development and learn skills in these areas. Social equity issues should be a prime consideration in any student project. For example, students should interview residents and meet with community organizations for any area for which they conduct a study or recommend planning and development policies.

An interesting approach which the California Planning Roundtable (CPR) is now discussing is a mentor program for minority planning students. A practicing planner could serve as a mentor for an individual student and could introduce the student to the workplace and encourage him or her in completing course work. An organization such as CPR could provide a structure to support the mentors, share information and provide recognition for both students and mentors. The Florida Chapter of APA found that many minority students, once they graduated and began working, were frustrated by their inability to address social equity issues such as low income housing, and left the profession. It would be mutually beneficial if the mentor program could continue through the first few years of work.

Diversity in the Student Body

Ideally, the planning profession, and therefore the students at planning schools, should reflect the diversity of American society. The 1990 Census reported that about 80 percent of the United States population was white, 12 percent African-American, 9 percent Hispanic (all races), 3 percent Asian and 1 percent Native American; 51 percent of the population was female and 49 percent male. In California, as pointed out in the initial article on "Social Equity in Planning" in the May/June issue of *California Planner*, the characteristics of the population are changing rapidly. The white population, which comprised 57 percent of the total in 1990, is expected to drop to 33 percent by 2040, while the Hispanic population is expected to increase from 26 percent to 50 percent during that period and the African-American population increases numerically but with a smaller percentage of the total.

How do the enrollments in planning schools and the composition of the planning profession reflect the diversity of the population? The information readily available is illustrative, rather than definitive, and should be used with caution, and there are no available breakdowns for California. Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that the Planning Accreditation Board reported that in the schools reviewed from 1992 to 1994 (two-fifths of all accredited planning schools), the percentages were 62 percent white, 13 percent Hispanic, 6 percent Asian, 7 percent African-American and 1 percent Native American. The American Planning Association's latest survey of *Planning* magazine subscribers indicated that, among those reporting, about 80 percent were white, 3 percent African-American, 3 percent Asian, 2 percent Hispanic and 1 percent Native American. (Race was "not known" for 14 percent of the respondents.) About 38 percent of both the planning students and the APA respondents were female.

It appears that there may be significant underrepresentation of African-Americans and females in planning schools and among practitioners, and an under representation of Hispanics as well among practitioners.

If we want the planning profession to "look like America", what are some of the actions we can take? Some obvious answers are scholarships,

outreach into inner city high schools and grade schools, creation of more planning degrees at the undergraduate level and training for para-professional positions. Also, how many planning agencies and firms participated in "Take Your Daughter To Work Day"? What role can the planning schools play in creating a more effective "feeder system" for young women, as well as people of color, into the profession?

Continuing Education For Practicing Planners

The planning professional is evolving toward a clearer recognition of the importance of social equity in our work. The traditional concept of an independent (mostly white male establishment) planning commission producing a comprehensive plan which represents the "public interest" for all is changing to a more open, pluralistic model.

The American Planning Association is now undertaking its Agenda for America's Communities program. APA will produce a series of papers on the social equity implications of land use, zoning, transportation and other areas addressed by practicing planners, similar on a national scale to the current effort by the California Planning Roundtable.

The APA program, as well as the Roundtable papers, can be useful in continuing education programs for planning practitioners. Many of us were trained to do traditional physical planning and could benefit by understanding more about issues of social equity, cultural diversity and environmental racism and how they affect our work as well as by learning techniques for neighborhood planning, community organizing and outreach.

Physical planning—the construction, preservation and revitalization of the built environment—will continue to be the core of our work. But we need to do it with an understanding of how it affects the people who live and work in cities, particularly those with the least opportunities. We need to recognize that today's planning tools do not necessarily address the diversity of our communities and to recommend changes accordingly. For example, how do you apply a parking formula based on seating to a mosque, which has no chairs? How do standards for the keeping of animals and number of persons per room relate to minority cultures? This idea of the central importance of physical planning differs from the idea of "advocacy" in the 1960's, which presented the view that planners should emphasize social and economic, rather than physical planning. However, we must recognize that physical planning will fail unless we address the issues of diversity.

Community Education

Educating community members so that they can participate effectively in planning and development activities is an important service planners can provide. Community workshops on how planning works, the development process and real estate financing could be valuable learning experiences, particularly in inner city neighborhoods. Planning schools, planning agencies and firms, and APA chapters and sections could sponsor these programs. Also, planning agencies could offer internships for community activists. The citizen participation process can be modified to recognize cultural differences through the presentation of multi-lingual materials and the use of translators at public meetings.

Planning affects the allocation of resources. A community that can speak— and plan—for itself effectively is in a good position to begin to solve its problems. Encouraging a "bottom up" planning approach, in which communities define their needs and go about meeting them, is an important part of the social equity concept.

_____

Marjorie Macris, AICP, is a planning consultant from Northern California.

COMMENTS

By Paul C. Crawford, AICP

If planners are to expand their profes-sional role to include facilitating social equity, the necessary consciousness-raising and skill-building must begin in planning education. At the same time, the profession itself needs to more "look like America" in gender, racial, and ethnic makeup. Both should start with more inclusion and diversity within the planning schools themselves. Macris' sources cite the significant underrepresentation of African-Americans and women in both planning schools and the profession itself, and Hispanics within the profession. It is understandable, but no longer acceptable, that a profession and process historically guided by Anglo males would be characterized by cultural and equity myopia among even the best-intentioned.

Moving the planning profession and the planning process toward greater awareness and achievement in equity issues will indeed require the three educational initiatives described by Macris: providing more emphasis on social equity issues in planning schools (and more diversity among planning students); including the same concepts in continuing education for planning professionals; and by community education efforts aimed at improving the participation of historically underrepresented populations in the planning process.

Macris' comments on the need for the planning process to embrace "a more open, pluralistic model," and that "physical planning will fail unless we address the issues of diversity," lead nicely into the following article. Blakely and Snyder show us the results of physical planning that is intentionally directed away from diversity and multi-culturalism, as they review the emergence and increasing popularity of gated and walled "private" communities.

FORTRESS AMERICA: GATED AND WALLED COMMUNITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

By Edward Blakely and Mary Gail Snyder

It has been over three decades since this nation legally outlawed all forms of public discrimination—in housing, education, public transportation and public accommodations. Yet today, we are seeing a new form of discrimination—the gated, walled, private community.

Gated communities are residential areas with restricted access such that normally public spaces have been privatized. These developments are both new suburban developments and older inner city areas retrofitted to provide security. We estimate that at least three or four million and potentially many more Americans are seeking this new refuge from the problems of urbanization. Economic segregation is scarcely new. In fact, zoning and city planning were designed in part to preserve the position of the privileged by subtle variances in building and density codes. But the gated communities go farther in several respects. They create physical barriers to access. And they privatize community space, not merely individual space. Many of these communities also privatize civic responsi-bilities such as police protection and communal services such as schools, recreation and enter-tainment. The new developments create a private world that shares little with its neighbors or the larger political system. This fragmentation undermines the very concept of *civitas*—organized community life.

Since the late 80's, gates have become ubiquitous in many areas of the country. While early gated communities were restricted to retirement villages and the compounds of the super rich, the majority found today are middle to upper-middle class. And along with the trend toward gating in new developments, existing neighborhoods, both rich and poor, are using barricades and gates with increasing frequency to seal themselves off.

Gated communities can be classified in three main categories based on the primary motivation of their residents. First are the Lifestyle communities, where the gates provide security and separation for the leisure activities and amenities within. These include retirement communities; golf and country club leisure developments; and suburban new towns.

Second are the Elite communities, where the gates symbolize distinction and prestige and both create and protect a secure place on the social ladder. These include enclaves of the rich and famous; developments for the top fifth, the very affluent; and the executive home developments, for the middle class.

The third type is the Security Zone, where the fear of crime and outsiders is the foremost motivation for defensive fortifications. This category includes the middle class perch, attempting to protect property and property values; the working class perch, often in deteriorating areas of the city; and the low income perch, including public housing, where crime is acute.

There is little doubt that urban problems are the stimuli for this wave of gating. The drive for separation, distinction, exclusion, and protection, is fueled in part by dramatic demo-graphic change in the metropolitan areas with large numbers of gated communities. High levels of foreign immigration, a growing underclass and a restructured economy are rapidly changing the face of many metropolitan areas.

Gated communities are themselves a microcosm of the larger spatial pattern of segmentation and separation. America is increasingly separated by income, race and economic opportunity. Suburbanization does not mean a lessening of segregation, but only a redistribution of the urban patterns of discrimination. Minority and immigrant sub-urbanization is concentrated in the inner ring and old manufacturing suburbs. At the same time, poverty is no longer concentrated in the central city, but is suburbanizing, racing ever farther out in the metropolitan area.

The growing divisions between rich and poor are creating new patterns which reinforce the costs that isolation and exclusion impose on some at the same time that they benefit others. The uncoupling of industry from cities and of professionals from geography compounds trends toward fragmentation and privatization by undercutting the old foundation of community and providing a new rationale for the lifestyle enclave or gated community based on shared socioeconomic status. This narrowing of social contact is likewise narrowing the social contract.

Privatization, the replacement of public government and its functions by private organizations who purchase services from the market, is one of the more serious effects that gated communities may have for social equity and the broader community. Private communities are providing their own security, street maintenance,

parks, recreation, garbage collection and other services, leaving the poor and less well-to-do dependent on the ever-reduced services of city and county governments.

The resulting loss of connection and social contact is weakening the bonds of mutual responsibility and the social contract. We no longer speak of citizens, but rather of taxpayers, who take no active role in governance, but merely exchange money for services. in the privatized gated communities, many say they're taking care of themselves and have no desire to contribute to the common pool serving their neighbors in the rest of the city. In areas where gated communities are the norm, not the excep-tion, this perspective has the potential for severe impacts on the common welfare.

Walled cities and gated communities are a dramatic manifestation of the fortress mentality growing in America. As citizens divide them-selves into homogenous, independent cells, their place in the greater polity and society becomes attenuated, increasing resistance to efforts to resolve municipal, let alone regional problems.

The forting-up phenomenon has enormous policy consequences. By allowing some citizens to internalize and to exclude others from sharing in their economic privilege, it aims directly at the conceptual base of community and citizenship in America. What is the measure of nationhood when the divisions between neighborhoods require armed patrols and electric fencing to keep out other citizens? When public services and even local government are privatized, when the community of responsibility stops at the subdivison gates, what happens to the function and the very idea of democracy? In short, can this nation fulfill its social contract in the absence of social contact?

_____

Edward Blakely is Dean of the School of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Southern California.

Mary Gail Snyder is a Research Associate at University of California, Berkeley, Department of City and Regional Planning.

COMMENTS

By Paul C. Crawford, AICP

It is no small irony that many of the same fears about urban pathology which engendered the first zoning efforts in the early nineteen hundreds continue to shape urban form in the last years of the century. The three types of gated communities described by Blakely and Snyder—lifestyle communities, elite communi-ties, and security zones—serve the same kind of "keep out those who aren't like us" impulses that

first created exclusive single-family residential zoning. The intention and form of these gated communities are fundamentally exclusionary. And regardless of any measure of security they offer, it can be argued that their continuing proliferation will support a balkanized society without the true, long-term security that can only occur in a *real* community with a diverse, interdependent population.

Unfortunately, the fear and self-centeredness that produces gated communities does not isolate itself to the physical planning realm. In the following article, David Booher, AICP, tracks some manifestations of these attitudes in the current political environment, and describes the difficulties associated with facilitating change at the electoral level.

THE POLITICS OF SOCIAL EQUITY

By David E. Booher, AICP

Perhaps no challenge to the success of California is more important or more daunting than the challenge of achieving the common good in the face of growing economic, social, and cultural diversity. It has been frequently noted that a society cannot be long sustained unless the people can agree on and support values and aspirations of a common good. But a common good cannot be defined which leaves out significant elements of people whether defined in economic, racial, or cultural terms.

The loss of community and the elusiveness of a set of values to give substance to the common good is a topic of considerable discussion. Some observers are beginning to attribute at least partial cause to the physical design of our metropolitan regions. For example, Harvard Professor Peter Rowe writing in his book *Making a Middle Landscape* argues, "In the end, with so much decentralization, it is not inefficiency and irrationality that undermine the suburban metropolitan experience. It is the darker underside of the idea of democracy, when people forget that it involves the common good as well as individualism."

Others argue that the pursuit of individual economic success has led to economic disparities and sacrifice of common economic success. They cite a 1993 study by the Congressional Budget Office which revealed that while personal income in the United States increased by $740 billion between 1977 and 1989, almost two-thirds went to just 660,000 families (the wealthiest one percent of the population). The middle classes gained a meager four percent during this time. And fully forty percent of all families actually experienced a loss of income over the decade. The great capitalist theorist Adam Smith, author of "Wealth of Nations", also wrote "A Theory of Moral Sentiments" in which he proposed that a stable society must be based on "sympathy", a moral duty to be concerned with the well being of fellow members of the society. The free market is not a substitute for responsibility to the common good.

In California we seem gripped by the dilemma between individualism and common good. Since the early 1970's we have consistently sacrificed investment in society to lower taxes. We have reduced our support for the most disadvantaged among us. We resist reforms to the political system which would ensure more representation in government by ethnic minorities.

And we seem fixated on blaming immigrants for the fiscal woes of government brought about by the dramatic economic changes underway. In November we were asked to deny medical and education services to the children of undocumented immigrants, an amazingly mean spirited and self-defeating proposal (Proposition 187).

In a democracy the quest for the common good begins with the electoral process. It is through elections that the people make their decisions to guide the policies of government that define the common good. So perhaps it is here where we must first look. What we find is not very encouraging. Voting has been declining steadily during most of this century. At the November 1992 Presidential election, voter turnout was only 41%. Last June the turnout was even lower, a measly 35%. Under five million of the state's fourteen million voters participated, compared to the estimated nineteen million eligible to register to vote, this is a participation of only 26%. This is only part of the story. The other part is the composition of this turnout. For while non-white ethnic groups are growing as a percentage of the total population, their participation in the political process is not growing. Instead elections are dominated by older, better off, better educated Anglo voters. A Los Angeles Times survey found that in the June election more than half of the voters were over 50 years old, 81% were Anglo, 36% had incomes of $60,000 or more, and half held college degrees. As political writer Dan Walters has observed, this amounts to political apartheid.

It is obvious that the decisions of government will be defined by the interests of those who show up at the elections and that the interests of those who do not show up will not be represented. It is also obvious that democracy will not work very well when such large elements of the population are not represented. As Aristotle said, "If liberty and equality, as is thought by some are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost."

We probably cannot achieve governmental policies that incorporate social equity until our governmental institutions are more representative of our population. And we cannot achieve more representative government until we can achieve a more representative electorate. We are beginning to see trends that may begin to move us in that

direction. Latino groups are aggressively pursuing election redistricting to ensure more ethnic representation. For example, as a result of a successful federal lawsuit, in 1991 Gloria Molina became the first Latino Los Angeles supervisor in this century. Voting rights lawsuits are pending in Monterey County which has not had a Latino supervisor this century. And Latin groups in San Francisco are considering a fight to revive district elections in that city. However, there are limits to the effectiveness of specially drawn voter districts to achieve better ethnic representation. There are a growing number of federal court decisions casting doubt on the constitutionality of racially delineated legislative districts. Winner take all elections discriminate against minorities. But there is no way to draw district boundaries without shifting the burden of uneven representation from one group of citizens to another. This is illustrated by a Florida redistricting case where Latinos and African Americans have been fighting over redistricting plans to secure an additional seat in the Florida Senate.

There are indications that immigrant bashing may be stimulating a backlash among immigrants, generating a high rate of naturalization and voter registration. This year more than 425,000 immigrants nationwide are expected to become citizens. In the Los Angeles area alone 90,000 immigrants are expected to become citizens, double the number last year. And some observers have noted the increased grass roots activity among Latino groups because of the vote in November on the "Save Our State" initiative mentioned earlier. Latino leaders are carrying out an aggressive voter registration drive in which they hope to bring Latino registration to one million.

Other approaches to achieving more representative government institutions are being considered. One issue is representation on local boards and commissions which are appointed by local elected officials. Although no comprehensive data is available, it is widely recognized that local boards and commissions are generally not representative of the diversity of the population. By focusing on the appointment of more ethnic members, local political leaders could begin to build a cadre of ethnic leaders with the experience and backing to move into higher elective office.

Another more radical approach which has been proposed is the creation of proportional representation districts similar to those used by such nations as Ireland, Australia, Spain and Sweden. Under this system, single member districts would be replaced by multiple member districts. Seats are assigned based upon the percentage of votes received. A variation of this approach would allow voters to rank candidates in order of preference. This system would likely be more of an incentive for the disaffected to vote since they have an enhanced opportunity to see their candidate win and there is little pressure to vote for the lesser of two evils.

There are also more direct approaches to encouraging participation in elections. For example, one approach might be to appeal to the pocket book by taxing the failure to vote. This could be achieved by an income surtax to be paid when the taxpayer cannot show proof of voting at elections held in the tax year when they file their tax return. Low income voters might even receive a tax credit for voting. No one would be forced to vote. They would merely have to pay for choosing to not vote. And priority state services would receive the benefit of additional revenues without the imposition of a broad based tax increase.

It has been said that in a democracy voting is both a civil right and a social responsibility. In this period of rapid change and growing demographic diversity, fulfilling this responsibility is critical to assuring that our governmental institutions adapt to societal changes and needs. History shows that the alternative to responsive and accountable government is social conflict and the loss of civil rights.

_____

David E. Booher, AICP is a Sacramento-based planner and policy consultant.

COMMENTS

By Paul C. Crawford, AICP

David Booher reports on political trends which highlight the fact that California may not be preparing itself to be a successful multi-cultural society. While the importance of the individual may be an appropriate cornerstone of our democracy, a parallel appreciation of the common good is becoming increasingly eroded. Just as the gated communities discussed earlier have either encouraged or accompanied a general decline of public participation in city life, our continuing vigorous pursuit of individual convenience seems very much related to the reduced societal support for the disadvantaged and declining voter participation cited by Booher. The economically advantaged are participating less in the process of shaping and monitoring local government, and the growing populations of former minorities are not encouraged to step forward to play their role.

The continuing dominance of the election process by a socially and economically monolithic segment of the population will only make effective cultural diversity and social equity more difficult to attain at the same time that they are becoming more necessary. Booher correctly notes "that democracy will not work very well when such large segments of the population are not represented." If government institutions, and local boards and commissions are to be more representative of the entire population, all of us, as planners and citizens, need to encourage full participation in community decision-making, from the election to giving feedback to the people we elect.

Encouraging widespread (much less, full) community participation in the planning process has always been a challenge in itself, but the characteristics of a multi-cultural society can make encouraging such participation (and its potential for improved social equity) even more problematic. Wayne Goldberg and Larry Ferlazzo explore some of the multi-cultural language problems facing planners in the next article.

EQUITY IN COMMUNICATIONS: THE LANGUAGE BARRIER

By Wayne G. Golderg, AICP and Larry Ferlazzo

The terminology of planning and the planning process can be difficult for a lay person to understand, even in his or her native tongue. Almost every professional planner has had occasion to involve citizens in some part of the planning process and deal first hand with questions on the terminology and jargon of planning. In addition, the planning process is laden with assumed values and accepted forms of interaction that are built on the American methods of persuasion, negotiation, influence and other factors that are so commonplace they are taken for granted and rarely verbalized. As California becomes more culturally diverse, the language we use and the citizen involvement processes we implement can present major difficulties to full citizen involvement if we address the needs of significant ethnic minorities.

Citizen involvement is frequently ad hoc. People tend to get involved in government issues in direct proportion to the impact they perceive an action will have on them. They also have a tendency to return to a state of non-involvement once the matter of particular concern has been decided. This means that the planner cannot rely on a citizen base that becomes sophisticated in planning concepts over time. The planner must be able to simplify concepts, terminology and issues in a relatively short period of time so as not to wear on the enthusiasm of interested citizens. It is important to recognize that residents from other countries may not have had the opportunity to participate in the planning process in their native land or may have been involved in entirely different ways than those with which we are familiar. If there is a significant ethnic minority population in a community it may be very useful for the planner to learn something of the planning process as practiced in their former country.

When dealing with ethnic groups, language can be an obvious problem. But more subtle are the differences that are a part of the cultures. Based upon a person's cultural background, he or she may not feel comfortable addressing a group of elected officials or may feel that strong threats and intimidation are the more appropriate ways to achieve action. Particularly if low income, people may have had negative experiences with bureaucracies or may not have been taken seriously. A group may feel that the professional planner is not someone who can be trusted or may wonder why the planner is asking questions of the residents. Isn't the planner supposed to know the answers?

Non English-speaking groups frequently employ intermediaries to help them convey their messages and perform the necessary technical work. These may range from translators to engineers and architects. It can be very tempting, in the name of efficiency, to hold most of the conversations with these individuals who speak English and count on them to relay any necessary information. To a non-English speaking person this can appear to be avoidance and reinforce any feelings that may exist about not respecting those who don't speak English. Conversations should always be directed at the applicant or group regardless of the language problem, unless they choose to have their intermediaries act for them. Even then, it may be important for the planner to take steps to assure that the individuals understand exactly what is happening.

As in all relationships the key is trust and trust must be developed. Something as relatively insignificant to a planner as showing up slightly late for a meeting or not delivering on a processing time commitment could be interpreted entirely differently by the non-English speaking client.

Some obvious solutions to the language problems are well known and tested. Translators and translator services are available through consultant efforts and even one of the telephone companies. Publication of frequently accessed planning guides and other materials in other languages indicates respect and acknowledges the legitimate planning roles of the non-English speaking residents.

Language is an important tool for the planner, but it is still only a tool. Its proper application cannot substitute for the need of a non-English speaking residents to feel they have some power over the situation. In addition to reaching out to these groups when projects that affect them are being considered, the planner should seek opportunities for them to be the initiators of action with the planner serving as the useful vehicle.

Sensitivity to the languages and communications styles of California's growing minority communities is an important new consideration in the design of planning programs.

Wayne Goldberg, AICP, is the Community Development Director for the City of Santa Rosa.

Larry Ferlazzo is Director/Lead Organizer for the Sacramento Valley Organizing Community.

COMMENTS

By Paul C. Crawford, AICP

Goldberg and Ferlazzo address issues of communication in planning that concern not only social equity, but also the basic effectiveness of all citizen/planner interactions. Planners need to convey the concepts, terminology and issues of planning more clearly, simply, and quickly. Doing so will better serve *all* citizens who have competing demands for their time and a lack of familiarity with planning concepts. More subtle is the need for planners to communicate with an understanding of both the cultural values embedded in the planning process as it exists, and the cultural values of the ethnic groups with whom planners are attempting to communicate. Unless planners increase their sensitivity, those values can easily collide, and discourage rather than enhance the accessibility to the planning process that social equity needs.

Among the many concepts that planners must communicate, zoning is one of the oldest. Its beginning as a mechanism of institutional-izing inequity has been mentioned earlier. Vivian Kahn explores the current implications of zoning practices for social equity in the following article, and offers a menu of refinements to zoning that can serve equity goals.

ZONING FOR AN EQUITABLE SOCIETY: AN ALTERNATIVE TO EUCLIDEAN EXCLUSION

By Vivian Kahn, AICP

Despite 75 years of case law reaffirming the illegality of exclusionary zoning, the widespread reliance of local jurisdictions on Euclidean districting as the primary means for implementing land use policies continues to promote social and economic segregation and confound efforts to achieve more equitable use of land resources.

- Districting preserves homogeneity and the status quo by preventing changes perceived as potentially detrimental to the interests of existing owners and residents. Zoning rules that reflect the values and priorities of those who got there first often preclude changes that would accommodate newcomers or different lifestyles. More than a century after San Francisco's Chinese residents were denied permits to operate laundries in wooden structures, a new generation of Asian and Latino immi-grants finds that zoning regulations don't allow housing suitable for their multi-generational families. Meanwhile, in suburbs designed for nuclear families with stay-at-home moms, working parents spend precious hours on the road between home, office, school, after-school activities and supermarket.

- Zoning is reactive and doesn't relate to the limited resources, such as capital improve-ment programming, or the allocation of public safety, social and health services, that local jurisdictions could use to affect the nature and timing of development.

- The segregation of uses deters the maintenance of lower-valued land uses, like the affordable housing in commercial districts that is often the housing of last resort for the poorest residents. When better educated pioneers (artist, loft-dwellers, etc.) venture into these urban wastelands, lower-income residents may lose not only their homes, but also their livelihood, as traditional blue-collar, "dirty", manufacturing jobs are forced out by higher tech new industries, trendy outlet stores, and services that usually pay higher rents and lower wages.

- The decisions of water, sewer, and school districts profoundly influence the location and timing of development, but planning coordination between the cities and counties that regulate land use and the single purpose districts responsible for providing critical services is rare. Despite court decisions intended to equalize the level of financial support for public education, regardless of the ability of local development to generate tax renenues, the perceived quality of local schools continues to have a major effect on housing cost.

Through proactive legislation and administration, the practice of zoning can overcome its inherently exclusionary conception and become a tool for promoting positive change.

- Zoning ordinances must allow for the modification of standards to promote housing and economic development of benefit to the entire community such as density bonuses for affordable units and the waiver of standard residential requirements for mixed use development. Traditional zoning regulations that require adherence to often arbitrary setback and density standards should be replaced with performance-based zoning that gives preference to applications that meet standards designed to advance social and environmental objectives such as transit access, inclusion of affordable housing or the provision of on-site childcare.

- Traditional districting schemes can be replaced with neighborhood-scale districts including a range of housing types, community facilities (including public schools), and retail services defined in coordination with the local school district. The ordinance should specify development goals and standards as ratios or percentages (e.g. 20% affordable units, 1,000 square feet of retail space for every 50 dwelling units, etc.). Districts that meet goals for housing production should be given priority for new or upgraded public facilities and services such as parks, libraries, and community centers.

- Zoning regulations should mandate minimum densities to promote more efficient use of land resources and reduce development pressure on outlying areas. Traditional hierarchical zoning schemes that allow all of the permitted uses in lower density districts in higher density areas must be replaced with regulations that prohibit the wasteful underuse of land that is appropriate for more intense residential or commercial development, especially when services and infra-structure already exist. The State should allow local jurisdictions to increase the tax rate on vacant land in areas

with infrastructure capacity to discourage investors from keeping these sites undeveloped.

- To maintain existing housing stock, the State should require discretionary review of residential demolition and, in most cases, mandate the replacement of demolished units. Although the Supreme Court's recent decision in Dolan v. Tigard should not affect the ability of jurisdictions to require the inclusion of affordable units, especially where developable land is in short supply, enabling legislation may be warranted to reinforce the legality of this approach. The State should also mandate so-called "zero sum zoning" requiring cities that downzone to maintain their ability to meet housing needs by transferring densities to other parts of the jurisdiction.

- State and Federal government must provide incentives and penalties to encourage zoning regulations that provide increased residential opportunities and discourage wasteful development practices. Existing State requirements mandating density bonuses and provision for second units need to be strengthened and clarified. State planning law should also require closer scrutiny of local zoning ordinances to ensure that the development of housing to meet existing and projected needs is actually feasible.

- A few zoning "groupies" with the time or inclination to spend hours debating the true meaning of "useable open space" are often the only citizens who participate in the dry business of formulating zoning standards. Planners need to reach out to social and civic organizations and local churches to involve low-income and minority households. Visioning exercises are among the methods planners can use to help citizens understand the role of zoning and to identify alternative standards for residential and commercial development.

In 1921, zoning pioneer Robert Whitten promoted his new approach to planning regulation in glowing terms. "On the economic side, zoning means increased industrial efficiency and the prevention of enormous waste. On the human side, zoning means better homes and an increase of health, comfort and happiness for all the people." At that time, the benefits he described were limited to the privileged few. But, with innovation and foresight, this most utilitarian of planning tools can become an implement to benefit all the people.

_____

Vivian Kahn, AICP, is a principal with Kahn/ Mortimer/Associates in Oakland, and was previously Manager of Current Planning for the City of Berkeley.

COMMENTS

By Paul C. Crawford, AICP

Kahn notes that typical zoning regulations perpetuate a number of exclusionary practices, and offers workable suggestions for evolutionary change in zoning concepts. Central among them is the idea that communities and their planners should work harder to create neighborhoods with a mixture of housing types and densities, using land much more efficiently than in typical, homogeneous suburban development. Of course, this type of neighborhood design would support a variety of beneficial goals besides social equity, including greater efficiency in transportation and energy consumption, and in the provision of public services.

For anyone interested in exploring changes in zoning practice in the service of social equity, it may be useful to consider how the transformation of some development standards has occurred in response to the needs of the disabled, and a particular approach to bringing those needs into public consciousness. In the following article, Susan Stoddard and Ed Roberts describe the emerging success of the disability movement in achieving significantly greater equity in physical accessibility.

PLANNERS AND SOCIAL EQUITY: LESSONS FROM THE DISABILITY MOVEMENT

By Susan Stoddard, Ph.D., AICP
with comments by Ed Roberts, World Institute on Disability

Of all the civil rights issues, disability is the most related to the planners role. Many of the inequities for people with disabilities are defined by the built environment. By setting physical standards for our buildings, communities transportation patterns, and community rhythm, planning has defined unnecessary limits which restrict the activities and the quality of life of many members of the community. Children, elderly people, women, and people with disabilities are all impacted by standards set for the adult male. Single people and people in group housing find a shortage of appropriate housing in subdivisions designed for two parents, two children and two cars. Our design standards focus mainly on certain types of households and certain types of individuals. Social equity calls for broader design standards and more accessible environments.

While the term "disability" is most commonly associated with the wheelchair symbol, the term disability refers to "limitations in performing socially defined roles and tasks in such spheres as interpersonal relationships, family life, education, recreation, self-care, and work." Disability is the gap between the individual and the environment. As planners learning about social equity and concerned with the environment, we have a lot to learn from people with disabilities and the Disability Movement.

Disability affects one in five. 48.9 million people (19.4% of the non-institutionalized U.S. population) have a *limitation in a functional activity (e.g. seeing, hearing, reaching, walking, performing basic mental tasks) or a socially defined role or task.* About 10% of the U.S. population has a *severe* disability, or is *unable to perform* at least one functional activity or one or more socially defined roles or tasks, (Nationally, 24.1 million people). With an aging population, we project increasing percentages of impairments. Planners have the opportunity, and the challenge, of seeking design solutions that reduce environmentally-created inequities and barriers.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) has put disability on everyone's agenda. The ADA, civil rights legislation, was achieved with political power. People chained themselves to buses to get access to transit (when design solutions were possible). They filed lawsuits when airlines would not board people or wheelchairs. There were pickets of Federal buildings, and the White House, for access to programs and buildings. Basically, the Disability Movement has been forced to take the political route to right an inequity. Disability leaders achieved a political strength by mobilizing people with a range of needs. The ADA is an adversarial model, implemented through litigation (or through fear of litigation). The ADA represents the political reaction to inequities in physical and social systems. The costs we see now are the burden of past mistakes and design limits. The ADA caught planners and planning off-guard. The ADA places planning in an embattled position with respect to disability. Both in retrofitting existing barriers, and in new building requirements, the "disability issue" presents new costs in an already burdened economy. But if we look at equity, not economics, these are the costs of correcting a series of old mistakes. What might have been forethought is now to be corrected. It is the cost of setting standards based on a "norm" that leaves people out of the process and out of the buildings, buses, social and economic processes.

It is more expensive to retrofit rather than design right to begin with. Social equity would call for a more proactive planning approach. Planners can influence the degree of barriers in the built environment, in access to the planning process and information, and in full participation in community life. Solutions for people with disabilities can help others too: children can reach the water faucets; elderly people can get to the airport gates; mothers with strollers can use the sidewalks; people without cars can use the community; and everyone learns to respect others' contributions, not prejudge ability because of physical appearance or limitation.

Ed Roberts, a nationally recognized leader in the Disability rights movements, states, "All you need to do is experience a reasonably accessible town through the eyes of people who live in an inaccessible community. They are astounded by the ease and pleasure of the barrier free environment."

"I had the opportunity the other day," Roberts explains, "to show Berkeley to 20 disabled Russian leaders. These are people we have been working with from the All-Russian Society of the Disabled for the past two years. Up until this month, all of our work together has been in Russia, primarily in Moscow. Talk about inaccessible! Of course, I had to explain to them that all of the United States is not as accessible as Berkeley. However, it is true that the entire country is certainly on the path to getting there—slowly but surely. The way we have done it here in America is by passing the ADA. Going through the hoops of the legal system might be the

route Russian disability leaders will have to take, too. They will save so much time, however, if they can convince planners, designers, politicians and the public of the necessity for social equity in design right from the beginning."

Steps Planners Can Take To Improve Social Equity For People With Disability

- For new construction, use models of "universal" or "barrier-free "design.

- In zoning, be inclusionary. Advocate group home zoning, flexibility in household size and composition.

- Promote a variety of housing to reflect variety of household types and accessi-bility needs.

- In the planning process (e.g. general plan revisions) make sure that the disability community is represented in the planning process.

- Use an assessment approach to learn about options in the community, and learn how to work with people with disabilities on planning issues.

- Reach out to recruit people with disabilities in the planning profession.

- Serve on Boards of disability organizations. Donate professional time to improve programs, link more creatively with city government.

- Develop long-term plans that reduce barriers, make the community more accessible for everyone.

- Expand use of information technology, and promote accessible communications, to improve access.

The World Institute on Disability Community Assessment Yardstick has created a tool for planners and other civic officials. Following the social indicator tradition, the Yardstick gives examples of disability-sensitive measures of community accessibility and support for independent living. Measures are developed in the areas of transportation, housing, education, and other areas of community life.

_____

Susan Stoddard, Ph.D., AICP is President of InfoUse, and a member of the California Planning Roundtable. She has served as Chair of APA's Human Services and Social Planning Division (now the Housing and Human Services Division). She is the Co-Director of the National Research and Training Center on Public Policy in Independent Living, conducting research on community accessibility.

Ed Roberts was co-founder and President of the World Institute on Disability in Oakland, California. Roberts, a post-polio respiratory quadriplegic, was the former Director of California's Department of Rehabilitation, and was the Executive Director of the Center for Independent Living, the first center of its kind in the country. Ed passed away in March, 1995. He has been described as the "Ghandi of the Disability Movement."

COMMENTS

By Paul C. Crawford, AICP

With most of the discussion in the preceding articles concentrating on social equity issues involving racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity, Stoddard and Roberts appropriately note that other citizens also face limited access to society's resources. Significantly, most measures to improve access for people with disabilities also serve other populations, including children and the elderly. Measures to improve physical accessibility also parallel recommendations for other social equity issues—more diversity of housing types in neighborhoods, broadening the composition of the profession to include more people with disabilities and, as with all aspects of social equity, learning how to work with this population on planning issues.

Aside from the specific concerns of the disabled, the work of the disability movement provides some other important lessons for planners, in some ways appearing as metaphors for addressing other social equity issues. Retrofitting either structures or social systems is more difficult than designing for accessibility/equity from the outset. A group which is denied equity long enough may choose direct political and legal action instead of continuing to work with unresponsive bureaucracies. The results of such actions may not work as well from a community (and individual) perspective as cooperative problem solving and consensus building. If implementation of some ADA provisions is more problematic because they were imposed "top-down" and do involve retrofitting, how easily will we be able to implement other social equity initiatives that did not emerge from cooperative processes?

Although most of the preceding articles have tended to describe social equity problems in terms of identifiable "groups," "communities," or "populations," William Claire's following article addresses social equity for the individual, which is ultimately the level that most matters.

_____

THE KEY TO SOCIAL EQUITY IN THE NEXT CENTURY - THE ASCENDANCY OF THE INDIVIDUAL

By William H. Claire III, AICP

California is engaged in a social experiment on a scale never seen before in history. We are amalgamating natives and émigrés from over 150 ethnic and racial entities into a community on a vast scale. We are different than all of the other states because only in our state there will be no majority ethnicity or race by the Year 2000. We have been and will always be a polyglot of race, ethnicity and economic means. Critical to our future is social equity.

In the final analysis, social equity can not be legislated or administered, by any single governmental organization, ethnic, religious or racial group, it must and will be related and practiced by the individual. We cannot delegate it or ignore it. It is the responsibility of each of us. It is guaranteed by our Constitution.

Social equity means giving or allowing each *individual* the quality of impartiality, opportunity, or consideration as given any other individual *without regard to any other societal criteria.*

Significant Long Term Trends

The agricultural age centered on the family farming unit as creator of wealth, the industrial age on the factory work unit, and the information age on the individual equipped with knowledge.

Intertwined, long term trends, promise to reduce in dramatic ways the dependency of individuals of the next century on societal institutions, existing social convention and privilege for personal development and advancement. These trends include:

- The acceleration of the information revolution/explosion.

- The global village and instantaneous global communication unfettered by institutional or cultural limitations, demographic characteristics and location. It is occurring over as yet unlighted and unsigned electronic highways . . . and is creating new world-wide, information-based "bankable wealth".

- The braiding and blending of many ethnic and cultural villages into a larger electronic community, blind to differences in physical ability, location, age, ethnicity, political party, race, gender, religion or wealth . . .

but grounded in the marketplace and the founding tenets of our nation.

Each trend augments and asserts the rights and importance of the individual, enhances the social equity of participants and adds momentum to the trend. It also begets a process of deconstruction and change of existing societal institutions which gradually become meaningless and ineffective unless they change too. Unfortunately for planning, these trends will have major impacts on our physical communities and our governance system.

In fulfillment of these trends, quietly and without fanfare, a new world-wide "electronic community" is emerging. It relies on the knowledge accessible to the individual working and communicating in concert with others and orchestrating vast amounts of information.

The ElecComm will liberate individuals long dependent on other people and institutions for information, direction, sustenance or activity. The electronic community functions without the need for government bureaucracies, equal result quota systems, expensive public welfare, educational or criminal justice systems.

As the troubles afflicting our urban areas continue and grow untreated—crime, pollution, socially dangerous behavior, decaying infrastructure—the ElecComm will flourish. Increasingly it will flourish in places other than major urban areas and thus further hasten the decline of large urban areas.

As urban dwellers seek quality of life, they are slipping the institutional bonds that chained them to downtown corporate offices, freeway commutes, and white shirt/blue suits and exposed their families to random violence, drugs and pollution. Many times the corporate world has abandoned them. They in turn with no further ties to the urban scene, are opting to move from the urban scene for the rural country-side and a different lifestyle. They are retiring to urban compounds and walled enclaves protected from outside threats by guards and gates. Family-time and leisure-time is once more equal to commuter-time and work time. Quality of life is enhanced, and the stresses of urban living are put behind them.

This is because the workplace is anywhere with a phone jack and electric outlet and operates

any day of the week. Colleagues are half a world away in some instances, never seen, spoken with only as needed, and at any time of day or night.

Our new arrivals and citizens alike will join the electronic community and the Information Highway ... all they need is a modicum of English skills, minor typing skill and a yearning for personal advancement. Cost will not be a deterrent. All of the material and equipment needed to travel the information highway is becoming cheaper each day.

The empowerment of the *individual through the availability of information, the ability to take unilateral action to further personal growth and wealth is virtually assured.* The current group will assimilate if they chose to do so more rapidly than any previous wave of immigrants . . . in the ElecComm.

Today, only 30% of American households have computers . . . about the same percentage as had telephones in 1930 . . . compare the costs and capabilities . . . at the two points in time. The number of household computers will double by the end of the century and then double again by 2010.

The Genie is out of the bottle!

Implications for Community Planning

The impacts of ElecComm have enormous import on the future of our *physical* communities. We will have to carefully examine the home office and business revolution, the implications of accommodating the electronic community and the land use and social issues to adapt our community plans to address the fallout from success or failure of the social programs currently in place. Large office and central city complexes may no longer be necessary for the conduct of "information" business. They create congestion, pollution and targets for crime and require expensive transportation and other infrastructure.

We must overcome the ineffectiveness of dealing with quality of life and personal safety concerns in our communities if they are to be livable or sustainable. People will go where they can have this quality at the earliest possible moment, leaving existing dangerous, blighted, urban areas without a backward glance.

Social equity in the next century in local communities will be dictated almost entirely by how we handle these challenges of planning our local physical communities so that they function to reduce barriers to economic opportunity, social discourse and ensure a quality of life guaranteed to each citizen by the Constitution and by the fruits of his/her own efforts.

The Electronic Community can play a major role in this effort to balance impartiality vs. privilege, fairness vs. injustice, inclusion vs. exclusion and equality of opportunity vs. equality of result in the next 20 years FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL IN THE STATE.

_____

William H. Claire III, AICP, is President of Claire Associates.

COMMENT

By Paul C. Crawford, AICP

Bill Claire's extrapolation on individual accessibility to the world through telecommunications finds a rare circumstance: a community where social equity may ultimately be achieved regardless of anyone's actions.

Much has been written about the inherent-ly pluralistic and egalitarian nature of the Electronic Community/ cyberspace): a global community where communication is unhindered by an individual's physical abilities, appearance, social or economic status, where information and ideas are the coin of the realm. Despite this optimistic view, Claire also understands that place-free work and electronic accessibility will reduce the time and opportunities available for *physical* communities to improve their living and social conditions, before they are abandoned by those who are not served. At the same time that telecommunications and the electronic infor-mation explosion offer planners tremendous resources as agents of change, physical commun-ities will never be more challenged to timely act, improve, and evolve.

The following article by Bell, Ying, and Wong and Alexeeff's subsequent "Epilogue" are proper conclusions for this introduction to social equity issues in planning, and constitute a call for continuing the work. The necessity for social equity only grows greater the longer it is absent.

WHY DO WE NEED TO PLAN FOR SOCIAL EQUITY?

By Al Bell, May C. Ying and Jack Wong

Social equity is the principle upon which our nation was founded: all men are created equal. Yet, that high principle wasn't really true even then. Many people were on the outside of equity, looking in. Even the highly respected Thomas Jefferson conscripted slave labor. Through the ages since then, undocumented and disadvantaged "shadow" workers have built our railroads, plowed our fields, tended our crops and looked after our children. Their cheaply bought labor drove much of our agricultural, domestic and portions of our industrial economy. Many eventually were assimilated into our culture and economy; many others remained permanently in the shadows.

Equity does not mean uniformity or balance in status or achievement: there will always be differences. What is increasingly distressing is the growing imbalance of resources, wealth, status, power, and influence among members of our communities. At times, the prevailing inequity was masked by the common denominator of people seeking the American Dream. That highly motivating vision lifted us above our daily struggles and sustained us through the painful periods in our nation's history.

Wracked by two world wars in this century, we placed immense strains on our resources. As our world view broadened and the diversity of our immigrants increased, so did our perceptions of who Americans are. Our optimism soared. Many of those shadow Americans were finally recognized as deserving of the principle of equality too—as they had long believed. Much—though not enough—was accomplished in terms of removing barriers to a fuller participation in our society. Then, sometime in the latter part of this century, the common thread that held us together began to fray. While this sort of national stress has occurred before, the current disenchantment is particularly complicated because of economic conditions impacting our large middle class, increasing diversity in our population and the uncertain position of our nation in a rapidly changing world balance of power.

Today, the economic woes of millions of our fellow Americans have helped, along with other forces, to create an "us versus them" mentality. Scapegoats for our economic and social malaise and allegedly quick solutions have become increasingly fashionable and acceptable. The spreading pervasiveness of our loss of hope is manifested in meanness, anger and mistrust that are driving us apart along racial, ethnic and economic lines.

The post World War II expansion of suburbia has now reached a point where central city problems have invaded the once insulated suburbs. The better life is now focused on the Safe Places: small towns outside the pall of metropolitan complexity. Frustrated with the difficulty in significantly reversing crime rates and increasingly empowered through emerging communications technology, individuals and families are beginning to opt for a simpler and less threatening environment.

For a growing number of Americans in the central cities and, even now in the suburbs, the historic growth pattern of segregation according to income, education and skin color enters a new chapter. Hopelessness among so many of our fellow Americans has taken on the symptoms of social paralysis. Many have given up on the Dream as a fraudulent illusion.

It is impossible to pick up a paper without noting the latest episode of gang warfare, drug abuse, child abuse, murder and confrontations in our streets. Even though the overall crime rate is declining slightly, many people feel more threatened by the horror of many of the crimes which occur. The slice of the pie for increasing numbers of us is diminishing sharply. As long as the pie kept getting larger, acculturation of those down the ladder a few rungs was acceptable— even desirable—as evidence that our relatively open market really works.

Amidst the anger and frustration, there are signs of revitalization of the spirit in our cities and towns. Individual responsibility, often eroded by expectations that someone else will take care of the situation, enjoys a resurgence in growing numbers of communities. Much of this is oriented toward pragmatic community efforts to fix problems now with local resources. A great deal of this energy arises out of neighborhoods housing Americans who have been seeking their shot at equity for a long time.

If we succeed in achieving a new level of social equity, (a target by no means assured) it will bring life back to our neighborhoods and communities. It will pull us through this monumentally frustrating period in our national evolution and justifiably restore our pride. Inventing how diversity in human terms can strengthen the quality of our lives will energize us,

just as preserving diversity in the natural environment will sustain us.

We can use at least two standards for assessing our accomplishments in the area of social equity. Compared to any other nation in the world, we have made monumental gains and remain a haven for those who seek a better life. Compared to our own declarations and principles, we still have a long way to go. In terms of empowering all individuals to achieve their aspirations without artificial (in contrast to self-imposed) barriers, we are in a race with ourselves, not other nations. That is why the Great American Experiment was undertaken and why we must continue to challenge our own performance.

Why do we need to plan for social equity? We need to plan for it because we don't have enough of it; because what we do have is diminishing; and because it is still within our grasp if we don't give up. We must plan for social equity because we, as Americans, have no acceptable alternative.

_____

Al Bell is a Principal of The Planning Center, a Newport Beach planning consulting firm.

May C. Ying is an architect in Los Angeles and Co-founder of Ethnopolis—a non-profit corporation devoted to planning for ethnically diverse communities—with her husband, Jack Wong.

Jack Wong is the Director of Community Development for the City of Huntington Park, Co-founder of Ethnopolis with his wife, May C. Ying.

EPILOGUE

By Val Alexeeff

Social Equity issues pose the question, "Who or what are we planning for?" The California Planning Roundtable is not unanimous in the perspectives, projections, or precursors that have been offered to explain social inequity, as there are so many ways to approach the issues. Debate will continue to rage on the cause and effect of social inequity.

The pieces compiled here capture glimpses of the issue. The next steps are to develop a framework for organization and examination of Social Equity issues, to debate the planners' role in this arena, to identify pivotal issues, and to gauge the priority of these issues relative to other planning priorities.

This section organizes recommendations from individual articles. Suggestions may be contradictory or inappropriate for some situations. Each reader must evaluate each suggested action for their own circumstance.

Community Interaction

The following recommendations are proposed to improve the analysis between the planning activity and a local community.

1. Ask the question, "For whom are we planning?"

2. Consider the tools a community needs to make a positive change.

3. Educate community members so they can participate effectively in planning and development activities. Hold community workshops on how the planning process, the development process, and real estate financing can make the planning actions less daunting and exclusionary.

4. Provide internships to community activists.

5. Write materials in the languages of existing and emergent populations. Obtain translators for public meetings. Place notices in non-English newspapers and radio. Provide closed captioned presentations for the hearing impaired.

6. Recognize that good communication (a key planning skill) includes recognition of cultural differences that filter communication.

7. Direct conversations to the applicant or applicant group rather than an interpreter, regardless of any language problem, unless

they choose to have their intermediaries act for them. Even then, take steps to assure that non-English speaking individuals understand exactly what is happening.

8. Nurture trust. Something as seemingly insignificant to a planner as showing up slightly late for a meeting, or not delivering on a processing time commitment, could be interpreted entirely differently by the non-English speaking client.

9. Reach out to social and civic organizations and local churches to involve low-income and minority households. Planners can use visioning exercises to help citizens understand the role of zoning and to identify alternative standards for residential and commercial development.

10. Recognize that all ethnic groups have amazingly similar basic aspirations. When they talk about where they'd like to live, they describe essentially the same neighborhood. It's largely a question of means, and who has the money to realize their aspirations. Unique cultural concerns often do not overshadow basic values.

11. Local boards and commissions are generally not representative of the diversity of the population. Encouraging the appointment of more ethnic members broadens the concept of local need. Local political leaders could begin to build a cadre of ethnic leaders with the experience and backing to move into higher elective office and should include ethnic populations in participation and decisionmaking.

12. In the planning process (e.g. general plan revisions) make sure that the disability community is represented in the planning process.

13. Use assessment to learn about options in the community, and learn how to work with people with disabilities on planning issues.

14. Examine and enhance neighborhood participation in the planning of their communities.

Consideration of Affected Communities

The following recommendations are proposed to improve access to decision-making for affected communities and relations between industry and adjacent, affected communities.

---

1. Encourage government or industry to offer technical assistance to the community to wade through the many documents that the companies provide in order to identify what is relevant and important to the community.

2. Encourage business in an area to train and hire local residents. Encourage government or industry to work with human service programs to improve employment skills of the resident population.

3. Encourage or require companies to establish community advisory panels which include local residents to work directly with the company(ies) and meet with them on a periodic basis to discuss issues and concerns related to the company and to the community.

4. Ask whether a proposal is a good idea from the community perspective, not simply the planning or industry perspective.

5. Acknowledge that noticing criteria are meant to inform people and enable them to participate, not simply to meet legal requirements, then revise notification accordingly.

6. Examine heavy industry designations to determine if residences and other sensitive receptors are permitted. Prior to amending the general plan from industrial to residential, analyze proximity to industry to determine potential effect on industrial operations.

7. Help industries clean up without imposing best available control technology. This way, the area can be improved, and industry can avoid using grandfather provisions to protect itself from expensive new technology.

8. If there are fines, return money to the community for community programs or improvements.

9. Stop approving houses around industry. Determine appropriate limits that will serve as buffer.

10. Set up ways that industries can contribute to the community in a clear, obvious way.

11. Have community and industry representatives talk about what they want, informally, with conversation directed to solutions rather than legal posturing.

12. Make the neighborhood a partner in the development negotiations. Tell them the truth about effects, community benefits, and the process. Set up monitoring to correct problems along the way.

Entry into the Planning Profession

The following recommendations are proposed for planning education to promote inclusion of under-represented communities in the planning process.

1. Planning schools, like the planning profession itself, have not yet acknowledged culturally diverse conceptions of need, community structure, family values, or what is appealing to the senses.

2. Universities and educators need to consider the curricula of planning schools, the diversity of the student body, educational activities for practicing planners, and community education. These issues should drive planning school curricula decisionmaking.

3. Design training places near exclusive emphasis on 18th and 19th Century European and American design and little on the design solutions of other countries and cultures. Communities in other parts of the world may have much to offer in relation to contemporary neighborhood issues.

4. Courses should emphasize subjects affecting social equity, such as race and ethnic diversity, multi-culturalism, social ecology and gender equity. Students should understand the importance of community organization and community-based planning/ economic development, and should learn skills in these areas. Social equity issues should be a prime consideration in any student project. For example, students should interview residents and meet with community organizations in any area for which they conduct a study or recommend planning and development policies.

5. Planning schools should establish and support mentor programs for minority planning students through school and the first few years of employment.

6. Ideally, the planning profession, and therefore the students at planning schools, should reflect the diversity of American society.

7. Planners should show us how to bring the community into the schools, encourage business and industry to adopt schools, participate actively in schools, and bring school children into the workplace.

8. Planners should recruit people with disabilities into the planning profession.

9. Planners can serve on Boards of disability organizations, donate professional time to improve programs.

Planning Methodology

The following recommendations address changes in the approach of planning to development issues through understanding the effect of actions of select populations.

1. Rather than separating the analyses of economic, environmental and fiscal impacts, all planning activities should consider their social implications so that all elements reinforce the planning goals.

2. Planners must acknowledge that objective standards are value laden. Examine "objective" standards for cultural implications.

3. We need to recognize that today's planning tools do not necessarily address the diversity of our communities, we should recommend changes accordingly.

4. District zoning preserves homogeneity and the status quo by preventing changes perceived as potentially detrimental to the interests of existing owners and residents. Zoning rules that reflect the values and priorities of those who got there first, often preclude changes that would accommodate newcomers or different lifestyles. Zoning regulations don't allow housing suitable for multigenerational families. Zoning is reactive and doesn't relate to the limited resources, such as capital improvement programming, or the allocation of public safety, social and health services, that local jurisdictions could use to affect the nature and timing of development.

5. Zoning ordinances must consider the modification of standards to promote housing and economic development of benefit to the entire community, such as density bonuses for affordable units and the waiver of standard residential requirements for mixed use development. Performance-based zoning that gives preference to applications that meet standards designed to advance social and environmental objectives such as transit access, inclusion of affordable housing or the provision of on-site childcare. Such considerations enhance community interaction and cohesion.

6. In zoning, development planners need to be inclusionary to advocate group home zoning

and flexibility in household size and composition.

7. Planners can promote a variety of housing to reflect a variety of household types and accessibility needs.

8. Planners may consider replacing traditional districting schemes with neighborhood-scale districts, including a range of housing types, community facilities (including public schools), and retail services defined in coordination with the local school district and other services.

9. The zoning ordinance can specify development goals and standards as ratios or percentages. Districts that meet goals for housing production could be given priority for new or upgraded public facilities and services such as parks and community centers.

10. Zoning regulations can mandate minimum densities to promote more efficient use of land resources and reduce development pressure on outlying areas. Traditional hierarchical zoning schemes that allow all permitted uses of lower density districts in higher density areas should be replaced. High density regulations should prohibit the wasteful underuse of land that is appropriate for more intense residential or commercial development, especially when services and infrastructure already exist.

11. For new construction, models of "universal" or "barrier-free" design can be used.

12. Planners should develop long-term plans that reduce barriers, make the community more accessible for everyone.

13. Planners need to use information technology to promote accessible communications, to improve access in all new developments, and to retrofit when possible.

Role of Government

The following statements address the role of government in considering Social Equity.

1. Government must reconcile common good with individual advantage. The free market is not a substitute for responsibility to the common good.

2. Today, the economic woes of millions of Americans have helped, along with other forces, to create an "us versus them" mentality. Scapegoats for economic and social malaise and allegedly quick solutions have become increasingly fashionable and acceptable. The pervasiveness of our loss of

hope is manifested in anger and mistrust that drive the County apart along racial, ethnic and economic lines. Government must find common ground in preserving and enhancing communities.

3. Government must make sure policies intended to promote affordable housing and other initiatives are not subverted.

4. For instance, government should enforce laws to see that communities do not use redevelopment housing dollars for operations or administrative systems, or for infrastructure for non-housing land use.

5. Government will have to examine the home, office and business telecommuni-cations revolution, and respond to the implications of the electronic community and the land use and social issues that arise as a result.

6. Government can consider regional approaches to help equalize infrastructure disparity by creating a regional pot of money to be spent according to regional needs. The current fragmented systems of local governments and special districts cannot provide equal quality infrastructure and services across the State.

Many of us embraced the planning profession because of its breadth of issues and perspectives. Born in the progressive era and dedicated to raising standards of public space, public faith in government and public health, the profession has encompassed every discipline that addresses our physical surroundings. But it is more comfortable for us to consider the details of the built community than to consider who benefits or how well it works for *all* residents. It is far easier to go through the checklists of General Plan Guidelines and CEQA than to ask, "What's the point? Who is affected? or How will this serve the community?"

As planners in California, we will be addressing the following community issues:

1. Growing disparity between government aims and neighborhood preservation interests.

2. Preoccupation with gated communities.

3. Alienation of minority and immigrant subcultures followed by confrontation among cultures.

4. Local need for improved telecommuni-cations infrastructure.

5. Tougher battles over affordable housing, use of redevelopment dollars, and infill.

6. Stronger arguments for regionalization of sales tax.

7. Cooperation or polarization of education and development constituencies.

8. Growth of objection to suburban develop-ment from urban constituencies rather than other suburban constituencies.

Recognition of social equity will help address these issues. Action on some of the suggestions may help address Social Equity issues in our respective communities. Planners who wish to be effective must get involved not only where they work but where they live. Communities need planning perspectives and experience. Elected leaders need to incorporate perspectives that consider the value of all segments of society. We welcome your comments. Please share your successes and "challenges" with us. They will be incorporated into future discussions.

_____

Appendix A

SOCIAL EQUITY SESSION AT 1994 CALIFORNIA CHAPTER APA CONFERENCE

The California Planning Roundtable Project on Social Equity

Edited by Naphtali H. Knox, AICP

This is an edited text of a session on Social Equity at the Cal Chapter APA Conference held in San Diego on Friday, October 21, 1994.

Introduction

In August 1992 The California Planning Roundtable participated in sponsoring a forum on *social equity*. The forum explored what we, the planning profession, could have done to be more responsive to the needs of our inner cities. Since then, members of the Roundtable have been grappling with understanding what *social equity* is. We have debated how the planning profession can promote greater equity in the public and private planning and decision-making process.

The Roundtable believes that urban planners must address issues that affect the good of our communities. Currently, most of our attention is given to land use and physical development. To ensure equitable results and influence the allocation of resources, comprehensive planning must take a new approach. In addition to assessing the economic, environmental, and physical impacts, we should also consider social implications so that all parts reinforce our overall planning goals. And we must evaluate our decisions for their unequal impact on different groups.

At the heart of the discussion of social equity are these questions: Who wins and who loses? What is the role of government? What are the responsibilities of the individual? What are the responsibilities of the planner? How can business be part of the solution while remaining competitive in the world economy?

Key Economic Trends in California

Trends that started in the 1960s and 1970s have now come upon us in the 1990s. In 1970, California's population was 19.9 million. We grew about 3.7 million to about 23.4 million by 1980. In the 80s, we saw a tremendous growth of 6.2 million people, taking us almost to 30 million people by 1990.

The White population grew modestly from about 17 million to about 20.5 million. By 2020, according to California Department of Finance (DOF) projections, the Hispanic and White populations will each equal around 20 million. By 2040, Hispanics will grow to about 31 million.

The African American population has grown modestly to about 7.5 million. It doubled its rate of growth from the 70s to the 80s. It grew from 3.6 million in the 70s to 6.2 million in the 80s. According to DOF projections, African American will add another 6.5 million in the 90s and another 6.5 million in the decade from 2000 to 2010.

While the state's population has been growing, per capita income has been declining. The total per capita income in 1980 in California was about $21 million. Then, during the 1980s, we had an early recession followed by a tremendous economic boom. Total per capita income grew to about $22 million. Since then, according to the UCLA Business Forecast, income per capita dropped about $1,000 to a total of around $20.4 million. If, as the population is growing, per capita income is declining, will people have the ability to pay for their desired quality of life?

California has been losing aerospace and other high income, high value-added industries. During the 80s, California employment grew to about 12.7 million, but recently dropped to a little over 11 million. Just in Los Angeles County, the drop in employment was about 600,000. Many other regions in California are facing similar declines, and it's not just the drop in jobs that is critical.

Local governments are losing their ability to pay for services. They have lost much of the stability they used to enjoy from the property tax. Property taxes tended always to be there and didn't fluctuate with the economy. By contrast, retail sales, which now provide the key revenue

for many jurisdictions, are tied very closely to the economy. There is a new uncertainty, with local jurisdictions having to know what is happening in and to the economy. It's not just a matter of jobs; it's also a question of whether local services can be provided.

Role-playing to Understand Social Equity

Members of the Roundtable role-played as members of a hypothetical Governor's Task Force on The Future of California. The job of Task Force members was twofold: To solicit input on the issue of social equity, and to advise the Governor on what needs to be done in the next century. Roundtable member Vivian Kahn, Manager of Current Planning and the Zoning Administrator for the City of Berkeley, played the role of Governor. Also on the Task Force were Ed Blakely, Dean of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Southern California, playing the role of President and CEO of InterInfoTel; Dr. Denise Fairchild, President of Neighborhood Strategies Group in Los Angeles, playing the role of an advocate planner in Los Angeles; and Jack Wong, Community Development Director for the City of Huntington Park, playing the role of Mayor of Huntington Park.

Governor played by Vivian Kahn: As Stan Hoffman indicated, soon no racial or ethnic group will be a majority in California. That creates a possibility for the most truly integrated society our country has ever seen. Unfortunately, only after the civil disturbances in Los Angeles did some learn the true nature of the problems we face. Those problems include the incredible burden of racial discrimination and a concentration of poverty that spawned a generation without hope. The disturbances testified to the flawed and failed policies of benign neglect and well-meaning programs that missed their mark. The programs failed because they didn't give citizens the tools they need to effect and sustain positive change in their communities.

State and local government should be making decisions based on creating the greatest good for the greatest number. Instead, our decisions and actions have contributed to increasing the isolation of great numbers of our citizens—citizens who already suffer the dual burdens of poverty and racial discrimination. We have thereby increased the race, class, and ethnic divisions among us.

The purpose of this Task Force is to identify the responsibilities of government in creating greater opportunities for those with few or no opportunities. The luster of the Golden State has not been permanently dimmed; we can enter the 21st century as a truly integrated society.

It is appropriate to begin the work of this Task Force at a conference of urban planners. Planners are problem solvers. They have the skills and tools to deal with complex issues. They are trained to approach problem solving comprehensively. They understand the importance of getting all of the stakeholders involved in making decisions. Planners can be agents of change; they can fully participate with multiple publics; and they can strive toward a multi-cultural community where opportunities are increased.

President and CEO of InterInfoTel, played by Ed Blakely: As you all know, telecommunication is one of the fastest growing industries in California and very important in international trade. The growth of this industry depends on people. California no longer has the human resources needed for this industry to grow, and our company, like many others, is thinking about leaving the state. Utah, New Mexico, and other states have friendlier environments. One reason for our decision to move is the increasing polarization of the workforce in California. That polarization has led to an increase in crime, and to despair among certain groups who are no longer employable. We are a growth industry that depends on the growth of surrounding industries. When California's industries lag, then InterInfoTel must seek better pastures.

Communication is critical to international trade. If we can use the language skills and other assets of our multi-cultural labor force, California can be a big player in the world. But at this juncture, InterInfoTel and many other companies are thinking about better places to settle and grow.

Advocate planner, role-played by Dr. Denise Fairchild: I am a dinosaur in planning—the advocate planner. I am here to challenge planners about the work you do that re-enforces the disadvantages of those who are already on the bottom rung of the ladder. I'm here to challenge you to look at the cultural complexities of your communities and to invent new methodologies and new languages for inclusion.

Inclusion means involving ethnic communities that don't understand our planning jargon. It is technical language that keeps ethnic communities outside decision-making. A lot of work needs to be done on the issue of distributed justice and balanced growth. And we should by 1996 integrate the Board of the California Chapter of the American Planning Association.

Mayor of Huntington Park, played by Jack Wong: Mayors need to be involved in examining the question of social equity. We face it daily. As leaders, we are always grappling with how to better represent the people who elected us. One group of elected officials says we need to have greater participation within our public processes. Another group says they were elected by the long-time residents and know what is best for the community.

Well, what should we as elected officials do to best represent our people? Daily we are faced with shortages. The California economy is down the tubes. We've had revenue shortfalls the last four years. About 700,000 people have lost their

jobs in this state since 1990. We need to look at the social equity issue, but frankly, we have economic problems.

The Governor's political consultant, role-played by David Booher: Before we get on with all this BS about social equity, let's just spell out the reality. First, the governor was reelected because the Anglo majority fears immigration and crime. Second, only 26 percent of the California population eligible to vote showed up at the polls. You were elected by about 12 percent of the voting public. Third, we have tremendous economic problems that you managed to hold off for the last four years. You're going to have to deal with those in the next four years. We are going to see more aerospace layoffs and defense conversions. About the only kinds of jobs we are creating are in sales or at fast-food restaurants. On top of that, we have experienced an income disparity over the past 12 years in which two-thirds of the income growth has gone to 1 percent of the families. The reality of governing a democracy in this state is that you will need a broad political base.

Some of the non-voters are going to quit complaining and get out and vote. Some of the big businesses are going to quit complaining about government regulation and get their employees to participate in the political process. The reality is that unless we can produce a political climate where the voters reflect the people instead of the white, wealthy, and elderly, you can plan on spending a lot of money on the National Guard to quell civil disturbances.

A new town planner, role-played by Marjorie Macris: I'm Brenda Burnham, a planner with the new City of El Tercero on the shores of the Salton Sea in Imperial County. Some of the problems we faced there might shed some light on planning education for students, for practicing planners, and for the community.

My first project for El Tercero was locating a landfill. I did a regression analysis, just as I was taught in planning school. I found that the most cost beneficial location for the new landfill, in terms of travel costs and air quality impact, was a location next to an older low-income community. My proposal to locate the landfill there generated some really nasty phone calls. A lot of them were in Spanish, but I got the picture that the residents were not pleased.

The planning director and I decided to hold a public hearing in the neighborhood most affected by the proposed landfill. The meeting was held in a hiring hall. It was jam packed. Ms. Marcella Gomez presented a map showing where the people in her community live. It became apparent that these were real people with real lives and real jobs. But the community has no sewers or paved streets.

At the close of the hearing, I suggested to the planning director that we redirect our efforts and plan for improving the neighborhood. I also suggested that we hire Ms. Gomez as a part-time planning aide to help us. We got a position created despite the civil service bureaucracy, and Ms. Gomez worked with us in establishing a capital improvement program for the neighborhood. She also organized her community to become an effective voice and helped get them started doing cleanup and fixup tasks.

Ms. Gomez really liked working with us, and she's now taking some planning classes at San Diego State. All of this leads to certain questions about planning education. What should planners study in order to be better prepared to deal with issues like this? Shouldn't communities be planned by people who know what it's like to live in them? Shouldn't the planning profession look more like America?

Statistics show that the planning profession and planning schools are a lot more white and Anglo than the rest of the country. One of the things the planning profession might do is reach out to high school students and sponsor mentor programs and scholarships. Planning schools might teach students to deal with social as well as economic and environmental impacts. Also, there should be opportunities for people involved in their communities, like Ms. Gomez, to learn about planning and how to work with City Hall. It also seems there are opportunities for paraprofessional positions to be held by community residents who can learn how they can help shape their neighborhoods. And there should be opportunities for practicing planners to learn what they need to know about social equity and cultural differences. Right now, Ms. Gomez is helping me learn Spanish.

President and CEO of InterInfoTel, Blakely: Ms. Burnham, how was your meeting publicized, and what did you do for translation services?

Town planner Burnham: We just sent out notices in English. It became clear at the meeting that a lot of people didn't understand what I was saying. Ms. Gomez was nice enough to get up and translate. Now when we have meetings in that community, we arrange to have people translate.

Community activist, role-played by Val Alexeefff: Social equity too easily becomes a theoretical debate among bureaucrats. In North Richmond, our lack of social equity is as obvious as it was in the South in the 1950s. Some basic statistics: The population of North Richmond is 2,300. Its median income is one-fifth the County median. Half of the households live below the poverty level. Owner occupancy is 28.5 percent. Fewer than 10 percent of the jobs in the community are filled by community residents.

Heavy industry is prevalent, roads are in disrepair, land uses are a checkerboard with small subdivisions separated from industrial plants by razor wire. There are drugs, drive-by shootings, and social workers. The community is not unique in the country. Consider this case study:

On July 26, 1993, a loophole in industrial regulations allowed oleum to be stored in a railroad tank car. Through a series of mishaps, an explosion occurred that resulted in sulfuric acid being released in a fine mist over a radius of several miles. In the usual manner, the risk was minimized by local agencies and industries until the magnitude became too great to ignore. In our community, we constantly live with sight and respiratory irritation. It takes an incident like this to make the outside world take notice.

The regulators talk about risk management. We need to examine who is taking the risks and who is getting the benefits. Bureaucrats make the rules, set procedures, tell us environmental requirements are being followed, but do not live within a mile of heavy industry. They tell us that emissions are within standards, but they do not see the color of the sky or live with the smell, ash, or noise. They tell us laws are in place, but there are no laws to absolutely prevent our exposure. Further, budgets have been cut, so regulations to protect us are not enforced.

We go door to door to assess health problems and submit our reports. But they tell us our information is anecdotal, inconclusive, and results not from the petrochemical industry, but from our lifestyles. When they approve expansion of industry, they create a process that is confusing and inaccessible. They bury us in technical detail rather than provide information about what we can expect or what we have to give up.

When they justify approval, they talk about jobs; yet no one in the community gets those jobs. When industry pollutes, is caught, and gets fined, the money goes to the State General Fund or provides a fee for the regulatory agency. No consideration is given to our remaining problems. Nor is there any monetary return to the community (except in this case study, the money did come back as a health clinic for the community).

Considering our experience, I recommend the following:

1. Get rid of the paperwork and get the players to the table to talk about solutions.
2. Help industries clean up without best available control technology, so we can get some improvement without industry using grandfather provisions to avoid new technology.
3. If there are fines, bring the money back into the community.

4. Stop approving houses around industry.
5. Set up ways that industries can contribute to the community in a clear, obvious way.
6. Bring groups to the table to come up with solutions rather than lawyers.

President and CEO of InterInfoTel, Blakely: Mr. Activist, you and I are on the same page. We both want industry and industrial growth and we want to get rid of paperwork. But it's people like you who create the paperwork. Every time we try to establish a business, you require EIRs and one thing or another to mitigate the problems. You can't have it both ways. You can't say you don't want paperwork, but then require the very paperwork that keeps businesses—even good clean businesses—from coming into the community.

Community activist Alexeefff: Neither I nor my community created the paperwork. Paperwork is the bureaucrats' solution to the problem as opposed to dealing with the toxics and the emissions with which we live. I would be happy to sit down with my community and your company to talk about what you want, what it will mean to us, and what we can do to locate you in the community. After we're done, we can let somebody else worry about the paperwork.

Advocate planner Fairchild: Mr. Activist, would you find it appropriate that we evaluate and monitor the racial or ethnic impact of a particular project siting or planning decision on disadvantaged communities—i.e., a racial impact study?

Community activist Alexeefff: Putting a nuclear waste depository on the Mescalero Apache Reservation doesn't require a study to know the community will be impacted. Walk through a community; see the industries that nobody else wants. Look at the color of the people and where they live—you don't need a study. However, this government and this country seem to function only through studies. We have no problem with studies, so long as they are released once they're done. Too many studies are buried once someone learns the results are not what they want.

Mayor Wong: Mr. Activist, I represent the cities in California, some small, some large. As you heard from Mr. Hoffman, sales tax revenue has precipitously dropped. Small communities are really eager to attract sales tax revenue. What should we do in a small community of two or three square miles, when an industry wants to use a site that's been vacant for several years? A case in point is a recycler who has come into one of our towns. He wants to occupy about three acres out of three square miles. The site is located across the street from residential. The proposed use is environmentally beneficial. They plan to crush concrete into aggregate for use in paving streets throughout California. But with the prospect for

emissions off the site, noise and dust, there have been a lot of complaints from neighbors.

Community activist Alexeefff: Make the neighborhood a partner and tell them the truth about what the effects will be—the jobs; the community benefits. Too often, industry plays card tricks with the neighborhood. Industry promises jobs, but they're for workers from a 50 square mile area. If we get the truth, the community will respond. But if we are lied to, we get angry, and then it takes a long time to regain our support.

Advocate planner Fairchild: Question for campaign manager Booher: You've made a very serious charge that immigrant communities come into California communities and don't fully participate. It's easy to complain, but we're here to seek solutions. Clearly there are language and cultural barriers to participation, but we know that new immigrant residents are involved in the economic growth of our communities. Their enterprises and small businesses are major generators of jobs, so they are creating opportunities for themselves and others. What could the State or the planning profession do to ensure more political participation by people who have never understood participatory democracy? These are people who don't know they have a right to complain about the quality of their lives. In the countries from which they come, they could be jailed if they said something against the government or an official. What do we do to ensure their political inclusion?

Political Consultant Booher: My experience is that you don't get political participation unless people are inspired by their leaders. Their leaders are not represented on community planning boards and commissions or in the planning profession. So you could be more aggressive to assure that appointed boards and commissions reflect the nature of the community. That will have immediate and long-term effects. You will begin to build a cadre of political leaders capable of going out and inspiring others to participate in the political process.

CEO Task Force member Blakely: Let me ask a delicate question. Do you feel that the local political leadership has to represent the dominant ethnic group within the community in order to be representative? Or do you think that a person who is a leader and elected to the council and is involved in the community—no matter his or her race or ethnic identity—can be an effective councilperson?

Political Consultant Booher: I am a political consultant, and all that's gobbledygook to me. We're talking about a society that's split. We're talking about fractures in society—economic, social, and ethnic. If you don't do something to engage the problem and repair the fracture, what

you're saying doesn't make any difference; it's meaningless. The Governor is a great leader, but she's going to be in a mess this term. She can't raise taxes and can't cut services and has no political constituency to solve any of these problems. So you can have great political leadership that can't do anything because they don't have any followers. My point is that in a diverse society, you have to come up with mechanisms to engage all the elements in a political process or, as Adam Smith said, it won't stand. Some cultures like Malaysia do it with formulas in which representation is guaranteed in the legislative body. I believe in California we could begin to make progress by, yes, quotas. My point is there *are* leaders out there in the community that represent its diverse nature. Those leaders can be found and can be appointed to commissions. Don't hide behind some stupid argument that you can't have leaders who don't reflect the ethnic diversity.

Mayor Wong: The State should set up a program to groom future leaders, of different ethnic groups, to become effective leaders. Some of our Hispanic communities have recently been given power, but their leaders have not had the grooming experience.

Governor Kahn: At this point, I would like to call for comments from additional panels.

Marta Self (role-playing): I'm a consultant with Regional Advocates, Inc. The growth and change in the population of California during the next 40 to 50 years will place incredible strain on all of our systems—transportation, water supply, sewage treatment, housing, educational facilities, and all other infrastructure and services. Affluent, expanding areas will be able to afford to make the improvements they need and still have quality services. Poor areas with stagnant economies will not. In the 21st century, the kinds of highways we have, the quality of our schools, and even the reliability of our water supply will depend upon where we live. Clearly, regional approaches can help equalize infrastructure by creating a regional pot of money to be spent according to regional needs. The current fragmented systems cannot provide equal quality infrastructure and services across the state.

CEO member Blakely: The business community will be very supportive of that approach. Our current city structures hail from agricultural times. They are outmoded and impractical. They do not reflect the diversity or the needs of the state. So one of the things we should do is examine a restructuring of the State even if we have to do it constitutionally.

Mayor Wong: While I understand the value of regional planning, I question what regionalism does for local participation and decision-making. As we move up the decision-making chain, we

reduce participation. How can we balance localism and regionalism?

Marta Self: Funding is the first benefit to localism that regionalism can offer.

Larry Mintier, role-playing as James Chaney-Pleasant, Assistant Planning Director of Rancho Greenview: We are a planned community that incorporated about five years ago. We are gated, and I've stewed for some years about the role of the planning profession in promoting this flight to the suburbs. We are the classic suburban community that receives so much of this outmigration. Over the past 40 years, planning has accommodated the small town picture of city park surrounded by churches, friendly policemen, kids riding to school on bicycles, trim lawns and trim hedges, single-family homes equipped with the latest electronic devices and gadgetry, massive supermarkets, private golf courses, and little league fields. In every respect we seem to be promoting safety and control in an effort to create a comfortable, serene, and secluded environment.

But this goal is fundamentally isolationist, exclusionary, and elitist. It panders to all the motivations of the middle class instinct to flee the central cities. It's ironic that we planners are part of the support system that enables this flight to suburbia. It's ironic that the strongest attack on this form of development comes from existing suburbs wishing to reinforce exclusionary principles.

The planning profession needs to accept a large share of the responsibility for creating this pattern of exclusion. Planners do have choices. We can oppose suburban patterns of development and refocus on infill. We can promote better access to the suburbs through a variety of techniques. Maybe we can find ways to tap the wealth accumulating in the suburbs and share it with the central cities. There may be other options, but we cannot ignore the problem much longer. It's a serious problem, and the planning profession has to accept a good share of the responsibility for finding a solution.

CEO Blakely: Then are you proposing a regional tax structure? Would we have a regional sales tax?

Mintier (Chaney-Pleasant): Frankly, I think that makes a lot of sense.

Advocate planner Fairchild: An observation: When you talk about white flight to the suburbs, it's not so much an ethnic issue as an economic one. It's the pursuit of a dream or a goal—the search for the perfect home.

Mintier (Chaney-Pleasant): Frankly, I think all ethnic groups are amazingly similar in terms of their basic aspirations. When they come down to describing the model neighborhood, they describe

essentially the same neighborhood. It's largely a question of means and who has the financial ability to actually realize their aspirations.

Woody Tescher role-playing as Los Angeles Mayor Riordan: Isn't social equity a theoretical impossibility when we have an unlimited migration of have-nots into our communities? Every time we provide new schools and work with developers and businesses to provide job opportunities and other amenities, we get hit with yet another wave of have-nots, and all of the progress we made is dissipated. Our needy population keeps growing. The revenues we get per capita decrease over time. And even though we provide new opportunities, we seem to be on a very slippery slide downhill. Our problems are compounded by our neighbors in the suburbs who tend to put up walls as we try to provide additional opportunities: They shut down development, decentralize school districts, and put up walls to create a defensible perimeter around their communities. We continue to see changes in families and ethnic and demographic characteristics. We see larger families, people doubling up, illegal units. People are living in or over the garages in single-family neighborhoods. We can't shut them down, and it's getting worse.

CEO Blakely: You raise some important and challenging ethical and moral issues, particularly about how we should respond to immigration. I want to at least make the point that our economy is fueled by immigration. The major manufacturing base in Los Angeles is apparel. The apparel industry is the largest in the country. And it is supported by the immigrant community. It is our major employers, major multi-national retailers, manufacturers, and subcontractors who support the growth of immigration. We have to look at who's supporting immigration and what immigration supports before we say that immigration isn't good, that it brings infrastructure problems and a need to build schools. Immigration supports basic economic growth and the service components that follow it.

Governor Kahn: Would our second panel please come forward?

Roberta Mundie, role-playing as school board member Amy Penn: I'm on a school board in an area where enrollment is growing rapidly, and there is a lot of fear about this among my constituents. They worry about the effect the growing enrollment will have on the quality of the education their children receive. They worry because growing enrollment means increased social diversity, and they don't know how to handle it. That's why I wanted to come here and talk to you about this today. The questions you're raising about social equity, if we're going to address them at all, have to be addressed in our schools. And we're going to need to restructure our schools radically if we want them to serve that

---

purpose for us. Planners can be of some help on this issue. They can do a better job of incorporating educational needs when they plan communities. They can force developers to talk to schools. They can negotiate school facilities as part of development agreements.

I think planners can supplement curriculum. They can act as mentors to people in the schools. They can help develop partnerships between education and industry. But if somebody asked me what I'd like to see from the State, let's face it, it's money. Many of the things we need to improve our schools cost money that we don't have. I know you've made a great commitment to build new prisons. That's where a lot of the money in the State will be going. But if you don't have money for schools, what can you do to help us address social equity? It seems to me you could give us some more flexibility in the school planning process. You could provide leadership in showing us how to bring the com-munity into the schools, business and industry adopting schools, participating actively in schools and bringing school children into the workplace, whether through apprenticeships in the older years or simply school visits in the younger years so that the school children feel that they are part of the community and the community feels that it is part of the schools. That is the only way that we're going to eliminate our fear of diversity and create a system that will enable our children to live in a community with others.

Governor Kahn: Has your school board participated at all with your city in planning activities? Do you have representation on commissions and other groups working on general plan revisions? Do they consult with you? What role, if any, does the school district have in all that?

School board member Penn: Our biggest problem is just getting school facilities on the ground in the face of the growth that we are experiencing. And regrettably, since we're a bedroom community, we don't have a lot of industries to call on for help either. It's a real problem for us. We're just trying to get sites ahead of the time when the land price goes up.

Advocate planner Fairchild: The schools are a valuable partner in communities. They are probably one of the largest landowners of open space in inner-city areas, and most cities badly need open space. People do not have enough area to run and play. If you can be more aggressive in talking to city government and forging new agreements and partnerships, they will be willing partners to work out arrange-ments for multi-use of their facilities.

Tom Jacobson, representing statewide community organizations: I want to talk about the crisis in education that we're facing in California,

some responses to it, and its relationship to the planning process. I don't have to tell you that there is a crisis in education. We all know that CEO Blakely is desperately trying to find qualified employees. Mayor Wong's city and others repeatedly have to deal with the education crisis. My concern is, "What's the response? What are we seeing?"

Well, what we're seeing is a circling of the wagons, and the circle gets smaller all the time. The response to our education crisis is the rats leaving the sinking ship. We're seeing a decreasing commitment to public education. Voucher systems have been proposed and will probably be enacted soon. We're seeing a lack of commitment to public higher education. Well, who does that hurt? It doesn't hurt the people with money to send their kids to private schools. What we see is an increasingly stratified educational system, and a rigidity without precedent. Public education in California, once the jewel in the crown, is tarnished and is about to disappear.

How does that relate to the planning process? How does the business community decide where to locate those uses that no one wants? I'm not talking about corporate headquarters, Nordstrom, or the auto mall. I'm talking about the uses that Activist Alexeefff described—the toxic-spewing facility that no community wants.

Well, how the business community decides where those things go is pretty simple. They look for places populated by doctors, lawyers, and planners—people who were the recipients of this state's once magnificent education system—and they don't go there. Those people know where and when the city council meets. They'll be at the council meetings. They will have written letters. They will have spoken to their congressperson. They'll be nothing but trouble. So the business community will locate where people don't have those skills, where education has not served them, where the residents can't represent their interests effectively.

Campaign manager Booher likes to ignore this fact, but he's the recipient of a quality education from the public schools of California. He panders to people's lowest instincts. I say everyone in this state needs to grapple with the crisis. We need the courage and commitment to do what's right rather than play to the lowest common denominator.

Linda Hale, role-playing as Jane Goodplanner, a planner in the City of Santa Ana in Orange County: Santa Ana is the largest city in Orange County. It recently went from an Anglo to a Hispanic majority. In Sana Ana, I am a really frustrated social planner because of our inability to pinpoint the issues associated with social equity. What *is* social equity? Until we can define it, how

can we begin to resolve it? What is the *standard* for social equity? Is the objective to achieve a median household income for everybody in the community? Is it equal access to all institutions in the community? Is it the opportunity to have a job, a car, a VCR? Is it the literacy and competency needed for employment?

I'm concerned about these questions. My community was not built on ideals like social equity, nor was our county. Unless we identify a concentrated approach to begin to address these issues, we will be fragmented in trying to define what social equity is. We all need to be clear about what we mean by social equity and how it will benefit our community. Else we'll have nothing more than another of the Great Society's failed social planning efforts. So I'd like to see this Task Force focus on identifying the specific issues of social equity.

Speaker from audience, Bernadette: I'm from the Legal Aid Society of San Diego. I know you hate lawyers, but if you as planners don't begin to pay attention to the law—specifically the laws dealing with redevelopment dollars, housing elements, and general plans—I'm going to be a thorn in your side. Your communities and planning groups have to help communities overcome NIMBYism. You have to do the planning necessary to provide low, very low, and low-moderate income housing. If you don't, you won't have homes for the lower paid workers you've all been talking about. And if you don't recognize the issues that social experts have been dealing with, you're going to see *more* litigation. We may all argue that that's not a cost-effective way to provide things the communities need in order to achieve economic diversity; but if you don't do it at the community planning level, I'll see you in court. We will enforce the law to see that communities do not use housing dollars for operations or adminis-trative systems, and that they don't hide in their budgets the tax increment dollars that are to be used to build houses in poorer neighborhoods and instead use that money in neighborhoods that already receive the bulk of city services and benefits.

CEO Blakely: I want to go back to the social equity issue, and I stress *equity*. One of the components of social equity is *balance*. Why should a community want only my firm's headquarters and not the manufacturing operations? Your acceptance of the manufacturing means you have to house some of our workers. So you decided not to house our workers, and we decided to leave the state. If you sue us, we will leave the state even sooner. This is serious. Condominium lawsuits have almost closed down San Diego County's housing industry. If new condominium housing is not provided in San Diego County, we won't locate any businesses there. Then people who need jobs in San Diego County won't get them because

lawyers and engineers made more money by suing than by solving problems.

Speaker from audience: I work for the City of Santa Barbara. Although many people consider us an upscale community, we have a median family income below that of the county and the state. Our population is about 40 percent Hispanic. In the past few years, we have reached out to the Hispanic community. We translate at most of our meetings. We place notices in Spanish language newspapers and on Spanish language radio. We had closed captioning at a community meeting last night so the hearing-impaired who don't know sign language could also participate.

Governor Kahn: I would like to read a comment that was handed to me from a member of the audience: "I am an American citizen, having immigrated from Korea to California 14 years ago. Since my immigration, I have been a college student, employee, employer, and taxpayer. The decline of employment and tax base is, in my opinion, less a problem of race or legal immigration, than a symptom of the social decline of the family. Since the early 1980s, Asians have been seen as socially moving upward with higher standards of living. It's been my observation that if this is true, it has less to do with affirmative action, social programs, and the endless rhetoric and legislation, and more to do with mom and dad at home ensuring that homework is done. Life is hard; patience and hard work are a virtue; and over the long haul in this country, like no other, you can prosper."

As you can see, this issue is extra-ordinarily complex, and yet it is also simple: "Can we all live together?" I urge you as planners and citizens to get involved, not only where you work, but where you live. Don't do this only on the job. It should be part of what you do in your lives. Become involved in your communities and give them the benefit of your training and experience. And let your elected leaders hear from you.

Appendix B

MEMBERS OF THE CALIFORNIA PLANNING ROUNDTABLE

Valentin V. Alexeeff, Director
Contra Costa County
Growth Management Agency

Edward J. Blakely, Dean
School of Urban and Regional Planning
University of Southern California

Jeff Carpenter, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
L.A. Community Redevelopment Agency

Paul C. Crawford, AICP
President
Crawford Multari & Starr

Susan A. DeSantis
Principal
The Planning Center

Diana Elrod
Principal
Solutions for Affordable Housing

Kenneth Entin, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
California State University, Stanislaus

Janet Fairbanks, AICP
Principal Planner
San Diego Association of Governments

Denise Fairchild, Ph.D.
Community Development Consultant

Melanie Fallon, Director
Community Development Department
City of Huntington Beach

Wayne Goldberg, AICP, Director
Department of Community Development
City of Santa Rosa

Terry Hayes
Principal
Terry Hayes Associates

Stanley R. Hoffman, AICP
Principal
Stanley R. Hoffman Associates

Victor Holanda, AICP, Director
Office of Permit Assistance
Trade & Commerce Agency

John Jaquess
Principal
Topping/ Jaquess & Associates

Vivian Kahn, AICP
Principal
Kahn/ Mortimer/ Associates

Barbara Kautz, Director
Community Development Department
City of San Mateo

Naphtali H. Knox, AICP
Principal
Naphtali H. Knox & Associates

Marjorie Macris, AICP
Consultant

Ken Milam, AICP, Director
Department of Permit & Resource Mgmt.
Sonoma County

Larry Mintier, AICP
Prinicpal
J. Laurence Mintier & Associates

Roberta Mundie
President
Mundie & Associates

Appendix - Members of the California Planning Roundtable

Don Rose
San Diego Gas & Electric

Janet Ruggiero, AICP, Director
Community Development Department
City of Woodland

Sylvia Ruiz
President
Tierra Concepts

Ann Siracusa
Principal City Planner
City of Los Angeles

Susan Stoddard, Ph.D., AICP
Principal
InfoUse

Richard A. Watson, AICP
Principal
Richard Watson & Associates

Frank Wein, AICP
Director and Office Manager
Harland Bartholomew & Associates

Jack Wong, Director
Community Development Department
City of Huntington Park

Reba Wright-Quastler, AICP, Director
Department of Planning Services
City of Poway

Emeritus Members

Al Bell
The Planning Center

David E. Booher, AICP
Geyer Associates, Inc.

William H. Claire, III, AICP
Principal
Claire Associates, Inc.

Dianne Guzman, AICP, Director
Planning and Development Department
City of Sacramento

Bob Harris
Robert Harris & Associates

Frank Hotchkiss
Urban Possibility

Tony Lettieri, AICP, Principal
Lettieri-McIntyre & Associates

Julie Castelli Nauman
The Planning Center

Kenneth E. Sulzer, AICP
Executive Director
San Diego Association of Governments

Susan Trager
Attorney at Law

1