CALIFORNIA PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT REPORT

April 1989 | William Fulton, Editor & Publisher | Vol. 4, No. 4

L.A. Air Plan Prompts Talks on Regionalism

Special Report: Legislative Roundup
Turn to Page 4

The passage of the Los Angeles area's sweeping air quality plan appears to have added momentum to the growing fear among local governments in Southern California that the state will usurp some of their land-use powers. As a result, the plan's passage may motivate local governments to engage in more cooperative planning arrangements on the sub-regional level, and add fuel to a movement to decentralize the Southern California Association of Governments.

In any event, it appears almost certain that the localities' iron grip over land uses within their borders will be weakened somewhat over the next couple of years — perhaps by cooperative arrangements, perhaps by the South Coast Air Quality Management District, and perhaps by the state legislature itself. Such a trend would hardly be unique to California; other states have been intruding on local land-use powers and a new study by the National League of Cities concludes that local governments actually have far less power over the use of land within their boundaries than they typically think.

More than 50 legislative bills have been introduced this year dealing with growth management issues in the state. The number and scope of these bills greatly exceed what was seen in the last legislative session. Most of these bills seek to deal with land-use regulations on a regional or sub-regional level, either by forcing local governments to follow state policies more closely when making land-use decisions, *Continued on page 6*

Cities Continue to Impose Restrictions on Growth

Experts may believe that the growth management debate has been elevated to the state and regional level — but there's still plenty of activity on the local ballot around the state.

Burbank and Pasadena both passed growth-control measures in March. Thousand Oaks extended a growth-control ordinance — perhaps the oldest in Southern California — that was due to expire. Voters in Diamond Bar approved incorporation, largely for reasons of land-use control. And supervisors in Orange County, under pressure to control growth even though a county ballot measure failed, passed growth management plans.

Of all these actions, the Pasadena election received the most publicity, mostly because it involved competing measures on the ballot. PRIDE, a local slow-growth group, defeated a city council-backed measure with a wide-ranging growth plan that includes limits on the number of multifamily residential units and a cap on commercial construction in the city.

The incorporation election in Diamond Bar, near Pomona, was noteworthy because cityhood had failed in both 1983 and 1986. It was the first San Gabriel Valley city to incorporate in almost 30 years, and indications were that regional (or at least sub-regional) growth forces played a role in the victory; with the *Continued on page 8*

Court Agrees to Rehear Public Housing Case

The California Supreme Court's recent decision requiring stricter voter approval of public housing projects has caused such a political ruckus that the court has agreed to rehear the case.

Typically, the state's high court will only rehear a case if it has had a change in personnel or if a U.S. Supreme Court has issued a new ruling that changes existing law. But neither has happened in this case. Rather, the court apparently buckled under to legal pressure — and some not-so-subtle political pressure from Senate President Pro Tem David Roberti — to make its decision more clear.

At issue is Article 34 of the state's constitution, an initiative passed in 1950 at the behest of the California Association of Realtors, which requires local voter approval for all public housing projects. For 38 years local jurisdictions around the state placed broad, vague measures on their ballots, asking approval of several hundred units at a time but providing no site-specific information. At present, localities have some 70,000 units approved in this fashion but as yet unbuilt. About 30,000 of these units have been approved in the City of Los Angeles alone.

In December, however, the state Supreme Court ruled by a 4-3 vote that Article 34 ballot measures must provide more specific information. (*CP&DR*, January 1989.) The ruling in *Davis v. Berkeley* struck down two city elections in Berkeley *Continued on page 3*

UPDATE

Cranston Introduces Housing Bill With D'Amato's Help

California Sen. Alan Cranston has introduced his National Affordable Housing Act with co-sponsorship of one-quarter of the Senate.

Cranston has worked hard over the last year to take the lead in placing housing high on the post-Reagan federal agenda. (*CP&DR*, June 1988 and March 1989.) His bill, which carries a pricetag of about $4 billion, was given a bipartisan tone by co-author Sen. Alphonse D'Amato, a Republican from New York.

The provisions of the bill are targeted primarily at low-income housing problems and first-time homebuyers. "The object is the bill is to provide more housing within the financial reach of the average income American and to ensure tht the needs of very low-income families are also met," he said in introducing the bill. The proposal is based largely on the recommendations of the National Housing Task Force, appointed by Cranston and D'Amato and co-chaired by developer James Rouse and David Maxwell, president of Fannie Mae.

It remains to be seen whether Cranston's bill will gain the support of Housing & Urban Development Secretary Jack Kemp, though Kemp has spoken out in favor many of the concepts Cranston has included.

The major provisions of Cranston's bill would:

- Permit first-time homebuyers to use IRA and 401(k) tax-exempt retirement funds for down-payments.
- Raise the FHA mortgage ceiling to 95% of the median sales price in the area. In California this would raise the FHA limit by some 50%, from $101,250 to more than $150,000.
- Reduce FHA down-payment requirements.
- Establish a voucher-type system of "rental credits" for low-income renters.
- Create a new position at HUD to administer housing programs for the elderly, the handicapped, and the homeless.
- Establish "Project Retrofit" to convert federal assisted housing to serve frail elderly residents.
- Revise the distribution of federal homeless funds to give state and local governments more flexibility.
- Create "Project Independence" to provide public housing residents with greater access to employment, day care, education, and other services.

BRIEFS

Gov. George Deukmejian has at last proposed a **9-cent increase in the gasoline tax**, but he wants voters to approve it as part of a $20-billion transportation package at a special election this November.

Deukmejian has also called for a $2.4-billion bond issue for mass transit and a Gann limit exemption for the whole package.

Deukmejian, who had previously said he would neither oppose nor support a gas tax increase, made his proposal after several "transportation summit meetings" with key state officials.

Meanwhile, a coalition of labor, business, and taxpayer groups have **joined together support reform of the Gann limit.**

The so-called Project 90 coalition supports legislation by Sen. Jon Garamendi, D-Walnut Grove, to amend the formula for the state expenditure limit, which was passed in 1979 as an initiative supported by tax-cutter Paul Gann.

Project 90 is a response to the passage of Proposition 98 last year, which sets aside general fund revenues for K-12 education funding — and requires that state funds in excess of the Gann limit also be used for education.

Only two months after imposing them, **Long Beach reduced its development fees for parks** by 24%. For single-family homes, the fee will drop from $3,510 to $2,680 per dwelling.

Along with a drop in the fees, Long Beach reduced its parkland improvement and acquisition budget from $56.7 million to $43.3 million over the next decade.

The cornerstone of the city's reduced parks program will be an aggressive effort to convert school playgrounds to parks when school is not in session. Such conversion would be much cheaper than buying land.

The only "no" vote on the council came from Councilman Ray Grabinski, who said the city should maintain higher fees in order to buy land soon, before the price rises considerably.

Famed Miami architect Andres Duany didn't go over too well in Folsom recently when he told city officials they have "a really lousy master plan" and they ought to "throw a monkey wrench in it."

Duany, who was in Berkeley for a conference, was invited to Folsom by slow-growth activists. The master plan he criticized provides for growth from 17,000 to 70,000 population over the next 20 years.

"You have beautiful natural fields here," he told a crowd of 300 people. "I hate to see them go and be replaced by parking lots and shopping centers." Though he didn't apologize for his remarks, he did decline the $1,000 honorarium the slow-growthers offered to pay him.

The New Jersey Public Advocate's Office has **sued the beach town of Sea Girt over public access to the beach**, claiming that the town's entrance fee to the beach ($5) is unconstitutionally high.

Sea Girt and the Public Advocate's Office have a long history of litigation dating back to the 1970s. Using the "public trust doctrine" in the state constitution, the Public Advocate successfully challenged the town's policy of completely excluding the public (except residents and their guests) from the beach.

CALIFORNIA PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT REPORT

is published monthly by Torf Fulton Associates

Editorial Offices & Subscriptions: 1275 Sunnycrest Avenue Ventura, California 93003 (805) 642-7838

Subscription price: $179 per year

Editor & Publisher: William Fulton ISSN No. 0891-382X

COURT CASES

Appellate Court Upholds Approval of S.F. Skyscraper

The San Francisco Planning Commission acted properly in approving a downtown office project on reconsideration without additional conditions, even though the city's "mitigation" policies had changed, an appellate court has ruled.

The case of *San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth v. City and County of San Francisco* began in 1982, when the planning commission approved construction of an 18-story office building at Spear and Howard streets, proposed by 201 Spear Street Associates. San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth, a litigation-minded environmental group, sued and lost the case at the trial level.

Meanwhile, however, Reasonable Growth won a different case with the same name (*San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth v. City and County of San Francisco*, 151 Cal.App.61 (1984)), in which the First District Court of Appeal invalidated four other building approvals because the city did not adequately deal with cumulative impacts in the environmental impact report.

As a result, all parties in the 201 Spear St. case agreed to start over again at the planning commission level. Meanwhile, however, San Francisco had imposed several new mitigation measures, including a permanent ordinance requiring office developers to provide housing and the Downtown Plan, which required in-lieu fees for both parks and child care.

In 1985, the planning commission re-approved the Spear Street project but imposed no further conditions. The commissioners concluded that the developers' agreement to build 233 units of housing under the original agreement was sufficient to deal with the housing problem, and further concluded that the project was exempt from child care and open space requirements in the Downtown Plan.

The planning commission's re-approval of the project was upheld by both the Board of Supervisors and the trial judge. On appeal, a three-judge panel of the First District Court of appeal affirmed these lower rulings. With regard to child care, the First District concluded that "economic and social changes resulting from a project" should not be treated as environmental effects under the California Environmental Quality Act. Similarly, the court found that the environmental impact reports for the Spear Street project did not identify open space as a significant environmental effect created by the project, and therefore additional mitigation was unnecessary.

The court also found that the developers' housing contribution was sufficient, although Reasonable Growth argued that the city's Office-Affordable Housing Production Program, passed in the interim, required the developer to provide even more housing.

Reasonable Growth has asked the court for a rehearing.

The full text of San Franciscans for Reasonable Growth v. City and County of San Francisco, A035010, appeared in the Los Angeles Daily Journal Daily Appellate Report on March 17, beginning on page 3426.

State Supreme Court Will Rehear Public Housing Case

Continued from page 1

that authorized 500 units of low-income housing; the plaintiffs were neighbors of one 75-unit complex built under that authorization. Writing for the majority in the split decision, Justice Stanley Mosk declared: "While we reject plaintiffs' contention that the specific site and design of each proposed housing development must be submitted for voter approval, we conclude that the relationship between the undifferentiated block of 500 units approved by the city's electorate and the subsequently developed 75-unit project is so attenuated as to effectively empty (Article 34) of all significance." Mosk said that proposed sites should be included in the ballot measure, but added that subsequent voter approval is not needed for reductions or sites added later.

The outcry was immediate, with cities around the state claiming that the decision would make it politically impossible to build low-income housing anywhere in California. Furthermore, while the justices specifically stated that Berkeley wouldn't have to tear down the 75-unit project in question, they didn't say anything about the 70,000 units around the state that have been approved but not yet built.

Maybe the majority of four thought they'd made themselves clear. Nevertheless, in the weeks that followed, the court found itself subjected to some good old-fashioned political pressure. Article 34 is an old wound to housing advocates in California, who insist it was a racially motivated initiative in the first place. Public agencies have tolerated it only by adopting the expansive practices struck down by the Supreme Court. (Ironically, even the board of directors of CAR, which sponsored the original initiative, recently came out in favor of grandfathering in the 70,000 units and indicated it would support legislation to protect broadly written Article 34 ballot measures.)

The pressure on the Supreme Court began when the Legal Aid Society of Alameda County, representing the low-income residents in the case, asked for a rehearing. Then the Attorney General's Office wrote a letter to the court asking the court to clarify whether the decision should be applied retroactively to the 70,000 unbuilt units—attaching letters from six panicked jurisdictions around the state, ranging from the City of Los Angeles to the Santa Clara County Housing Authority. "We could have let the decision stand and wait for another case," said Assistant Attorney General Ann Jennings. "But that could take years and in the meantime all these projects are in jeopardy."

Finally, the court heard from Sen. David Roberti, D-Los Angeles, one of Sacramento's biggest wheels. Not only did Roberti echo the AG's request for a new hearing, but he was nice enough to send along his own ideas on how the court ought to handle the case. Specifically, he asked the court to ratify the ideas contained in two bills since introduced by Senate Housing Chairman Leroy Greene, D-Carmichael. SB 1045, an urgency bill, would ban a supplemental election on already approved units if land is bought for low-income housing within five years, or if at least $10,000 is spent toward the project within 10 years. SB 1046 would narrowly circumscribe the definition of "public housing" subject to an election, and lay out rather broad rules about how specific a ballot measure must be. (Three other bills have also been introduced to deal with the problem.)

At the beginning of March the Supreme Court finally broke down and agreed to hear the case Oddly, they agreed to the rehearing without stating which issues they wanted to deal with, without asking for additional briefs — and without putting the case on any kind of a timetable. Presumably, the court wants to deal with the questions Roberti raised — retroactive application to unbuilt units and standards for future elections.

SPECIAL REPORT

building permit if the proposed project is within one-half mile of a solid waste disposal site.

SB 255 (Bergeson): Establishes a deadline of June 30, 1991, for completion of airport land-use commissions to adopt their plans. Though laws requiring the adoption of such plans have been on the books since 1970, less than half of all plans are complete.

SB 713 (Leroy Greene): Restricts the imposition of conditions on general plan or zoning amendments which are more restrictive than permissible conditions under the Subdivision Map Act.

SB 965 (Bergeson): Sets specific statewide goals and policies on growth management to guide local agency decision-making. Also requires that all plans in a county be reviewed and revised concurrently.

AB 628 (Kelley): Declares that local land-use initiatives are matters of statewide concern and directs the Office of Planning and Research to prepare an assessment on each local measure to determine its fiscal, housing, employment, economic, and environmental effects. Also requires a local public hearing on the measure and the OPR assessment.

AB 655 (Jones): Etablishes Agricultural Land Conservation Act of 1989.

AB 842 (Chacon): Modifies current law to require (rather than permit) a city or county to refer a local initiative to staff for review of potential effects on housing, employment, public facilities, economic growth, and similar matters. The original law was used by Riverside County to effectively postpone the election on a citizen growth initiative from June to November last year. This bill would also require the local government to prepare an impartial analysis and put it in the voter pamphlet.

AB 1661 (Costa): Automatically extends the life of residential building permits which have been issued in an area which has passed a growth-limiting resolution of initiative. A similar bill failed last year after it become front-page news in the *Los Angeles Times*.

AB 1979 (Areias): Directs state infrastructure projects to avoid routings through productive agricultural lands.

AB 2060 (Costa): Requires a 60-day waiting period for application of new or increased development fees for all projects, not just residential.

AB 2200 (Cortese): Sets specific statewide goals and policies on growth management, somewhat similar to Bergeson's SB 965. Requires Senate confirmation of the director of the Office of Planning and Research.

AB 2206 (Costa): Expressly authorizes a local agency to require developers to set land aside for open space before a development project may be approved.

AB 2439 (Ferguson): Defines the issuance of a building permit as a "ministerial act" rather than a "discretionary act," meaning such permits are not subject to review under CEQA and cannot be used as a component in a local growth management system.

Local Agency Finance

SB 308 (Seymour): Creates "infrastructure financing districts" that would permit use of tax-increment financing without the finding of blight now necessary under redevelopment law. Seymour has introduced similar bills in the past; with growing citizen outcry over abuse of redevelopment (*CP&DR*, September 1987), this idea may become more popular.

SB 961 (Maddy): Creates the "California and Baja California Enterprise Zone Authority", with bonding power, in order to coordinate the development of maquiladoras on the California-Mexico border.

SB 968, SCA 19 (Bergeson); AB 2204, AB 2205, and SCA 38 (Cortese): All these bills seek to make it easier for local agencies to share sales or property taxes more easily. The constitutional amendments are required because both Cortese and Bergeson seek to remove the constitutional requirement that tax-sharing be approved by the voters in both jurisdictions. AB 2205 would remove the requirement that property tax sharing between agencies other than cities or counties also be approved by the city council or board of supervisors.

SB 1288 (Seymour): Prohibits communities from requiring new developments to fund existing infrastructure deficiencies.

AB 253 (Cortese): Revises County Service Area law to reflect the increasing use of this technique in incorporated areas.

AB 2460 (Hannigan): Prohibits a public agency from approving a development project unless a method to fund necessary roads, schools, water, and sewer facilities is determined.

Regional Governance

SB 303 (Deddeh): Establishes the San Diego Regional Planning and Growth Management Review Board as directed by the passage of Measure C last November.

SB 1225 (Boatwright): Requires that a county seek the input of an adjacent city before that county approves a development permit in an unincorporated area.

SB 1332 (Presley): Establishes the Model Subregional Planning Act to create advisory boards in specified subregions who will advise local agencies on growth-related topics.

AB 2202 (Cortese): Requires that cities and counties consider the input of surrounding local governments when general plans are revised.

Transportation

SB 300 (Kopp): Increases the state gas tax by 10 cents per gallon and directs new revenues to mass transit, highway improvements, and alternative transportation methods.

SB 967 (Bergeson): Gives preference in doling out state highway funds to cities and counties that have adopted local traffic mitigation programs and have housing elements approved by the state. Reclassifies the circulation element in general plans as a "transportation" element and ties it more closely to land use.

Continued on page 8

SPECIAL REPORT

Bill-by-Bill Rundown of Legislative Proposals on Growth

Last month, *CP&DR* listed the packages of growth bills (without bill numbers) introduced by the Local Government Committee chairs in the Assembly and Senate, Dominic Cortese and Marian Bergeson. Now, all the bills have been introduced and other legislators have weighed in heavily in the growth area, including Leroy Greene, chairman of the Senate Housing Committee, Sen. John Seymour of Orange County, and Assemblywoman Delaine Eastin of the Bay Aea. In addition, old hands like Sen. Jim Costa of Fresno and Assemblyman Pete Chacon of San Diego, who often carry legislation for the building industry, have made their voices heard.

In addition to *CP&DR*'s own research, information for this list was provided by the Senate Local Government Committee, the Senate Office of Research, and the League of California Cities. None of these bills is very far along the legislative track, but at least a few of them will undoubtedly become law — in some form or another — by the end of the legislative session this fall.

Housing

SB 727 (Leroy Greene) and AB 1002 (Eastin): Require that regional jobs/housing balance be considered in local land-use plans. The Greene bill would require cities and counties to monitor the number of jobs created each year and compare the amount of land set aside for different uses.

SB 966 (Bergeson): Gives preference for future development grants to cities and counties that follow state housing policy.

SB 1278 (Seymour) and AB 2236 (Costa): Both these bills would make eligibility for state housing assistance conditional on a valid housing element, and would prohibit state housing assistance to localities whose measures would reduce the supply affordable housing.

SB 1279 (Seymour): Requires local agencies to spend expenditure of revenue from development fees in accordance with their housing elements.

SB 1280 (Seymour): Requires a local agency that is planning to reduce its low-income or affordable housing to file an Economic Impact Analysis.

SB 1282 (Seymour): Expands the housing element of a local agency's general plan to include specific reporting requirements relating to low-income and affordable housing.

AB 145 (Costa): Proposes a $710 million bond measure in 1990 to fund state wildlife conservation, parkland, and recreation programs. Local agencies would have to have a valid housing element to receive bond proceeds.

AB 447 (Bradley): Authorizes a county to contract with a city for the construction of low- and moderate-income housing.

AB486 (Clute): Prohibits conversion of mobile home parks to another use if a local agency lacks an approved housing element. Requires that conversion of mobile home parks to another use must be consistent with the local housing element.

AB 1217 (Hauser): Limits application of development fees if local government does not have an adequate general plan or housing element.

AB 1251 (Bader): Extends the sunset clause of the Local Agency Housing Infrastructure Act, relating to low- and moderate-income housing, from 1990 to 1994.

AB 1252 (Bader): Extends the sunset clause requiring a study by the California Debt Advisory Commission of the Local Agency Housing Infrastructure Act.

AB 1290 (Hauser): Requires that cities and counties maintain an acceptable level of low- and moderate-income housing, no matter what local initiatives may have been passed regulating growth. Places the burden of proof of a local agency's compliance with state housing policy in the local agency itself. Codification of attorney general's opinion.

Air and Water Quality

SB 712 (Leroy Greene): Expands air quality attainment plans to include consideration of the regional jobs/housing balance.

AB 632 (Bradley): Establishes the Reclaimed Water Use Facilities Bond Act to develop and maintain water or sewage facilities.

AB 2203 (Cortese): Requires cities and counties to include an air quality element in their general plan. Requires the State Air Resources Board to set guidelines for acceptable air quality elements.

Governmental Organization

SB 846 (Leroy Greene): Prepares for possible reorganization of the city and county of Sacramento.

SB 969 (Bergeson): Restructures the Southern California Association of Governments to create a more decentralized form of regional planning.

SB 1057 (Davis): Revises existing LAFCO guidelines to deal more directly with growth pressures and funding shortfalls. Specifically, the bill tries to respond to complaints from within Sen. Ed Davis's L.A. County district that the LAFCO there makes life difficult for proposed new cities. Among other things, this bill would toughen fiscal review and judicial review, and require spheres of influence. Davis introduced a similar bill in the last legislative session.

SB 1258 (Bergeson): Requires cities to accept county development agreements for annexed areas.

AB 886 (Cortese): Clarifies public hearing requirements under California Environmental Quality Act.

AB 1512 (Farr): Establishes county and regional "study groups" to encourage cooperative decision-making. Such groups would be overseen by the Office of Planning and Research, which would be given $6 million to dole out to such groups.

AB 2201 (Cortese): Requires LAFCOs to consider the regional jobs/housing balance effects of a governmental reorganization.

Land Use and Permits

SB 12 (Robbins): Prohibits a local agency from issuing a residential

Cities Continue to Impose Restrictions on Growth

Continued from page 1

development of the nearby Chino Hills, Diamond Bar voters became more concerned over traffic and growth.

Here's a brief rundown of recent activity on the local growth control front, both on the ballot and before legislative bodies:

Los Angeles County

Burbank

Voters in Burbank overwhelmingly approved (74%) a measure prohibiting up-zoning of residential property and subjecting all multi-family projects to a conditional use permit.

Diamond Bar

Cityhood passed narrowly in yet another suburb seeking to retain its "rural" character. Located at the confluence of three major San Gabriel Valley freeways — 210, 60, and 57 — Diamond Bar's population had increased 60% since 1980, with condominium and apartment construction tripling during that period of time.

Cityhood supporters blamed L.A. County Supervisor Pete Schabarum, a pro-development politician who represents their area, for failing to look out for their interests. A cityhood measure lost by 200 votes in 1983, and a 1986 petition drive failed to place the issue on the ballot.

Glendora

This San Gabriel Valley foothill community approved a cap on the height of single-family homes by 69%-31%.

Pasadena

Already known for its intense neighborhood politics, Pasadena favored a sweeping growth-control ordinance supported by citizen slow-growthers over a growth measure drafted by the city council.

Proposition 2, sponsored by the citizen group PRIDE, received 57% of the vote, while Proposition 1, the council measure, received support for only 25% of the voters.

The two propositions were actually quite similar — both were strict — but the city measure was intended as an interim measure while the PRIDE measure is permanent. Both were the subject of intense last-minute campaigning from opponents, including Realtors, who raised $70,000 in the last few weeks of the campaign.

A previous growth-control proposal was defeated in Pasadena last June.

Orange County

Supervisors in Orange County have approved a growth management plan for unincorporated areas similar to Measure A, the growth-control measure defeated at the polls last June.

The growth management plan, which will mostly affect fast-growing southern Orange County, differs from Measure A in several respects — most noticeably in the way it deals with remedial improvements for congested intersections and interchanges.

Measure A would have prohibited development unless traffic conditions were improved at such intersections; this provision has led judges to find similar measures in Orange County cities to be unconstitutional. The growth management plan permits developers to pay into a fund that may eventually be used to correct the remedial problems. Also, the new plan does not set required emergency response times, as Measure A did.

Growth management in Orange County could take another step in November, when a half-cent sales tax — with growth management standards contained in it — is likely to appear on the balance. Orange County slow-growthers have been skeptical of sales tax in the past, arguing it will merely be used to subsidize new development.

Ventura County

Thousand Oaks

Thousand Oaks has extended its 500-home-per-year growth limitation, first approved by voters in 1980, through the year 1995.

However, the city was forced to permit an additional 150 homes each year until 1994 because of a 1986 federal court settlement with the Lang Ranch Co., which had sued the city.

The city passed the extension almost two years ahead of expiration because of the council's desire to make sure several large developers did not seek exemptions from it. At least three developers are before the city with plans to build 1,000- to 2,000-home tracts. Some of the developers may claim that they filed vesting tentative tracts prior to the council's extension of the ordinance.

The Building Industry Association has been particularly critical of Ventura County cities such as Thousand Oaks, claiming that the growth measures have contributed to the county's rapidly escalating home prices. Ventura County now has the highest home prices in Southern California, surpassing Orange County in the past several months.

Bill-by-Bill Rundown of Legislative Proposals on Growth

Continued from page 5

AB 35 (Eastin): Replaces the circulation element in general plans with a transportation element. Links the agency's land-use plan with its transportation plan.

AB 40 (Eastin): Requires the lead agencies of transportation projects to prepare "regional transportation impact analyses" for large projects.

AB 471 (Katz): Increases the state gas tax by 5 cents per gallon. Requires local governments to adopt traffic mitigation and air quality measures in order to receive additional funds.

AB 491 (Frizzelle): Sets goals and requirements for the development of toll roads in California.

AB 1520 (Cortese): Requires the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, or MTC, to establish a special gas tax in the Bay Area to provide additional funding for mass transit and highway renovation

AB 2050 (Areias): Raises the gas tax by 6 cents per gallon, increases weight fees for commercial vehicles, and provides for the Mass Transit Bond Act of 1990.