

Sherry's Index

Figures and sidebars are indicated with **bold** type.

- Abbey, Edward, 8, 38
 ABC/*Washington Post* survey, 50
 accessory dwellings, 75
 Adams County, Colorado, 137
 advisory committees, 36, **149**
 aesthetic value myth, 55–57
 AFT studies, 54, 79–80, 82
 agricultural land
 losses, 19–20, 82
 taxes/services ratio, 54
 zoning, 137
 Alabama, open space savings, 134
 Altshuler, Alan, 29, 40
 American Chemical Society, 48
 American Farmland Trust (AFT), 54, 79–80, 82
 Anheuser-Busch Brewery, 64–65
 annexation, restricting, 125
Ariadne's Thread: The Search for New Modes of Thinking (Clark), **146**
 Aspen, Colorado, 75, 120
 attitudes about growth (citizen). *See* public opinion about growth
 automobile usage, 24
- Bammi, Delip, 41
 Barry, Marion, 127
 Bartlett, Albert, 28, **43**, 105, 144
 Beckenridge, Colorado, 119
 bedroom communities, 81
 benefits of growth, 10–11, 78
 Berry, Wendell, 140
 biological productivity, 19–20
 Boca Raton, Florida, 119
 bonds, municipal, 83
 Boulder, Colorado
 controlled growth strategies, 119, 120, **121–123, 124**
 cost of growth study, 88–90
 greenway benefits, 55
 rate of growth, 105, **106**
 boundaries, urban growth. *See* urban growth boundaries (UGBs)
 Buddhist economics, **146**
 Burchell, Robert, 82
 Burlington, Vermont, 74
 business climate myth, 44
 business & growth. *See* economic development
- California
 caps on growth, 119–120
 controlled growth policies, **138**
 farmland losses, 20, 82
 housing cost research, 45
 inclusionary zoning, 73, 74
 open space savings, 134
 population/sprawl compared, 24
 Proposition 13, 11
 surveys on controlling growth, 51, 112, **113**, 139, 156–157ⁿ¹⁷
 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), 129
 campaign finance reform, 36
 Cannon, Frederick, 46–47
 capital costs. *See* infrastructure costs
 caps on growth, 48–49, 119–120, **121–122**
 Carlson, Arne H., **151**
 Carnegie Group, 99–100
 carrying capacity limits, 133
 catch 22 of growth, 61–62, 72, 152
 Central Valley, California, 82
 Charlotte, North Carolina, 45
 Chattanooga, Tennessee, 45
 Chicago, Illinois, 24, 41–42, 82–83
 Chula Vista, California, 119
 citizen participation
 importance, 141
 project reviews, 126–127
 promoting, 11–12, 35–37, 58–59, 137–139
 sustainable communities and, 148, **149**
 Clark, Mary, **146**
 Closter, New Jersey, 134
 Coburg Hills (Oregon), **51**
 Colorado
 Anheuser-Busch Brewery, 64–65
 controlled growth policies, 119, 120
 growth interest groups, **31**
 housing-job linkage program, 75
 housing price comparisons, **123**
 open space requirements, 137
 surveys on controlling growth, 51–52, **111**
 transportation cost analysis for Denver, 100–102
 See also Boulder, Colorado
 commercial development
 Boulder's approach, **122–123**
 costs of growth-related, 81, 88–90, 91

- community impact statements (CIS), 103, 127–128
- Community Land Trusts (CLTs), 75, 136
- compact growth
 - benefits, 25–26
 - cost savings, 79–80, 82, 83
 - public opinion, 26
 - See also* density levels
- concurrency requirements, 123
- Connecticut, land gains tax, 130
- conservation easements, 135
- conservation taxes, 137
- constitutional basis for controlling growth, 110–111
- construction tax, 130
- consumption levels
 - community values and, 141–143
 - increases in, 23–24
 - limiting for controlled growth, 133–134
- controlling growth, strategies
 - overview of types, **115, 138**
 - annexation restrictions, 125
 - Boulder's approach, 119, 120, **121–123, 124**
 - caps, 48–49, 119–120
 - compared to managing growth, 27–28, 106–107
 - consumption limits, 133–134
 - development fees, 114–116
 - downzoning, 125–126
 - greenbelts/UGBs, **121, 124–125**
 - impact statements, 127–130
 - infrastructure spending limits, 131
 - legal basis for, 110–111, 131
 - lending policies, 132–133
 - local importance, 62
 - moratoria, 131
 - neutral policies, 107, **108–109**
 - preservation of open space, 134–137
 - project reviews, 126–127
 - public facility requirements, 121, 123
 - public opinion polls on, 51–52, **111, 112, 156–157n17**
 - research inadequacies, 26–27
 - selection criteria, 113–114
 - standards of quality, 116–118
 - tax-related, 130–131, 137
- cost analysis methods
 - annexation and, 125
 - data sources, 90–91, 98
 - definitions/assumptions, 91–93
 - development impact fees and, 102–103
 - environmental impact, 97
 - school requirements, 93, **94**
 - sewage requirements, 95–96
- cost analysis methods (continued)
 - sustainable communities and, 150
 - Thurston County example, 98–100, **101**
 - traditional approach, 13–14
 - transportation requirements, 93–95, 100–102
 - water requirements, 96–97
- Cost of Growth* (Springfield Planning Dept.), 84
- Cost of Sprawl* (Real Estate Research Corp.), 79
- costs. *See* economic costs; environmental costs; infrastructure costs; public services costs
- Country View Estates (Oregon), **51**
- Daly, Herman, 52, 142, 144, 145, 147
- Davis, California, 74
- debt as growth cost, 83
- democratic principles and growth. *See* citizen participation
- density bonuses, 74
- density levels
 - controlling growth with, 125–126, 133
 - land tax effects, 130–131
 - public opinion, 26
 - See also* compact growth; population growth
- Density-Related Public Costs* (AFT), 79
- Denver, Colorado, 101–102, **123**
- design review process, 126–127
- development impact fees
 - arguments about, 102–103
 - Boulder's policy, 88–90
 - controlling growth with, 114–116
 - housing uses, 75–76
 - Olympia's proposal, 100
 - public opinion survey, **112, 156–157n17**
- development rights, 134–136
- diversity, as growth benefit, 78
- "divider" effect, 67
- downzoning, 125–126
- drinking water, cost analysis, 96–97
- DuPage County, Illinois, 41, 82
- Durning, Alan, 145
- ecological footprints, 24, 134
- ecological growth, defined, 21–22
- economic costs
 - AFT studies, 54
 - Boulder study, 88–90
 - distribution of, 32–34
 - Oregon study, 88
 - policymaking significance, 78
 - public sector types, 82–87
 - sprawl studies, 79–80, 82
 - taxes, 39–42, 80–81, 82–83
 - See also* cost analysis methods

- economic development
 - analyzing, 65, **67**
 - environmental policy and, 46–48
 - in-migration from, 61–64
 - local vs. new business, 65–66
 - multiplier effects, 66–67
 - myths about, 42–44, 52–53
 - public investment alternatives, 68–71
 - subsidy costs, 64–65
 - sustainable, 144–147, 148
 - See also urban growth machine
- employment. See job creation
- environmental costs
 - analysis methods, 97
 - farmland losses, 82
 - Hyundai factory, 69
 - landscape changes, 19–21
 - listed, **87**
 - sprawl-type development, 79
- environmental impact statements (EIS), 128–130
- environmental protection
 - as growth control criteria, 133–134
 - impact statements, 128–130
 - job creation and, 68–71
 - myths about, 46–48, 57–59
 - public opinion polls, 50
 - threshold standards for, 116–117, 119
 - See also sustainable communities
- Eugene, Oregon
 - development subsidies example, **33**
 - growth myth example, **54**
 - Hyundai factory, 64, 65, 69
 - rezoning case study, **51**
 - survey on controlling growth, 139
 - water cost study, 97
- extinction rates, 20
- facility maintenance deficit, 83
- farmland
 - losses, 19–20, 82
 - taxes/services ratio, 54
 - zoning, 137
- fees. See development impact fees
- financial institutions & growth, **31**
- finite-world planning, 27–28
- fire service calls (Boulder, Colorado), 89
- Florida, 119, 123
- forest losses, 19
- Fort Collins, Colorado, 64–65
- Frederick County, Maryland, 54
- Fregonese, John, 125
- Freudenburg, William R., 44
- "Front Porch Forum," 18
- Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), 52, **53**
- Gomez-Ibanez, Jose, 29, 40
- Gone with the Wind* (Mitchell), **21**
- government. See local government
- government costs. See public services costs
- grassroots organizing, 36
- greenbelt systems, 55, **121**, 124–125
- Gross Domestic Product (GPD), 52, **53**
- growth, definitions, 21–22
- growth controls. See controlling growth, strategies
- growth machine. See urban growth machine
- Growth Management Act (Washington), 17, 99
- growth-neutral policies, 107, **108–109**
- Hardin, Garrett, 32
- Hilton Hotel (Eugene), **54**
- Home Builders Association (Portland), 45
- housing
 - aesthetic values and, 56
 - affordability strategies, 72–76
 - bedroom communities, 81
 - Boulder's prices, **123**
 - consumption levels, 23–24
 - federal government role, 62
 - ownership statistics, 72
 - pricing myth, 44–46, 113
 - See also residential development
- Houston, Texas, 45
- How Much is Enough* (Durning), 145
- Huntsville, Alabama, 134
- Huszar, Paul, 32
- Hyundai factory, 64, 65, 69
- Illinois, 24, 41–42, 82–83
- impact fees. See development impact fees
- impact statements, 103, 127–130
- inclusionary zoning, 73–74
- income/business climate comparison, 44
- India, ecological footprint, 24
- industrial development. See commercial development
- "inevitable growth" myth, 48–49
- infrastructure costs
 - Boulder study, 88–90
 - compared to open space preservation, 134
 - concurrency requirements, 123
 - described, 42, 83, 84–85, **87**
 - household average, 13, 84
 - Oregon study, 88
 - sprawl vs. compact development, 79, 82
 - stable vs. growing city comparison, 85–86

- infrastructure costs (continued)
 See also cost analysis methods; public services costs; transportation infrastructure
- infrastructure deficit, defined, 83
- infrastructure spending limits, 131
- in-migration, 23, 24–25, **43**, 60–64
- Institute for Southern Studies, 47–48
- interest groups (growth)
 described, 29–30, 34–35
 environmentalism myth, 57–59
 government role, 30–32
 political influence, 32–34
- Jacksonville, Oregon, **132**
- job creation
 housing linkage, 74–75
 in-migration with, 43, 62–64
 local vs. new business, 65–66
 myths about, 42–44, 62
 small business, 157–158n5
 subsidy costs, 64–65
 See also economic development
- Job Creation Paradox* (Bartlett), **43**
- Kerr, Andy, 34
- King County, Washington, 17–18, 135
- Kitzhaber, John, 131
- Lake Oswego, Oregon, **118**
- Lamm, Richard, 123
- Lamont, Bill, **123**
- land
 aesthetic values, 55–57
 costs & housing prices, 45
 development tactics, **33**, **51**
 growth-related changes, 9–10, 19–21, 24, 82
 preservation strategies, 54, 75, **115**, 134–137, 148–149, 150
 regulation purposes, 25
 tax recommendations, 130–131
 vacancy myth, 54–55
- land acquisitions, public, 134–135
- land banks, 136–137
- Land Trust Alliance, 136
- land trusts, 75, 136
- The Last Landscape* (Whyte), **20**
- Lawrence Township, New Jersey, 128, 129
- Learning to Listen to the Land* (Abbey), 8
- legal basis for controlling growth, 110–111, 131
- lending policies, 132–133
- Leopold, Aldo, 17
- level of service (LOS), establishing, 93–95, 118–119
- Livermore, California, 120
- local business, 30, 65–66, 70
- local government
 democratic principles and, 11–12, 35–37, 58–59, 148
 pro-growth actions, 30–32, **33**, 107–110
- Londonderry, New Hampshire, 134–135
- Los Angeles, California, 24, 51, 156–157n17
- LOS (level of service), establishing, 93–95, 118–119
- Loudoun County, Virginia, 80
- Louisiana, subsidy criteria, 70
- low-income housing. See housing
- low-wage jobs, 66
- Mack Orchards, New Hampshire, 134
- Maine, land preservation savings, 134
- maintenance/operation costs, defined, 84
 See also public services costs
- management of growth, types, 27–28, 106–107
 See also controlling growth, strategies
- Maryland
 author's childhood landscape, 9–10
 land preservation strategies, 135, 136
 open space taxes/services ratio, 54
- McMinnville, Oregon, 95–96
- Mencken, H. L., 35
- Metro Council (Portland, Oregon), 114, **118**, 133
- Metropolitan Planning Council (Chicago), 41–42, 82–83
- Meyer, Stephen, 47
- Michigan, growth study, 82
- millennium community. See sustainable communities
- Milwaukie, Oregon, 26
- Minnesota Environmental Rights Act (MERA), 129
- Minnesota Sustainable Development Initiative, **151**
- Minutoli, Robert, 128
- Mitchell, Margaret, **21**
- mixed-use zones, 75
- Molotch, Harvey, 29, 31, 42–43
- Money* magazine survey, 50
- Monfort, Kenneth, **31**
- Montgomery County, Maryland, 135, 136
- moratoria as growth control, 131, **132**
- multiplier effects, 66–67
- myths of growth
 summarized, 12, **39**, **40**, 59
 economic development, 42–44, 52–53
 "empty" land values, 54–57
 environmental standards, 46–48
 housing prices, 44–46, 113

- myths of growth (continued)
 - inevitability of growth, 48–49
 - NIMBY motives, 49–50
 - public interest, 57–59
 - public opinion, 49–52, 156–157n17
 - taxes, 39–42
- National Association of Home Builders, 56
- National Environmental Policy Act (1970), 128–129
- natural areas, aesthetic value, 55–57
 - See also open space
- neighborhood associations (Washington, D.C.), 127
- net primary productivity (NPP), 19–20
- neutral policies, growth, 107, **108–109**
- New Hampshire, 54, 134–135
- New Jersey
 - environmental impact statements, 128, 129
 - land preservation strategies, 134, 136
 - public advocates, 155n8
 - sprawl cost study, 82
- New Mexico, growth study, 83
- new millennium community. See sustainable communities
- newspapers, as interest group, 34
- New York, 135, 137
- NIMBY myth of growth, 49–50
- North Carolina, land prices, 45
- O'Hara, Gerald (fiction character), **21**
- Oklahoma City, land prices, 45
- Olympia, Washington, 98–100
- open space
 - Boulder's, 55, 89–90, **121, 124**
 - myths about value, 54–57
 - preservation strategies, **115**, 124–125, 134–137, 148–149, 150
- operation/maintenance costs, defined, 84
 - See also public services costs
- Oregon
 - cost analysis examples, 94–97
 - growth cost studies, 13, 84, 88
 - growth myth example, **54**
 - Hyundai factory, 64, 65, 69
 - Jacksonville's growth moratorium, **132**
 - Lake Oswego's growth policy, **118**
 - rezoning case study, **51**
 - road construction limit proposal, 131
 - subsidy example, **33**
 - surveys on controlling growth, **112**, 139
 - tax incentive study, 63
 - UGB tradition, 124–125
 - See also Portland, Oregon
- Palo Alto, California, 134
- parks. See open space
- performance standards, 116, 119
- Petaluma, California, 119–120
- Pinelands National Reserve, 136
- Pittsford, New York, **135**, 137
- planned growth management, 27–28, 106
 - See also controlling growth, strategies
- planners, as interest group, 34
- pollution
 - job creation and, 69–71
 - unemployment rates and, 48
 - See also environmental costs; environmental protection
- Pomerance, Steve, 100–101, 102
- population growth, 22–25
 - See also density levels
- Portland, Oregon
 - density goals, 133
 - housing costs, 45–46
 - Metro functions, 114
 - public opinion on urban sprawl, 26
- poverty level wages, 66
- prairie losses, 19
- pro-growth coalition. See urban growth machine
- property taxes. See tax revenues
- proportionate share cost method, 91
- Proposition 13, 11
- prosperity/business climate comparison, 44
- public advocates, 36–37, 155n8
- public interest myth, 57–59
 - See also citizen participation
- public investments, alternative, 68–71
- public land banks, 136–137
- public opinion about growth
 - citizen power, 8
 - Colorado's survey, **111**
 - development impact fees, **112**, 156–157n17
 - Eugene's survey, 139
 - Los Angeles survey, 156–157n17
 - myths about, 49–52
 - Santa Barbara's survey, 139
 - sprawl vs. density, 26
 - survey design recommendations, 137–139
 - Washington's forums, 18
 - See also citizen participation
- public participation. See citizen participation
- public services costs
 - household averages, 84
 - open space, 54, 134
 - sprawl vs. compact growth, 79–80
 - types, 83–85, **87**
 - See also infrastructure costs

- quality-of-life threshold standards, 117, **118**
The Quiet Crisis (Udall), **26**
 quizzes on growth, 4–5, 39
- "railing" analogy, 48–49
- rate caps, growth, 48–49, 119–120, **121–122**
- Rawls, John, 58
- "Real Cost of Growth in Oregon" (Fodor), 13, 88
- real estate development. *See* urban growth machine
- Real Estate Research Corporation, sprawl study, 79
- real estate transfer tax, 130
- Recollected Essays 1965-1980* (Berry), 140
- Redmond, Washington, 81
- Rees, William, 24, 134
- regional revenue sharing, 81
- regulating growth, approaches
 management/planned, 27–28, 106–107
 neutral policies, 107, **108–109**
See also controlling growth, strategies
- Regulation for Revenue* (Altshuler & Gomez-Ibanez), 29
- regulation of land use, purpose, 25
- Reilly, William K., 77
- residential development
 affordable housing policies, 73–76
 service costs, 54, 79–80, 81, 82, 83
See also housing
- resource consumption. *See* consumption levels
- revenues. *See* tax revenues
- rezoning. *See* zoning
- roads. *See* transportation infrastructure
- rural land. *See* farmland; open space
- Rutgers University, growth cost study, 82
- Salt Lake City, Utah, 45
- A Sand County Almanac* (Leopold), 17
- Santa Barbara, California, 139
- Santa Fe, New Mexico, 83
- savings account analogy, 55
- schools
 cost analysis methods, 93, **94**
 development costs, 82, 83, 88
 Proposition 13 impact, 11
- Schumacher, E. F., 147
- SDCs. *See* development impact fees
- Seattle, Washington, 17–18
Seattle Times, 17–18
- Seckle, David, 32
- sewer infrastructure
 cost analysis methods, 95–96
 development costs, 83, 88
- simplicity values. *See* sustainable communities
- slow growth. *See* controlling growth, strategies
- Small is Beautiful* (Schumacher), 147
- smart growth management, 27–28, 106
See also controlling growth, strategies
- speculative development
 limiting, 132–133, 137
 process of, **33**, 107, 110
See also urban growth machine
- sprawl-type development
 commercial costs, 81
 public opinion, 26
 residential costs, 79–80, 82, 83
See also density levels
- Springfield, Oregon, 84
- stable (steady-state) economics, 52–53, 144–147
See also sustainable communities
- Stafford, Oregon, **118**
- standard setting for controlling growth, 27, 116–119
- steady-state (stable) economics, 52–53, 144–147
See also sustainable communities
- subsidies. *See* tax incentives/subsidies; urban growth machine
- Suffolk County, New York, 135
- Supreme Court, U.S., 110
- surveys. *See* public opinion about growth
- sustainable communities
 characteristics, 15–16, 140–141, 143–147
 distractions from, 141–143
 strategies for, 147–153
- systems development charges. *See* development impact fees
- tax incentives/subsidies
 alternative, 70–71, 130–131, 137
 traditional, 63, 64–65, **108–109**
- tax revenues
 Boulder's proposal, 88–90
 commercial development, 81
 myth of, 39–42
 open space and, 55
 residential development, 80, 82–83
 stable vs. growing city comparison, 85–86
- TDRs (transferable development rights), 136
- Templet, Paul, 70, 119
- Tenleytown and Cleveland Park Emergency Committee, 127
- Tennessee, land prices, 45
- Texas, land prices, 45
- A Theory of Justice* (Rawls), 58
- Thoreau, Henry David, 60
- threshold standards, 27, 116–119

- Thurston County, Washington, 98–100, **101**
 Toynbee, Arnold, 104
 traffic congestion & threshold standards, 117–118
 See also transportation infrastructure
The Tragedy of the Commons (Hardin), 32
 transferable development rights (TDRs), 136
 transportation infrastructure
 automobile usage, 24
 cost analysis methods, 93–95
 Denver's cost analysis, 101–102
 development-related costs, 82, 88
 spending limits for controlling growth, 131
 sustainable communities and, 150
 threshold standards for, 117–119
Trip Generation (Institute of Transportation Engineers), 95
 Trust for Public Land, 134
- Udall, Stewart, **26**
 UGBs. *See* urban growth boundaries (UGBs)
 undeveloped land. *See* open space
 unemployment myth, 42–43
 See also job creation
 urban growth
 causes, 22–25
 defined, 21
 urban growth boundaries (UGBs)
 controlling growth with, 25–26, 124–125
 housing prices and, 45–46
 urban growth machine
 government support for, 30–32, 107–110
 job creation myth and, 42–44
 participants, 29–30, **31**, 34–35
 political power, 11, 32–34
 urban planners, as interest group, 34
The Use of Land (Reilly), 77
 Utah, land prices, 45
 utility services, development costs, 79, 82
- "Veil of Ignorance" (Rawls' concept), 58
 Vermont, 74, 130
 Virginia, sprawl cost study, 80
- Wackernagel, Mathis, 24, 134
 walking as transportation, 150
Wall Street Journal, 41
 Washington, D.C., 126–127, 132
 Washington County, Oregon, 95
 Washington (state)
 concurrency requirements, 123
 conservation easements, 135
 growth study, 81
 public forums on growth, 17–18
 Thurston County cost analysis, 98–100, **101**
 water system infrastructure
 cost analysis methods, 96–97
 growth moratoria and, **132**
 West Orange, New Jersey, 155*n*8
 wetlands losses, 19
 Whyte, William H., **20**
 Wisconsin Avenue development (Washington, D.C.), 126–127
 Woodburn, Oregon, 94–95
- Yarmouth, Maine, 134
- zoning
 affordable housing with, 73–74, 75
 agricultural land, 137
 controlling growth with, 120, 122–123, 125–126, 133
 development case study, **51**