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Executive Summary

What if leaders of Southern California knew that during the next 20 years our region was bound to experience an earthquake of 8 magnitude on the Richter scale? Would they have a responsibility to inform the public? Would they mobilize citizens to ensure the region is prepared?

During the next 20 years, our region will experience a demographic earthquake of a magnitude of 6 million more people, which will reshape everything we know about Southern California. On October 10, 2002, nearly 300 of the region’s political, business, development, community, and environmental leaders and experts met to undertake an audacious task. Convened by the USC Lusk Center for Real Estate and ULI Los Angeles, a district council of the Urban Land Institute, these regional stakeholders gathered to participate in a groundbreaking visioning exercise. “Growth visioning” is a means to ensure that Southern California’s quality of life and standard of living are improved instead of destroyed by the addition of 6 million more people.

With Southern California already feeling the impacts of traffic congestion, water shortages, and a housing crisis, a 33% increase in population in a relatively short time presents serious issues that must be resolved. If this area is to remain competitive and vibrant, it faces urgent questions that affect the daily life of every resident:

- Where will our children and grandchildren live?
- Where will they work — and will they have to drive 90 minutes a day to get there?
- How do we plan for and govern our region’s future to accommodate this growth?

The assembled regional representatives didn’t just talk about these questions — they spent the morning actually wrestling with where to locate 6 million more people and two million more jobs on a huge map of Southern California. Leaders were divided into groups of 8 to 10, where they found shared priorities, mediated familiar conflicts of interest, and generated innovative ideas envisioning possibilities for the future.
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Most tables traded more than half of their low-density residential chips for higher density residential development.

Although the 20 groups worked out 20 different solutions, some striking similarities reflected a clear consensus on some key points on how to solve our shared challenge:

▲ Every group decided to use higher housing densities than current development practices – there was no other choice for accommodating 6 million more people.

▲ Nearly every group stressed investment in new infrastructure, including more rapid transit and airport capacity to ensure that the region grows together and not apart.

▲ Most groups opted for new “satellite cities” to accommodate a significant share of the population growth – these were complete new communities with employment centers and downtowns, not just tracts of new housing.

▲ Most striking of all, participating in such an intense and realistic problem-solving exercise changed the leaders’ perceptions about growth and gave the leaders a fresh way to look at Southern California’s future. The experience convinced participants that it is urgent and essential for all parties and interests to listen and to work with each other for the common good, and that it is possible to work together.

It was obvious that local, regional, and State decisions today are not promoting a healthy future. At the conclusion of the exercise, the leaders had a sober understanding of how far we have to go to prepare ourselves for the imminent growth – and an excitement about the potential for “growth visioning” to change the way we all think about Southern California. That is the first step in changing how we all act – together.

“This task is hard. You will have to do things people have said you couldn’t do.”

– Raphael W. Bostic, Director, USC Casden Real Estate Economics Forecast
The 2001 ULI Los Angeles/USC Lusk Center for Real Estate Strategies for Solutions Summit focused on the growth challenge facing Southern California. A key recommendation of that forum was to generate significant public engagement in a "regional visioning" process. Soon after that summit, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) announced a multi-year, multi-million dollar "Growth Visioning for Sustaining a Livable Region Work Program," with the goal of creating awareness, excitement, and meaningful participation among stakeholders and the wider public.

"Reality Check on Growth" grew out of the commitment shown by the leaders at the 2001 ULI/USC Summit to the potential of regional growth visioning. Given the opportunity to bring this pre-existing support into SCAG's Growth Visioning Program, ULI Los Angeles and the USC Lusk Center for Real Estate partnered with SCAG, the Southern California Transportation and Land Use Coalition, the USC Casden Real Estate Economics Forecast, and the USC GIS Research Laboratory to plan the ambitious "growth visioning exercise" conducted in October.
Introduction

Before undertaking the exercise, the nearly 300 regional political, business, development, community, and environmental leaders and experts who attended “Reality Check” received the latest information of our region’s most pressing challenge.

Do we really believe our population will increase by 6 million people over the next 20 years? Many don’t. Unless the people who live here now leave, nearly 70% of the projected population growth will be due to natural increase of births exceeding deaths. Growth, in a very real sense, is already here.

The participants were charged with considering the very real consequences if we fail to plan for this anticipated magnitude of growth:

**CONGESTION:** Given the congestion the region already faces, the large number of new residents could strangle transportation and severely damage the local economy, especially given the importance of trade and commerce to the region.

**HOUSING:** The Los Angeles basin already has the most severe shortage of housing units in the country. Building the 2 million new homes for the 6 million new residents is a challenge that, if not met, will lead to high home prices and rents that will drive away the skilled workforce needed for our economy.

**JOBS:** Without the creation of a substantial number of new well-paying jobs, the region will face an employment crisis that could devastate the region’s productivity and strain social services.

**RECREATION:** The land needed to accommodate the housing and jobs for the new households will increase pressure to develop fragile habitat and needed recreational space.

**LIFE CHOICES:** With already long commutes, individuals will face even more drastic choices of how much time they will spend on the road to earn a living for themselves and their families.

“I heard more than one participant say, ‘we should just wipe it all out and start over again.’” — Gary Hunt, Partner, California Strategies LLC
Rather than attend a conference where “experts” prescribed their solutions to the potential problems, the Reality Check attendees had to come up with prescriptions of their own through a simulated growth visioning exercise.

“Visioning” is increasingly being used to effectively engage the public in long-term regional planning. Active participation raises public consciousness about issues that require a public discourse. The Reality Check exercise was based upon regional visioning processes that have been undertaken in cities such as Chicago, San Diego, Azusa and most notably in the Salt Lake City area via the “Envision Utah” project, which received an Urban Land Institute Award for Excellence in 2002.

The most popular form of visioning requires the participants to make land use decisions by placing small paper “chips” (representing the amount of land required to accommodate the projected population growth) on a map to show where the participants believe the future growth should go. The chips represent various land uses and types of development, including single-family detached housing, apartments, office space, manufacturing, and retail activity. In addition to characterizing land use, the chips also represent the area required to accommodate development of that land use (Figure 1). Thus, a chip represents a certain number of new housing units or new jobs. For example, a single-family housing chip that covers 150 acres could represent 450 new homes and 1,350 new residents. A chip representing a medium density alternative would accommodate almost four times as many homes and residents in the same acreage.

FIGURE 1: Chip Layout for Three Reality Check Tables
Visioning allows participants to arrive at different solution strategies.
The Reality Check exercise required participants to develop a plan for solving the “6 million person challenge” in 3 hours—a tall task. The attendees were divided into 20 groups of 8 to 10 people. The table assignments represented “enforced diversity,” so that the many varied interests—development, business, political, environmental—were present in each group. Thus, the exercise approximated the dynamics that policymakers face when considering major land use decisions. A facilitator and scribe were at each table to answer questions and to record the tradeoffs that participants contemplated and incorporated in their final plans.

The target region was the vast, 20,000-square-mile, five-county region spanning the Los Angeles basin. Using data from the 2000 Census and local government sources, the USC GIS Research Laboratory, headed by Dr. John Wilson, developed a detailed map of the basin that was the centerpiece of the exercise. The maps featured data layers showing slope, rivers and reservoirs, land use, parks and open space, population density, and existing and proposed transportation routes (see legend in back). With such detail, participants were able to determine those areas that were readily available for development, those areas that were effectively unbuildable because of steep slopes or park designation, and those areas that were “encumbered” by floodplains or legislative growth controls such as Ventura County’s SOAR boundaries.

The multicolored regional maps measured 5 feet by 8 feet, providing participants with a large enough scale base map to make explicit decisions about what parts of each county should receive housing and jobs, remain open space, or be designated for retail, manufacturing, or office use. The maps covered Southern California from the Santa Barbara County line on the west to Palm Springs on the east, and from Barstow on the north to the San Diego County line on the south. The northern and easternmost portions of San Bernardino County and easternmost portions of Riverside County were not included to keep the size of the maps manageable (see fold-out in back).

Based on historical development patterns, the projected 6 million new residents will require about 2 million homes and 2.2 million jobs. Participants were asked to locate the housing using three residential land use chips:

- Low-density: the standard type of single-family development pattern used in new projects, about 3 housing units or about 9 people per acre;

- Medium density: 2- and 3-story low-rise apartment buildings common in the region, about 12 housing units or about 36 people per acre; and
High density: dense high-rise apartment buildings, at 48 housing units or 144 people per acre.

Jobs were allocated using four commercial land use chips:

2-story office: low-rise office space that translates to slightly more than 120 jobs per acre;

10-story office: the dense high-rise office space located in large downtown areas that produces more than 500 jobs per acre;

Manufacturing/warehouse: the low-density, flexible "big box" workplaces that averages about 20 jobs per acre; and

Retail: shopping establishments that produce an average of 27 jobs per acre which includes the big box, strip mall, and storefront development types.

The initial allocation of chips to each group mirrored how Southern California is currently being developed. Therefore, 93.3% of the residential chips needed to house the 6 million new residents were low density chips, 6.2% were medium-density chips, and 0.5% were high-density chips. That means that 74% of the future population would live in single-family detached housing, 20% in medium density apartments and townhomes, and 6% in high density housing. The commercial chips likewise were divided according to current employment patterns.

One important ground rule was that each table had to place all chips representing the 2 million homes and 2.2 million jobs on the map. There could be no leftovers. Participants soon recognized that this was a serious constraint. Accommodating growth using current development patterns (represented by the initial chip allocations) would require covering 838 square miles with new housing development and 120 square miles with new commercial development. Thus, nearly 1,000 square miles of new development space would have to be identified in order for the projected growth to be incorporated into the region if we continue to develop as we have in the past.

Participants were given two options for changing the pattern of future development. First, the groups could agree as a group to "trade" residential chips for higher densities. Secondly, the participant groups were allowed to increase densities in existing areas by placing medium and high density residential chips on existing low density residential areas.
Initial Lessons Learned

The staff and students in the USC GIS Research Laboratory had two hectic hours following the growth visioning exercise itself to collect, analyze, and report back to the workshop on the growth scenarios laid out on the maps at the various tables.

The results (summarized in Figure 2) indicate a number of important common approaches across all or almost all the groups:

There was a strong consensus that a majority of the population and jobs should be located in areas that already have significant development.

The groups all placed at least 3.4 million people in the central portion of the region—central and southern Los Angeles County, northern Orange County, and western Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. Although this makes up only 25% of the region’s land area, approximately 57% of new growth was directed to where it already exists.

In addition, the results pointed to the importance of having a jobs-housing balance in the region. Mirroring the location of population, approximately one million jobs (48% of the projected growth) were also located in the central part of the region (Figure 3). The groups, nevertheless, still placed significant numbers of new residents and jobs in other parts of the region. Ventura County, even with its stringent growth controls, saw an average population increase of approximately half a million and the Inland Empire counties of Riverside and San Bernardino together were seen to increase their population by nearly 1.9 million people.

Figure 2:
The average number of new residents (in thousands) placed in each of the grid cells. On average, participants placed most of the population in the region’s core and large numbers toward the periphery.
The growth scenarios developed at the different tables shared three other common threads.

First, development densities that are higher than current development practices and patterns will be essential. While each table began with an allocation of homes that presupposed that development would continue in the manner that it has to this point in time, no table proposed a solution that followed the current pattern of development. Every table traded for higher density chips — most traded more than half of their low-density residential chips for higher density residential development (Figure 4). One table (table seven) traded all their low-density chips for higher density chips.

Second, several new “satellite cities” will be needed to accommodate the population growth while maintaining a jobs-housing balance. While tables, on average, located 60-80% of the projected new population in the core area of the region, significant new concentrations of people and jobs were also located at more peripheral locations. The average allocation of new growth in the Palmdale-Lancaster area was about 340,000 new people and 235,000 new jobs, while Victorville and Apple Valley would gain about 250,000 new residents and 145,000 new jobs. Several other larger new cities were envisaged for the south I-15 corridor between Corona and the San Diego County border.

**Figure 3:**
The average number of new jobs (in thousands) placed in each of the grid cells. Participants placed substantial numbers of jobs in Ventura County, northern Los Angeles County (Lancaster, Palmdale, Santa Clarita), Victorville, and a series of new towns in Riverside County.

**Figure 4:**
Final chip allocation for each table compared to the original distribution of chips. To find a solution that worked, nearly all tables needed to trade more than half of their low-density chips for higher-density housing.
Thinking the Unthinkable
Some of the “unthinkable” solutions included:

- Upzoning more than half of Los Angeles County’s current single-family-detached areas as multi-family.
- Creating a new town on the El Toro Marine Base (recently zoned as a park).
- Doubling the population of Ventura County by developing housing on agricultural land.
- Creating one million new infill, multifamily units in Los Angeles County by promoting “town center” concepts in areas such as Downtown Los Angeles, Glendale, and Long Beach.

Third, a top priority must be investment in infrastructure, including various forms of rapid transit and airports, to allow the region to function efficiently and effectively. Four tables created a transportation corridor infill model, placing their chips in “corridor” configurations along existing and potential transportation routes within urban areas. These participants stressed that significant transportation and other infrastructure investment are necessary to realize this vision. Indeed, many tables added new transportation infrastructure to their maps and some even proposed “stacking” additional transportation modes above existing freeways.

“The idea of taking on the whole region is an idea so audacious, I never would have thought of it. But I like it.” – Felicia Marcus, Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, Trust for Public Land
Where do you put six million people?

So how did the groups find room for homes and jobs for 6 million additional residents? The short answer: with great difficulty. But the overwhelming sentiment was that "where there is a will, there is a way," and four main approaches emerged from the intense discussions as each diverse group of leaders looked for consensus answers (Figure 5):

- Transportation Corridor with Infill
- New Towns with Infill
- Sprawl with Infill
- New Cities

The most common of these four approaches was the New Towns With Infill approach, which featured the establishment of medium-sized hubs distributed around the outer edges of the region. An essential element of this strategy is "infill" — development in places that are already relatively densely populated — as most of the new residents are housed using this approach. A lot of infill development was a feature of two of the other

Existing Land Use

Figure 6:
Division of the region into a series of core and periphery regions with less densely settled landscapes and more potentially developable land as one moves from the core (colored purple) to the periphery 1 grid cells (green), periphery 2 grid cells (rust), periphery 3 grid cells (blue), and the periphery 4 grid cells (yellow).
main approaches, which differed only in how the remainder of the population was accommodated. In the Transportation Corridor approach, significant development was focused along key existing and future transportation nodes. By contrast, the Sprawl approach placed large numbers at the fringes of the region in low-density development.

The fourth main approach - the New Cities model - differs from the others in that it does not rely nearly as heavily on infill to accommodate the looming population growth. Rather, the signature feature of this approach is large cities (greater than 400,000 in population) toward the edges of the region that become powerful urban centers.

All of these models feature densities far greater than those that prevail today. Even the Sprawl model, which among the four approaches had the lowest average development density, calls for development patterns that are more than twice as dense as current development patterns (Figure 7). And all foresee the need for a striking increase in the number of high density developments in the region.

The models’ differences, however, become evident when we look at how the population is distributed geographically under each plan.

Using the regional breakdowns depicted in the land use map in Figure 6, it is evident that the three infill strategies rely heavily on new development in the region’s core and inner-ring suburbs (periphery 1). For example, the Transportation Corridor approach sees 64% of the new population residing in this area (Figure 8). By contrast, only 43% live in the core and inner-ring suburbs under the New Cities strategy. Under this approach, the bulk of the new residents live in periphery 3, which is close to the region’s current fringe.

The sections that follow offer more detail on each of the four main approaches that emerged from the consensus answers of the Reality Check participants.
Lessons Learned

Growth Model One:
Transportation Corridor Infill
MODEL ONE: TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR INFILL

The participants at four tables placed their chips in “corridor” configurations along existing and potential transportation routes within urban areas. Nearly 5 million of the 6 million new residents were placed in the two sets of central transportation corridor grid cells (Figure 9). These tables allocated two-thirds of the new residents (3.85 million people) to existing urban areas. These tables also traded an overwhelming share (86%) of their low density housing chips for medium and high density chips.

The four maps on the opposite page detail how one table that chose the transportation corridor infill strategy approached the challenge. This group traded away 97% of its low density chips. Those that were left were placed in three of the least populated grid cells in the region (Figure 10a). The low density chips were swapped for medium density chips and most of these chips were placed in the urban core (18%) and periphery 1 zone immediately adjacent to the core region (58%) (Figure 10b). Three of the four high density chips that were included in the initial allocation of residential chips were placed in these two zones as well (Figure 10c). This particular team identified the existing Alameda Corridor and its proposed eastward extension to San Bernardino as a key corridor and added high speed rail connections linking the

Downtown with Lancaster, Redlands, San Juan Capistrano, and LAX on their base map. Overall, the participants at this table placed over 80% of new residents in these two corridors, minimizing urban expansion and growth in Ventura County, northern and eastern San Bernardino County, and southeastern Riverside County (Figure 10d).

FIGURE 9:
This map shows the placement of new residents (in thousands) by tables that favored the “transportation corridor infill” growth model.
FIGURE 10a  •  Low Density

FIGURE 10b  •  Medium Density

FIGURE 10c  •  High Density

FIGURE 10d  •  New Residents

E 10 a-d: These maps show the placement of (a) low density housing chips, (b) medium density housing chips, (c) high density housing chips, and thousands of new residents on the base map by participants at Table 9.
Lessons Learned

Growth Model Two
New Towns With Infill
Model Two: New Towns with Infill

Eight groups directed a substantial portion of new growth to a series of new towns around the edges of the region. They envisioned new major urban hubs totaling well over a million additional people in Santa Clarita, Palmdale, Lancaster, Victorville, Apple Valley, San Jacinto, Temecula, and Palm Springs. These tables traded away 66% of their low density chips and replaced them with large numbers of medium density and some additional high density chips (see Figure 8 for details).

The next four maps show how the chips were traded and allocated by one of the tables that followed this model. This group kept 162 low density chips (21% of their original allocation) and traded for 128 medium density and 24 high density housing chips, respectively. Nearly two-thirds of the low density chips were used in the peripheral “new town” areas (Figure 12a), while the medium density chips were spread throughout the region (Figure 12b). High density chips were split between the San Fernando and San Gabriel Valleys and the northern half of Orange County (Figure 12c).

Figure 11: This map shows the placement of new residents (in thousands) by tables that favored the “new town with infill” growth model.
Figures 12 a - d: These maps show the placement of (a) low density housing chips, (b) medium density housing chips, (c) high density housing chips, and (d) new residents *(in thousands)* on the base map by participants at Table 11.
Lessons Learned

Growth Model Three
Sprawl With Infill
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MODEL THREE: SPRAWL WITH INFILL

Four tables followed a growth model that combined “sprawl” with increased densities in existing areas (Figure 13). These groups were second only to the “transportation corridor” groups in allocating substantial growth in the core region (an average of 1.5 million new residents), while sending 2 million new residents to the periphery in conventional low-density development. Not surprisingly, these groups also kept the largest numbers of low density chips (over 40% of their original allocations) and used them to extend the urban boundaries along the northern margins of the current cities and towns in Ventura, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties and along the western and southern margins of Riverside County (Figure 13).

The next four maps show how the chips were traded and allocated by one of the groups using this approach. The participants kept almost a third of their original low density housing chips. Most of this growth was placed along the northern edges of a series of existing cities and towns in Ventura, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino Counties and on the outskirts of a series of cities and towns in western Riverside County (Figure 14a). A large number of the medium density chips were placed in the same grid cells and the remainder were allocated to the urban core (Figure 14b.) The high density chips were split between grid cells in Ventura, South Los Angeles, and Orange Counties (Figure 14c).

---

FIGURE 13: This map shows the placement of new residents (in thousands) by tables that favored the “sprawl with infill” growth model.
Figures 14 A-D: These maps show the placement of (a) low density housing chips, (b) medium density housing chips, (c) high density housing chips, and (d) new residents (in thousands) on the base map by participants at Table 5.
Lessons Learned

Growth Model Four
New Cities
Model Four: New Cities

Five tables favored a more aggressive "new city" strategy than those that split growth with the existing urban core. On average, these tables added 935,000 new residents in the San Jacinto/Temecula/Palm Springs area, 706,000 in the Santa Clarita/Palmdale/Lancaster area and 414,000 residents in the Victorville/Apple Valley area (Figure 15).

The final four maps show how the chips were traded and allocated by one of the tables that followed this model. The participants at this particular table traded away only 40% of their initial allocation of low density housing chips, replacing them with mostly medium density chips. The largest number of low and medium density chips were allocated in Orange County, western Riverside County, and to the satellite cities of San Jacinto, Temecula, Palm Springs, Santa Clarita, Palmdale, Lancaster, Victorville, and Apple Valley (Figure 16a, 16b). The high density chips were split between the San Fernando Valley, Orange County, and the northwestern corner of Riverside County (Figure 16c).
Figures 16a-d: These maps show the placement of (a) low density housing chips, (b) medium density housing chips, (c) high density housing chips, and (d) new residents (in thousands) on the base map by participants at Table 17.
The true success of Reality Check was that it demonstrated that real estate and planning professionals from the public and private sectors were able to work with a wide range of business, community, and environmental leaders in an atmosphere of mutual respect that gave all participants a share in influencing the outcome of future growth.

The organizing presenters of Reality Check — ULI Los Angeles, USC Lusk Center for Real Estate, SCAG, SCTLC, the Casden Real Estate Economics Forecast, and the USC GIS Research Laboratory — hope that this event kick starts the longer-term planning and development process being undertaken by SCAG and other organizations at the regional, community, and neighborhood level. The organizers and sponsors of the Reality Check exercise believe it shows the value of confronting all parties and interests with the realities of projected growth. Once all stakeholders share a common understanding of the region’s challenges, potential solutions, and the tradeoffs associated with each, it is possible to overcome the fear of change, achieve compromise, and articulate and implement solutions.

We encourage civic and political leadership to draw from the lessons learned from the Reality Check exercise and shape strategies that will improve the region’s future. Let us prepare for the coming demographic earthquake and improve our regional quality of life.
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FOR MORE INFORMATION

ULI Los Angeles and the Smart Growth work of the Urban Land Institute: www.uli-la.org

USC Lusk Center for Real Estate:
www.usc.edu/lusk

Southern California Transportation and Land Use Coalition: www.sctlc.org

USC Casden Real Estate Economics Forecast:
www.usc.edu/casden

USC GIS Research Laboratory:
www.usc.edu/dept/geography/gislab

Southern California Association of Governments:
www.scag.org

MEDIA COVERAGE

For copies of articles, transcripts of broadcasts, and other information relating to media coverage of Reality Check on Growth, please contact:

Jack Skelley
Roddan Paolucci Roddan
2516 Via Tejon, Suite 114
Palos Verdes Estates, California 90274
Tel: 310.791.2759
Fax: 310.791.2750
jskelley@roddanpaolucci.com

REALITY CHECK REPORT

To obtain copies of this report contact:
USC Lusk Center for Real Estate
650 Childs Way • 331 Lewis Hall
Los Angeles, California 90089-0626
Tel: 213.740.5000 • Fax: 213.740.6170
www.usc.edu/lusk
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