5TH STORY of Focus printed in FULL format.


The New York Times

December 30, 1996, Monday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section A; Page 1; Column 2; National Desk

LENGTH: 2994 words

HEADLINE: Drawing a Hard Line Against Urban Sprawl

SERIES: BECOMING LOS ANGELES -- Second of two articles.

BYLINE: By TIMOTHY EGAN

DATELINE: PORTLAND, Ore.

BODY:

One of the great challenges of the West, the writer Wallace Stegner said, was to build a civilization to match the setting.

But as 6 of the 15 fastest-growing cities in the nation come of age in the West, spilling into forests, deserts and mountain valleys, the only urban area that appears to be most consciously trying to shape itself as a new kind of American city is Portland.

While other 1990's boom cities like Phoenix, Denver, Salt Lake and Las Vegas were following a predictable pattern of unchecked growth, taking on the bloat and sprawl of Los Angeles, Portland went the other way.

Ignoring lawsuits and pressure from commercial and development interests, Portland -- acting on a much-fought-over new state law -- simply drew a line around the metropolitan area, beginning in the late 1970's. On one side would be forests, farms and open space; on the other would be the city. The aim was to force jobs, homes and stores into a relatively compact area, served by light rail, buses and cars.

Skeptics said it would be impossible to contain a fast-growing city like Portland within a political boundary, without sending jobs away or killing property values. It seemed even more unlikely that a big city in the West could force people out of their cars, as Portland, with a current population of about 450,000 tried to do, tearing up a downtown freeway and putting a limit on parking spaces.

But instead of lost jobs, a silicon forest of high-tech campuses and factories grew inside the new urban boundaries. Instead of falling property values, home prices have soared. And instead of losing population, Oregon added 500,000 people, mostly in Portland and the Willamette Valley to the south, in the last 15 years.

It did so with the strictest laws against urban sprawl in the nation. Many of the newer companies in Oregon -- among them Hewlett-Packard, Intel and Hyundai -- say they moved here because there are forests, fruit orchards and meandering creeks just across the street from the contained urban areas.

The employers said they wanted to locate in an area that could attract educated workers who were as interested in quality of life as a paycheck.

"This is where we are headed worldwide," said Bill Calder, a spokesman for Intel, the computer chip manufacturer that has nearly 9,000 employees in Oregon. "Companies that can locate anywhere they want will go where they can attract good people in good places."

A number of critics say Oregon is unique, and that its political culture -- it is known as New England on the Pacific Rim -- and relatively small population of 3.2 million allow it to experiment and tinker. But supporters of the Oregon city-shaping plan note that it was hatched by a Republican governor, and that business as well as Birkenstock environmentalists have rallied around it.

Seattle has followed Oregon's lead, creating its own line against sprawl in the Cascade Mountain foothills, and trying to force homebuilders back into the core of the city.

Denver and Salt Lake City, and officials in those states, are studying it. Phoenix is in a political quagmire over development. Even Las Vegas, the fastest-growing city in America, is experiencing the first calls for growth control in the face of severe traffic congestion, overcrowded schools and a looming water shortage.

And this year several cities in California -- a state often cited as a caricature of ill-considered urban development -- took a page from Oregon. San Jose and four smaller Bay Area communities all voted to keep new subdivisions and commercial clutter within a contained area.

If anything has defined the quest to create something different in the emerging mega-cities of the West, it is the idea of blending urban life with the outdoors -- be it the desert, the Rocky Mountains or the wet woods of the Pacific Northwest.

As such, one of the big questions for the urban West, said Richard Lamm, the former Governor of Colorado, is: "How many people can lead satisfied lives here?"

To residents of cities that are losing people and jobs and are fighting just to hold the line on basic municipal services, such a question may seem self-indulgent. But it is the issue that many people in the West say most troubles them as they watch cities they fell in love with morph into something unrecognizable.

Boulder, Colo.
The Best Laid Plans Are Undermined

Nearly 40 years ago, Boulder, Colo., tried to control its future on its own, setting itself up as an ideal mix of wild and urban -- a midsized city pressed against the vertical flank of the Rockies, 30 miles from Denver.

Starting in 1959, Boulder drew a line in the mountains just above the city, above which no water or sewer services could be extended.

Then, in 1967, Boulder started to take a portion of the sales tax and buy up open space, mostly ranch land that was being sold to commercial developers. It has since purchased 25,000 acres. In 1976, Boulder went a step further, setting a limit on residential growth, at 2 percent a year.

For a time, it seemed to work. From 1976 to 1993, the population remained relatively stable but the economy grew at a vigorous rate with the creation of new jobs. This year, Boulder has been trying to limit new commercial growth -- the most contested step it has yet taken.

At night, it is clear what Boulder has done. Above the city, there are no urban lights massed along the mountains. A sign just blocks from the edge of the city says, "This is a mountain lion's home," and indeed, there are fresh cougar tracks in the snow.

The line has held Boulder at bay. But if Boulder thought it could keep the sprawl of greater Denver from coming its way, it was wrong.

A series of communities sprang up along Highway 36, between Denver and Boulder. On the prairie where the Arapaho and Cheyenne people once roamed, there are tens of thousands of new three-bedroom, two-story, cedar-decked homes massed in developments with Indian names, and beautifully landscaped headquarters of high-tech companies.

An occasional ranch or two stands out incongruously. The Rockies are close enough to feel their breath. But on some days, the mountains are obscured by Denver's brown cloud, drifting north. At rush hour, Highway 36 is a parking lot all the way back to Denver.

In essence, the megalopolis has come to Boulder. It is an island no more.

"The lesson is: we can't do this alone, in isolation," said John Carpenter, the community development director of Westminster, a fast-growing Denver suburb. Like Boulder, Westminster had tried to control its fate by limiting development and buying open space. But greater Denver has engulfed it.

"They are things we have no control over, no matter how many laws we pass in Westminster," he said.

In both Phoenix and Denver, officials have made a strong effort to purchase open space before it is lost to development. Phoenix boasts of having the largest municipal park in the world, the 25,000 acres of South Mountain Park. But as one branch of government, the city, has been trying to buy vacant land for parks and wildlife, another branch, the State of Arizona, has been selling it to housing developers because it needs to make money for the state.

"It's like funding cancer research and giving subsidies to tobacco growers at the same time," said Scott Phelps, a spokesman for Mayor Skip Rimsza of Phoenix.

Colorado has faced the same predicament. The state, which first showed its political mentality when it voted down a chance to host the Olympic Games in 1976, has used a portion of lottery money to buy land. Still, in the last 10 years alone, more than 500,000 acres of open space has been lost to development.

But this year, voters passed a constitutional amendment that will allow the state to designate as protected open space some of the land that had been set aside as revenue-generating property. In short, instead of buying open land, they are just not selling or developing open land owned by the state.

"This was a huge change -- a very big deal around here," said Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado.

Governor Romer favors an Oregon-style growth management plan for his state. But he says property rights advocates, and Colorado's more conservative political tradition, would keep anything like the Oregon plan from passing the Legislature.

"I'm a former developer," Mr. Romer said. "I know how the free market works. It's very difficult to convince people of growth management when you have a political ethic that says, 'Stay away from my private property.' "

When asked about Wallace Stegner's hope that cities would match the setting, Mr. Romer was a bit pessimistic. "We're likely to have that one big sprawling city from Fort Collins to Colorado Springs, with bits of open space in between," he said. "But I haven't given up hope. This is the fight to fight."

Prof. Ray Studer, sitting in a University of Colorado office in Boulder on a day when winds had blown the smog away and the mountains seemed newly polished, believes that the urban West may yet live up to its promise, though it faces ingrained political opposition.

"There is a spirit of innovation and newness here, still a sense of the possible," said Professor Studer, who is director of the Urban and Regional Planning Program at the University.

"Nobody in Colorado is willingly trying to screw up the land or dirty the air," he said. "This kind of stuff happens because we Westerners are not, by nature, a planning culture."

## Salt Lake City
## A Vision of Place Fades Over Time

Westerners have, in fact, tried to plan for orderly growth, starting in 1847 in the Salt Lake Valley, where Mormon pioneers set out the region's first planned urban development, acting on Brigham Young's directive, "This is the place."

By careful design, the streets of Salt Lake were to be 88 feet wide, the sidewalks 20 feet, with houses set 20 feet back from the street. A large part of the city was set aside as the common area.

The problem has been maintaining a central vision over time. This is evident in the Salt Lake of today, where the fastest-growing areas around the city are a hodgepodge of new suburbs and developments creeping up the sides of the Wasatch Range.

"Is this still the right place?" said Robert Liberty, of 1000 Friends of Oregon, in a recent speech before civic leaders in Utah. His group studies urban growth issues. "Or will you become just another place to be abandoned? Will the bronze pioneers stare sadly out in the smog into a murky future where the dream of community has been lost?"

Seattle at the turn of the century had a master plan for boulevards, parks and waterways. In the 1960's, it cleaned up Lake Washington before there was a Federal mandate to do so. But it turned down mass transit, opting for more highways instead.

As a result, traffic grew four times as fast as the population. Last month, people in the Seattle metro area finally approved a plan to build a $4 billion rail and bus system, costing residents four times what it would have cost, in inflation-adjusted dollars, to do the same thing 20 years earlier.

In the early years after World War II, Phoenix thought it had a plan for orderly growth; it decided to annex neighboring suburbs before they could even take shape. The city grew tenfold, in physical size and population, in 50 years.

But its annexation policy led to publicly financed sprawl of the worst kind, many Phoenix officials now say. The Phoenix of 1996 has terrible air, gridlocked traffic, and spreads out in so many directions that it seems to lack any sense of order.

In the face of these problems, Phoenix has done a near-complete reversal; as of this year, it is using the leverage of lower development fees to try and lure homebuilders back to the city center.

Phoenix has set a goal of trying to keep development within about a 500-square-mile area. But there is no leverage to enforce the goal -- only the carrot of lower building permit fees within the central city. So, massive new developments, 10,000 homes apiece, are under way well north of the area that the city would to see remain wild.

"Developers will go wherever they can make a buck," said Rob Melnick, head of the Morrison Institute for Public Policy at Arizona State University. "If you charge them more to build on the far suburban edge, they'll pay it and just pass that on the homebuyer."

Portland, Ore.
The Next Challenge: A Population Tide

Oregonians delight at being contrarian. The force behind their plan was Tom McCall, the Republican Governor in the early 1970's, who once said he loved Oregon more than life itself. Governor McCall told Oregonians that they faced a choice between "sagebrush subdivisions and coastal condominiums," or towns that blended gently into the state's stunning natural environment.

In 1973, Mr. McCall signed a law that required every one of Oregon's cities and counties to write land-use plans that limited sprawl and protected farms, forests and open space. They were to draw boundaries around the cities or face legal sanctions.

Three times, in 1976, 1978 and 1982, developers and other commercial interests brought ballot measures before the voters to repeal the act, and three times, Oregonians voted to keep the tough anti-sprawl measures.

Today, a clear line -- with cities on one side, and open space on the other -- can be seen from the air. The difference is particularly graphic along the Washington-Oregon border. Just across the Columbia River, in Washington State, much of suburban Clark County spills out in myriad directions over what used to be farm land.

Oregon, which had been losing 30,000 acres of agricultural land a year, is now losing only 2,000 acres a year. Colorado, by contrast, is losing nearly 50,000 acres a year.

Portland today has a tight, dense downtown area that caters to pedestrians; where once there was a freeway along the river, there is now the most-used city park, named for Mr. McCall. The city's light-rail system, MAX, has exceeded expectations for use and popularity.

This year, the Metro government of Portland adopted an even stricter plan for its three-county metro area. It envisions adding 500,000 people within the existing urban boundaries.

Officials in the Metro governing body, which controls development of the three-county area that contains 24 individual cities, are constantly reminding Portland residents of a population tide that will engulf them if they don't act, saying, "We'll be having 75 more people here by dinner time than we had at breakfast."

In an attempt to control the size of stores springing up in industrial areas, the plan limits retail outlets to 60,000 square feet.

And while Portland has long limited parking spaces downtown, the new plan restricts the number of parking spaces at new stores. Angry retailers say the restriction will hurt them; Portland officials counter that it will merely encourage people to take public transit.

When Seattle followed Portland's lead in its 1994 urban growth plan, it actually downzoned 50 square miles of what used to be an area designated for new homes into a rural and forest category. This set off howls of outrage. But so far, the boundary has survived court and political challenges.

There is something of a self-congratulatory -- critics call it smug -- tone about what Portland has done.

"We have been careful stewards of the land and have fought to protect our natural resources against the urban sprawl that has plagued almost every other metropolitan area in this country," said Mike Burton, Metro's executive officer, in a message sent to Portland residents. "We have worked hard to maintain our enviable quality of life."

The real test for Portland will come after another million or so people have moved there. Then the cities will face a question of allowing more apartments and town houses into their cherished single-family neighborhoods or spilling into the rural areas they have just fought so hard to preserve.

"At some point with those cities you get into a question of density: will people still move there if they can't live in a big home with a yard?" said Phil Burgess, president of the Center for the New West, a Denver research organization.

Mr. Burgess said sprawl could still be controlled by relying less on state government and more on market forces, but taking into account the true costs of building instant cities on open land. If developers were forced to pay fully for roads, sewers, schools and other necessities, they would be more likely to rebuild within the existing urban area, he said.

"You make them pay the full costs and all of a sudden that $130,000 home in the far suburbs is $230,000," Mr. Burgess said.

And Oregon's plan has not been entirely successful in containing sprawl. In the town of Bend, east of the Cascades, officials merely drew a broad urban boundary. While this complied with the letter of the law, it allowed strip development to spill out in two directions from the city.

The other major complaint against Oregon is that civic planners, by drastically restricting urban sprawl, would cause home prices to shoot up. And indeed, median home prices for existing homes in Washington and Oregon, the two states with urban growth restrictions, rose to $153,190 this year -- the third highest among 10 regions of the country.

Mr. Liberty of 1000 Friends of Oregon said home prices rose, in Seattle and Portland, primarily because so many new jobs have been created.

More important, Mr. Liberty says Oregon has shown that American cities do not have to follow the predictable pattern from boom to sprawl to abandonment.

"At least we have shown that you can do something," Mr. Liberty said. "There is a fundamental civic assumption that we can make the city work, and shape it the way we want it to be shaped. It's taken 20 years of political blood, sweat and tears to come to that realization."

GRAPHIC: Photos: Portland's light rail system, Max, was crucial in its plan to keep jobs and homes within an area that would be ringed by farms and forests. (David Falconer for The New York Times) (pg. A1); Officials in Portland began managing urban sprawl in the 1970's, drawing a line around the city to force development into a relatively compact area. The downtown skyline is bounded by Washington Park in the foreground and Mount Hood in the background. (David Falconer for The New York Times) (pg. A12)

Map/Chart: "HOW IT WORKS: Keeping Growth Under Control"

In the 1970's Oregon began requiring all cities and counties to write land use plans that limited sprawl and protected farms, forests and open space. Portland's plan, covering 24 cities in three counties, is considered a model. Map/Chart outlines some features of this plan. (pg. A12)

# H.R. 1231: Post Office Community Partnership Act

**Introduced by Congressman Earl Blumenauer**
**April 8, 1997**

**What is the Problem?** When building, closing or altering post offices, the U.S. Postal Service is ignoring local laws and bringing harm to communities across the country.

**First**, the Postal Service is not required to abide by local zoning and building laws. This has led the Postal Service to build new facilities or make changes to existing facilities out of compliance with local plans for growth management, traffic management, environmental protection or public safety.

**Second**, communities have little say in the decisions that impact them. Currently, under Section 404(b) of Title 39 of the U.S. Code, the post office is required to consider the effect of any closings or consolidations of post offices on the community. The post office has adopted "community contact" procedures to meet the requirements of this section. However, the post office has, in some cases, not followed these procedures where they are not technically required to do so. The most glaring examples have involved relocations, which can have major impacts on communities but do not fit the technical definition of "closing" or "consolidation".

**A Few of the Communities Negatively Affected by Post Office Decisions:**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ⇒ Portland, OR | ⇒ Durbey, NY | ⇒ Castine, ME | ⇒ Golden, CO |
| ⇒ Lakewood, NY | ⇒ Red Lodge, MT | ⇒ Woodland, WA | ⇒ McCall, ID |
| ⇒ Big Horn, WY | ⇒ Philadelphia, PA | ⇒ Basalt, CO | ⇒ Abbeville, LA |
| ⇒ Auburn, CA | ⇒ Parks, LA | ⇒ Livingston, MT | ⇒ Genoa, NE |

**How H.R. 1231 Helps:** Treats the Postal Service as a responsible member of the community by not allowing it to be above local laws. Gives the community a voice in post office decisions.

**First**, the proposal would require the Postal Service to comply with any zoning or building codes that the local community may have in place, so long as those regulations are applicable to state or local public entities, including the zoning authority itself.

**Second**, outlining minimum community contact procedures that apply to the **renovation, relocation, closing and consolidation** of post offices, not just closings and consolidations as under current law. Included would be a list of criteria the post office must consider when evaluating the effect of the decision on the community.

Under the community contact procedures, individuals served by the post office in question would be given the opportunity to offer reasonable alternatives to the Postal Service proposal, to which the Postal Service would reply in writing why the alternative is or is not viable. The proposal would also expand communities' rights to appeal Postal Service decisions to the Postal Rate Commission, to include **renovations** and **relocations** along with **closings** and **consolidations**.

*For more information or to cosponsor, contact Michael Harrison at 225-4811*

# GIVE FANS A CHANCE

## The Who, What, When, Where, and Why

**Who**: Rep. Earl Blumenauer has introduced *H.R. 590*, to **Give Fans a Chance**

## WHEN it started: The Green Bay Story

The Green Bay Packers where founded in 1919. In 1950, the fans saved the team from bankruptcy through a one and only public stock offering. Since then, this team from the NFL's smallest city has seen 175 consecutive sell-outs, 11 championships, and three Superbowls, including the Superbowl they won this year. They have the best record in the NFL.

The Packers aren't an ordinary football team. Their fans aren't ordinary fans. And their community isn't an ordinary community -- **because 1,915 residents of Green Bay and other "Packer Backers" own their football team**. The Packers help hold the Green Bay community together.

## What needs to be done:

The Green Bay Packers are unique. NFL rules prohibit any more public ownership of teams. H.R. 590 gives fans a chance to define their communities by owning the local team. It:

⇒ Eliminates league rules against public ownership

⇒ Gives communities a voice in team relocation decisions

⇒ Ties the leagues' broadcast antitrust exemption to the requirements in this bill.

## Where: Communities affected

These are only a few of the communities affected by franchise moves. H.R. 590 would give localities and fans a voice.

| | |
|---|---|
| ⇒ Brooklyn, NY | ⇒ New York, NY |
| ⇒ Washington, DC | ⇒ Seattle, WA |
| ⇒ Oakland, CA | ⇒ Los Angeles, CA |
| ⇒ Philadelphia, PA | ⇒ Baltimore, MD |
| ⇒ Cleveland, OH | ⇒ Houston, TX |
| ⇒ Sacramento, CA | ⇒ New Orleans, LA |
| ⇒ Tampa Bay, FL | ⇒ Minneapolis, MN |
| ⇒ Hartford, CT | |

## Why: Questions and Answers

***Why is this bill necessary?***

Since 1950, there have been 68 franchise moves in the four major sports leagues. Only a few teams currently have any form of public ownership, including the Celtics, the Packers, and the Florida Panthers. These teams haven't moved since they went public.

Public ownership of teams could help stem the tide of franchise moves, which severely test fan loyalty. But many league rules and practices either prohibit or discourage public ownership.

***Why is a "community voice" so important?***

Like it or not, professional sports teams have become an integral part of the fabric that makes up our communities. Too often, however, sports team owners instigate pitched battles between local communities over placement of teams. These communities are willing to pay millions of dollars to coax teams from one city to another -- at the expense of other vital city services.

Communities need more leverage in these battles. H.R. 590 provides that leverage by requiring teams to listen to the community before making a relocation decision. It also gives communities an opportunity to purchase the team.

***Why tie this bill to the broadcast antitrust exemption?***

This congressionally granted antitrust exemption allows teams to collaborate on the purchase of national broadcast time. The NFL earned $1.2 billion on broadcast rights last year. Since Congress granted the leagues this benefit in 1961, professional sports in America have flourished. This exemption has provided the financial foundation for each team in each of the leagues. We have an obligation to sports fans to ensure the exemption is used for positive purposes.

*For more information contact Stephanie Vance in the DC Office at (202) 225-0820 or Julia Pomeroy in the Portland Office at (503) 231-2300*

# H.R. 814 – The "Defense of Children Act"

## HERE ARE THE STATS:

- ***Every 90 minutes*** **a child is killed with a loaded gun**
- ***1 out of 8*** **fatalities among kids are from guns**
- **Shootings are the** ***4th leading cause*** **of accidental death for children**
- **For every child killed by gunfire,** ***4 more*** **are wounded**

### WE NEED TO REDUCE THESE STATS

Kids should not mix with guns improperly stored in the home. We can and should do something about it. The right to own a gun must be balanced with the responsibility of keeping guns out of children's hands. When people buy a gun, they should be encouraged to purchase a device that ensures the gun will not be accidentally handled or fired.

### STATES ARE ALREADY TAKING ACTION

**Child Access Prevention (CAP) laws** and other similar trigger lock laws are already on the books in 15 states and a number of local communities. **CAP** laws make it the legal responsibility of both gun dealers to provide and gun owners to use such devices. **THESE LAWS WORK.** Florida, the first state to pass such a law, showed a **50%** drop in unintentional deaths the first year after passage. California has shown similar results after passage of their **CAP** law.

### OUR BILL WOULD FOLLOW THE STATES' LEAD

Our bill consists of the following main provisions, which are included in most versions of the state **CAP** law:

- makes it unlawful for any person to leave a loaded firearm, or a firearm near ammunition, in a manner that makes it likely to be reasonably accessed by a juvenile without supervision or permission
- makes it unlawful for a gun dealer to sell a firearm unless the dealer has offered to sell the gun buyer a locking device or "lock box" for safe gun storage
- requires gun dealers to post a sign saying that such a law is in effect to notify potential customers

**States where CAP laws are already in effect:**

- California
- Connecticut
- Delaware
- Florida
- Hawaii
- Iowa
- Maryland
- Minnesota
- Nevada
- New Jersey
- North Carolina
- Rhode Island
- Texas
- Virginia
- Wisconsin

(CAP laws are pending in several more states)

**Co-sponsors of H.R. 814**
**(as of 4/23/97)**

Rep. George Brown (D-CA)
Rep. Carrie Meek (D-FL)
Rep. Sidney Yates (D-IL)
Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-CA)
Rep. Lynn Woolsey (D-CA)
Rep. Gary Ackerman (D-NY)
Rep. Elizabeth Furse (D-OR)
Rep. Steven Rothman (D-NJ)
Rep. John Lewis (D-GA)
Rep. Corrine Brown (D-FL)

For more information, contact **Adam Carstens** in **Rep. Blumenauer's** office (202-225-4811)

# H. Res. 37 -- House Transit Pass Program

*Improving Transportation Options for Congressional Employees*

## Who in DC is helping ease traffic congestion?

- ➪ Over 1,000 private businesses and 100 Federal Agencies in Washington, DC offer transit pass incentives to their employees.
- ➪ 745 employees of Bell Atlantic receive transit pass benefits
- ➪ Many federal agencies, including EPA, participate in the transit pass program
- ➪ The Senate, with 7,000 employees, has an active transit pass program

## Who's missing?

*The United States House of Representatives.* The House has never established a transit pass program. With nearly 7,000 employees living and working in the DC metropolitan area and another 3,000 in district offices, we could have a significant role to play in getting people out of their cars and on to public transportation.

## Why haven't we? The History:

The House was authorized to participate in state and local transit programs under the Federal Employees Clean Air Incentives Act of 1993. However, the structure of certain House budgets at the time made it nearly impossible to develop a viable program for all House employees.
Recent changes in the budget structure make this the opportune time to establish a transit pass program.
**Representative Blumenauer introduced House Resolution 37 to do just that.**

## How it works:

H. Res. 37 would require House Oversight to establish a program that:

- ➪ Gives each office the option to participate.
- ➪ Makes house employees who neither hold a parking permit nor participate in a carpool eligible to receive a $21 monthly transit pass.
- ➪ Requires no additional revenue.
- ➪ Works with participating offices to help budget the costs associated with employee participation.

This resolution is an opportunity to support transit systems in the District of Columbia and in cities across the country. It is a simple, cost-effective way to ease congestion on our highways, clean our air and improve our communities.

**Please add your support to this list of current cosponsors:**

Reps. Boehlert, Bonior, Borski, Brown (CA), Clyburn, Davis (IL), DeFazio, Dellums, Dunn, Ehlers, Engel, Farr, Flake, Foglietta, Frank, Frost, Furse, Gejdenson, Gilchrest, Kelly, Knollenberg, LaFalce, Leach, Lewis (GA), McKinney, Markey, Maloney (NY), Martinez, Miller (CA), Moran, Morella, Nadler, Nethercutt, Norton, Olver, Quinn, Skaggs, Snyder, Stark, Traficant, Watt (NC), and Wynn

*For more information or to sign on as a cosposnor, please contact Chris Spencer at 51179.*

# H.R. 108 -- Vehicle Forfeiture for Repeat Drunk Drivers Act

## DRUNK DRIVING'S COSTS TO SOCIETY ARE DRAMATIC AND RISING:

- 1995's deathtoll was **17,274**, up four percent from 1994;
- drunk drivers injure **hundreds of thousands** every year;
- the economic costs borne by individuals, industry and the government **exceed $45 billion** annually!

## VEHICLE FORFEITURE STOPS THE WORST OFFENDERS -- THE CHRONIC DRUNK DRIVERS:

- Portland, Oregon has registered a steep drop in drunk driving deaths - **down 42%** between 1994 and 1995. Much of this success can be attributed to Portland's auto forfeiture program.
- The city of Portland has seen a recidivism rate of only four percent for offenders whose cars have been seized;
- Auto forfeiture has been proven to be cost-effective and litigation proof.

## WHAT WILL H.R. 108 DO?

Representative Blumenauer's H.R. 108 alters an existing federal anti-drunk driving grant program to encourage, but not require, states to adopt auto forfeiture. This increases the number of options states have in fighting drunk driving, giving credit for a proven means of combating the repeat drunk driver. H.R. 108 does not penalize states who do not adopt auto forfeiture programs -- they could continue to meet the existing grant criteria and remain eligible for funding.

## HOW MUCH WILL H.R. 108 COST?

Nothing. This bill does not change the amount authorized for the existing anti-drunk driving grant program.

## NATIONAL FORFEITURE SUPPORTERS:

Mothers Against Drunk Driving, Law Enforcement Steering Committee, Police Executive Research Forum, Citizens for Safe Drivers Against Drunk Drivers & Chronic Offenders, the American Bankers Association, the Century Council and the Independent Insurance Agents of America.

## COSPONSORS:

Reps. Quinn, DeFazio, Solomon, Frost, Underwood, John Lewis, Parker, Furse... and you?

*For more information or to cosponsor, contact Michael Harrison in Congressman **Blumenauer's** office, at 225-4811*

# H.R. 1231: Post Office Community Partnership Act

**Introduced by Congressman Earl Blumenauer**
**April 8, 1997**

**What is the Problem?** When building, closing or altering post offices, the U.S. Postal Service is ignoring local laws and bringing harm to communities across the country.

**First**, the Postal Service is not required to abide by local zoning and building laws. This has led the Postal Service to build new facilities or make changes to existing facilities out of compliance with local plans for growth management, traffic management, environmental protection or public safety.

**Second**, communities have little say in the decisions that impact them. Currently, under Section 404(b) of Title 39 of the U.S. Code, the post office is required to consider the effect of any closings or consolidations of post offices on the community. The post office has adopted "community contact" procedures to meet the requirements of this section. However, the post office has, in some cases, not followed these procedures where they are not technically required to do so. The most glaring examples have involved relocations, which can have major impacts on communities but do not fit the technical definition of "closing" or "consolidation".

**A Few of the Communities Negatively Affected by Post Office Decisions:**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ⇒ Portland, OR | ⇒ Durbey, NY | ⇒ Castine, ME | ⇒ Golden, CO |
| ⇒ Lakewood, NY | ⇒ Red Lodge, MT | ⇒ Woodland, WA | ⇒ McCall, ID |
| ⇒ Big Horn, WY | ⇒ Philadelphia, PA | ⇒ Basalt, CO | ⇒ Abbeville, LA |
| ⇒ Auburn, CA | ⇒ Parks, LA | ⇒ Livingston, MT | ⇒ Genoa, NE |

**How H.R. 1231 Helps:** Treats the Postal Service as a responsible member of the community by not allowing it to be above local laws. Gives the community a voice in post office decisions.

**First**, the proposal would require the Postal Service to comply with any zoning or building codes that the local community may have in place, so long as those regulations are applicable to state or local public entities, including the zoning authority itself.

**Second**, outlining minimum community contact procedures that apply to the **renovation, relocation, closing and consolidation** of post offices, not just closings and consolidations as under current law. Included would be a list of criteria the post office must consider when evaluating the effect of the decision on the community.

Under the community contact procedures, individuals served by the post office in question would be given the opportunity to offer reasonable alternatives to the Postal Service proposal, to which the Postal Service would reply in writing why the alternative is or is not viable. The proposal would also expand communities' rights to appeal Postal Service decisions to the Postal Rate Commission, to include **renovations** and **relocations** along with **closings** and **consolidations**.

*For more information or to cosponsor, contact Michael Harrison at 225-4811*

REMARKS BY GOVERNOR PARRIS N. GLENDENING

FORGING METROPOLITAN SOLUTIONS TO
URBAN AND REGIONAL PROBLEMS

BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
Wednesday, May 28, 1997

GOV. PARRIS N. GLENDENING: Good afternoon and thank you, Bruce.

I am sorry I could not be with you earlier for your discussions. As a former County Executive and professor at UMCP for 27 years I enjoy those types of talks. Instead, this morning, I attended the Geographic Information Systems Conference where we talked about the topic I will talk to you about, Smart Growth.

I am particularly pleased that I was asked to speak AFTER lunch. I have given enough speeches to know that you never want to be the person standing between the audience and lunch!

As I said, I spoke about Smart Growth earlier today. To put it in a nutshell: Smart Growth marks the first time that a state has designed a system of public investments as a series of private sector incentives and disincentives. We do this to combat suburban sprawl, protect the environment, revitalize older communities, and conserve limited public resources.

Our philosophy is that we should NOT use tax payer dollars to promote sprawl. We should NOT use tax payer dollars to encourage the abandonment of our cities and of our established communities, and instead we ought to be using our tax dollars to revitalize existing communities.

Now, having said that in philosophical terms, what does it mean in a personal term? I'll tell you where I really saw this come to bear.

My wife Frances Ann (ph) and I have been married for a little over 20 years now. Back when we were courting -- looking around the room, half of you don't even know what the word courting means -- (laughter) -- but back when we were courting, she lived up in Cumberland, Maryland, in Western Maryland, and I lived in College Park here in Prince George's County.

And every weekend, I would go up to visit her and we'd have dinner either Friday night or Saturday night with her parents, and then we would go to downtown Cumberland. And we would walk along, and the stores would be open, and there would be little cafes, and there would be lounges, and there would be theaters. And at any given time, up until about 9:00 or 10:00, there would be a couple hundred people just milling up and down the street in this small town.

About 12, 13 years ago, someone decided to build a regional shopping mall about, I guess, maybe 15 miles outside of town in a place called LaVale, if you know Western Maryland. The state of Maryland, in a burst of enthusiasm for new economic development, helped make that happen by providing $12 million to help build the road up the side of the mountain to make it economically viable.

And when you go to downtown Cumberland today, as my wife and I did just a few weeks ago, a third of the stores are completely empty, a third of the stores are, you know, second-hand shops and things like this. And we went there to visit some friends, and we had a cup of coffee at a little coffee shop. Seven o'clock in the evening we went out, and you could look up and down the street, there was no one there on a Friday evening.

Now, we taxpayers used our resources to promote the end of economic viability in one of the older communities in the state of Maryland. And these decisions are going on all over the state constantly. In Chestertown, they're debating whether or not to build a Wal-Mart right outside of Chestertown. And I walk the city streets with the mayor and see the abandoned stores there already. And I think what we've got to come to is a basic philosophy, again simple, but I think profound, and that is we will not use tax dollars to promote sprawl.

Now, my message is simple today, and that is, we must change the direction of growth habits across America. I'm not saying it's a good idea to change the direction of growth. I think it's absolutely imperative that we do so. We must come together and make these changes.

Before talking Maryland's Smart Growth initiative, let me just tell you why I feel so passionately about this. We respond publicly to the world as we see it. And that is, as I was looking around the room, I know a good number of you here. Frances Ann and I have a boy now 17 years old, Raymond. Half of you saw him grow up and all, right, but a 17-year-old boy.

Our greatest pleasure, my son and I in particular, and my wife could only do it so often, she wasn't quite as enthusiastic, but it was going to the lower Potomac and camping out and fishing. It was going to the Patuxent and crabbing. It was going out on the Chesapeake Bay. And we would spend hours and hours in a little town called -- not even a town, a little place called Nanjemoy in southern Charles County.

And in Nanjemoy, friends of ours had a little, tiny cabin. And we would sit on the dock, and we would listen to the Orioles game, and we would catch channel catfish. And we would do that for three days in a row. And we'd come home and be smelly and everything else. But it was a wonderful, wonderful time for a father and a son.

Now, my fear -- my fear -- is if we don't change what we're doing in this country today, if we don't change what we're doing in Maryland, that what was so wonderful a memory for me and our son, who's now this weekend, in fact, graduating from high school and will be going off to college, he will not have that opportunity with his children or their children. And I think we owe it to our children to come to grips with the need to change.

Now, for 50 years, America I believe has been sold on the concept that moving up means moving out there somewhere. In the years following World War II, we all know the history. American veterans and their young families rushed from their city rowhouses to newly built suburban tracts, always in search of green lawns and bigger lawns and their piece of the American dream. And the view became that the American dream was out there.

This flight, really, in large and middle-sized cities and towns continues even to this day. Just as our parents packed up and picked up and moved out of the cities, today's baby boomers are packing up, picking up and moving out of the suburbs, where they were before. The older suburbs are being abandoned now, just as the central cities were. Every day, more and more people leave our inner cities, our older established communities for ex-urbia and for the rural areas. It is happening in my home state of Maryland, it is happening to some extent in every state in this country, and we have seen the result of this sprawl.

In its path, sprawl consumes thousands of acres of forests and farmlands and woodlands and wetlands, and it requires us to build new schools, new streets, new water and sewer lines, new police stations, new parks, and you can go on and on. In its wake, sprawl leaves boarded up homes, vacant storefronts, closed businesses, abandoned and often contaminated industrial sites, and traffic congestion stretching for miles and miles as people try to come back to job centers.

I also emphasize, this is an economic matter as well. Sprawl is creating a hidden debt of unfunded infrastructure repairs and services that will run into the billions of dollars. And it's rare that time goes by now that you don't see some major water pipe burst, for example, as we had in Baltimore just recently, as they had in Northern Virginia just this last week, here in this area. And it's because of the inability to invest in the older infrastructure because we're putting all of our money into new infrastructure for sprawl out there.

Simply put, I believe that it's not only the debt of unfunded infrastructure and the social dysfunction and the urban decay and environmental degradation, but I believe that sprawl is a disease that is eating away at the heart of America.

Now, to show you the pace of what we're talking about, in Maryland alone during the past six months, approximately 5,000 people left Baltimore city. We issued a little over 3,000 new septic tank permits, and nearly 10,000 acres of forest and farmlands were lost in the last six months alone. And I want to tell you, you can go to just about any state in the country, certainly on the East Coast, and you're going to have comparable or greater figures.

We estimate that over the next 25 years, Maryland will grow by more than a million people, roughly 20 percent. Another half million people will leave existing towns, cities and suburbs, and move to the outer areas unless we make some changes. Because of these population trends, we stand to consume as much land in the next 25 years in Central Maryland as we consumed in the entire 300-year history of the state of Maryland.

Now, while the environmental costs are difficult to estimate and the social costs are difficult to put dollar numbers on, there are areas we can talk about dollars. Every new classroom costs $90,000. Every mile of new sewer line costs roughly $200,000. And every single-lane mile of new road costs at least $4 million. That is what we're building into our equation of cost.

Perhaps more important to me, however, and I think this is true for most Marylanders, for most Americans, more important is the loss of community. When I talk about the loss of community, if you think about more traditional communities, literally with families on the front porch, keeping an eye on one another, knowing one another's children, and then you think about what we have today, where people's idea of moving up is in fact 5-acre, 10-acre, 20-acre home sites, in doing that, in many cases, people live 10 years next to their neighbors and don't even know their first names.

Now, we cannot allow this to continue to happen. When we talk about a lot of social problems, commitment to education, dealing with juvenile problems, when we talk about that, it seems to me that, indirectly, we are seeing the consequences of a loss of community as we spread ourselves so thin that community no longer exists.

I'll tell you a story that I said to the legislature when we debated this issue. I told them how when I was county executive, one afternoon I came home, and our son was about 4 or 5 years old, and we had a caregiver. My wife is an attorney with the Federal Election Commission, and we had a caregiver. And I went home, and I said to the caregiver, "Where's Raymond?" And she said, "He's out riding his bike." And so I looked up and down the block and I didn't see him. And my neighbor right across the street was out working on his yard, and he said, "I'll bet you're looking for Raymond. He just went down that street there."

And I went to the corner and I still didn't see him, and he wasn't supposed to do more than go around the block. And someone else saw him and said, "I saw your boy going over there toward the school." And I went over to the school, and there were a bunch of children playing there. And I'm standing on the side looking, and a person in a home that faces the school said to me, "Are you looking for your son? He just went to the tennis courts." And I went over there, and I said, "Raymond," I said, "You're not supposed to be riding your bike this far. What's going on here?"

And he looks at me, and his eyes get all big. He said, "Dad, how did you find me?"

(Laughter.)

And after we got over the practicalities of it, I told him, I said, "Raymond, the whole community knows you here."

Now, let me tell you, it wasn't because it was the county executive's son, because that same community spirit exists there. We know our neighbors' children. We know where they're going to school. I can tell you, two houses down when one of the teenage neighbors are coming home because I know what station they listen to in their car when they pound that music out.

(Laughter.)

Now, that is what's being lost, and that's where I think is even perhaps a bigger danger than just the economics. Maryland's effort to battle sprawl really dates back several governors and almost a quarter of a century. The last four governors all made both efforts and contributions in this area. We've all tried to protect the Chesapeake Bay by land use efforts in terms of taming suburban sprawl. These efforts, the prior governors laid the foundation for what we did today in terms of the adoption of Smart Growth.

Now, let me emphasize, I said our Smart Growth initiative. This is not no growth. This is not slow growth. This is Smart Growth.

Over the past year and a half, my administration and I have worked with elected officials and the people of Maryland to craft a plan that simultaneously supports a healthy economy and controls sprawl. I know there are people out there who say that we cannot protect the environment and at the same time have a real prosperous economy. I strongly disagree with that view. I think it's a false dichotomy to say you're either for the economy or for the environment. We can have both a clean environment and a vibrant economy.

Now, I know this is true because in Maryland, we are showing that you can have the economy grow and prosper and you can protect the environment. Right now, the Maryland economy is absolutely surging. Jobs are at an all-time high. Unemployment is at a six-year low. The last monthly report showed that unemployment figures dropped in every jurisdiction in the state, including Baltimore city. We had the fourth highest income level of the nation. Our welfare rolls have declined by 29 percent in the last two years. And we have a $670 million budget surplus.

And at the same time, we are recognized as having perhaps the most progressive environmental policy in the nation.

From the beginning, we recognized that our Smart Growth initiative, to be successful, had to involve the people of Maryland, Republicans and Democrats, municipal and county officials, environmentalists and farmers, community leaders and business people, and the general public. And we came together with a year -- almost a year-long community debate. And thanks to the bipartisan grassroots effort, the Maryland General Assembly passed the entire package of legislation that responded to our concerns about sprawl.

Key to the success, I believe, in our decision process was to step outside of the box. We decided not to create another level of review or a new set of regulations. Rather, we said let's affect the bottom line as people make decisions. And we decided to use our $15 billion budget as an incentive for Smart Growth and to use our tax laws as a disincentive for sprawl.

Now, our critics said we would not be able to make such sweeping change in one session. And quite candidly, we did have to push hard. We had to play hard ball, including using the budget. But it really was a victory for common-sense policy, and I was pleased at the overwhelming support on a bipartisan basis that we ended up receiving in both houses of the legislature.

It was a package of bills, and I won't go through great detail, but let me just tell you, the first measure that we passed was perhaps one of the most important. And that was our Brownfield facilities program, to help clean up Brownfields, the reuse of abandoned industrial areas in urban sites. And this has been done in a number of jurisdictions across the country.

I did just recently visit one of those sites in Baltimore city, and let me tell you, I was thrilled not only about the enthusiasm of the new owner, but I was thrilled by the neighbors that came when we had this celebration of the Brownfield declaration, because these are people who had lived with an abandoned factory. It was an early burlap-bag-manufacturing factory that was now becoming a computer center right in the midst of their neighborhood. And think what that means in terms of jobs and in terms of stability and dealing with crime.

In addition to the Brownfields legislation, we also crafted what we called a priority funding or Smart Growth area. And this will allow the state to direct its resources for programs, existing programs, such as housing, transportation, sewer and water, direct those resources toward areas specifically designated by local jurisdictions for growth and meeting rigid state standards: Must be on water and sewer lines, must meet a minimum residential density of three and a half units per acre, and other standards that we have outlined.

Now, I have instructed every department, and the law will require as of October of next year that every department must review, is their expenditure in a Smart Growth area, their capital expenditures or their program support that would affect the growth and development in a Smart Growth area? Each department has been told that their resources must be used as incentives to direct growth where it belongs.

Now, what does this mean as a practical matter? We're already doing this in several areas. We changed the school construction formula. Now the first priority for the state portion of school construction goes to those schools in existing communities for renovation, for wiring, for technology, for new science wings, for expansion. When I came in, 40 percent of the school funding, roughly $150 million, went into those areas. Today 82 percent goes into existing schools.

We had an interesting experience. The mayor of Hagerstown, in Western Maryland, came to me and he said, "The state's going to build a new district court building up here." And I said, "Yes, I know that." And he said, "Do you know where they're going to build it?" And they were going to build it out in a suburban area.

And I talked to the chief administrative judge, a very wonderful gentleman, now retired, Judge Sweeney (ph), and I said, "Judge Sweeney, why are we going to put it out there?" And he said, "You know, when you're downtown, you have to worry about parking." And he says, "This is so convenient for the judges, and we're going to have our own parking area over here."

(Laughter.)

Now, I've got to tell you, Judge Sweeney is a wonderful person, there's no question about it. He was not focused, however, on Smart Growth. We have a new administrative judge, Martha Raison (ph). She understands clearly. The new courthouse is now going to be in downtown Hagerstown. And if we don't have confidence in the economy of Hagerstown, then how is the private sector going to have it? And this is when I say, use the budget as an incentive. That is what we're doing.

Same thing in Easton. If you go to Easton, it is a beautiful -- on the Eastern Shore -- it is a beautiful community. The downtown area is struggling, however. They were going to put the new district courthouse outside. We said no. Then they were going to build a new structure. And we said no, why don't you take one of the existing structures, renovate it? And I'm very pleased that next week, that will be dedicated and opened in Easton for the mayor, in fact, who has now passed on, who devoted his life to the downtown area.

With this Smart Growth method, we will be investing taxpayers' dollars in areas that provide efficient and effective use of our funds, that support the revitalization of existing neighborhoods and rural villages, that supports areas designated by local governments as priority areas, and that reduces the pressure for sprawl and for unending development.

Now, in addition to those two components, we're also as part of our package trying to preserve the rural legacy through a new greenbelts program. This will work in conjunction with other existing land conservation and preservation programs to help preserve rural acreage throughout Maryland. We will be putting roughly $170 million into the purchase of the development rights for 90,000 acres to keep open space around our areas where we want to concentrate the development.

And finally, we have amended the tax code so that there is a new job creation tax credit to give those businesses that choose to locate or expand in growth areas an income tax credit for their corporate income tax. This is also augmented with an innovate program to provide cash incentives for people who choose to buy homes near the places where they will work.

And let me tell you, I know clearly that these new programs and these new attitudes about sprawl are not a panacea. They're not going to solve everything tomorrow. You're not going to immediately turn around and say look at this difference. But they are starting the process of protecting our environment and our natural resources and starting the process of preventing the devastating effects of runaway development.

Simply put, our hope is that if homebuilder A is building within a Smart Growth area and meets the water and sewer requirements, meets the density requirements, he or she will receive help on that project on everything from tax credits to roads to infrastructure improvement.

If homebuilder B, on the other hand, takes a farm and decides to build out there somewhere, he or she still has the absolute legal right to do so, but there will not be tax credits, there will not be public dollars for water and sewer lines, and there will not be public dollars for roads.

I believe that what will happen is that the bottom line is that the same house will cost considerably more out there and that the bottom line economics will force more and more people to invest in existing community.

(Applause.)

Now, the fact is that Maryland, I think, has a rare opportunity, and I'm pleased with the interest and excitement coming from around the nation as people are asking us to see the details of our program and all. But I think Maryland has a rare opportunity to show the nation that Smart Growth can support a healthy environment and a strong economy. We have already received requests from so many different people asking how we did it, how it's going to work.

Most importantly, perhaps, is what we did not do. We did not create a new statewide planning czar. We're simply using the public resources and the private incentives to protect the environment and to stop sprawl and to encourage community revitalization.

Later this afternoon, you will hear from experts from the federal government about -- it's not oxymoronic either -- you'll hear from experts from the federal government about what we can learn from Maryland and from other experiences elsewhere.

Let me be perhaps a little bit bold here and suggest that the federal government ought to follow our lead and reinforce our efforts. And by that, I mean everything from the reauthorization of ISTEA, the transportation program, with the flexibility so that we can use our funds in the future as we are now for neighborhood reinvestment. Just think what would happen if there was a requirement, for example, to reuse existing buildings before building new buildings or if there was a requirement that this be in Smart Growth areas as well within a jurisdiction.

Last fall, my wife and my son and I went down to Greensboro for the ACC conference. And we made a terrible mistake and we said, let's walk through Greensboro, it looks like a beautiful old town. It was a beautiful old town -- probably 25 years ago. It is practically abandoned now. The area around here, however, is thriving. It's just absolutely thriving.

When I talk about the federal government role, it seems to me as I look at these beautiful old buildings, totally empty, that when the next federal facility in that area goes, if it were designated by some type of policy decision as a renovation of one of those buildings in downtown Greensboro, it could do more than just provide space for whatever that function is, but could start to use the federal budget for the same type of catalyst that we're using our tiny little $15 billion budget in

Maryland.

Now, when I say that, some people say, well, gee, is that appropriate? Let me ask everyone to keep in mind that federal policy helped create sprawl, and federal policy helped drive sprawl. Two major items that you see all around us. One was the GI Bill, which helped people go out and buy homes, helped people -- veterans come back and buy homes. We've got a wonderful community, Bowie. It was a Levitt community. And I remember when those homes were advertised for $9,999 when they were started, with a veteran's loan. And it's a thriving little community now, there's no question about it, but it was a major suburban sprawl way out there at the time that that was started.

The other major policy area is the interstate highway system. The interstate highway system has opened up the suburbs, has been good for the nation in many ways, but it has also put billions of dollars into making sprawl possible. If the federal government saw fit to contribute to sprawl in the past, then surely it can refocus efforts and assist with reinvestment today.

Public spending clearly affects private decisions. And I urge members of Congress as well as federal and state officials to try to follow this lead because if we're all working together, it's going to work better. If we're successful, if we're truly successful, there are going to be some problems for the District of Columbia. That will not happen if the federal policy uses the same approach. And I have no interest in raiding the economic viability of our nation's capital. And that's why I urge that more than just Maryland start to address this issue very aggressively.

We are indeed at a crossroads. We can choose several different paths. We can choose the status quo, which in my mind is clearly not working, or we can choose a new path, a path less traveled, but that I believe will be more sensible, and that is the path of smart growth, with a focus on a healthy environment and a healthy economy. Working together, we can do that.

Let me just conclude with an observation. Just last week, I went to a small community in Baltimore Country, Hillendale community, unincorporated area. The homes were built about 45 years ago. They're beautiful little brick structures with four units to a home.

I went through there because the community had invited me. And this was a community that was having huge problems. Most of the homes have started to move to rentals, a sure sign of the decline of a community. Drug activity was up, the age level was going up dramatically as young families left.

Working with the county executive in Baltimore County, we had a comprehensive -- and with the private sector -- we had a comprehensive revitalization effort going on. And we went over there to celebrate the 45th family that had moved in less than one year. And I met those families; I walked through their homes. They were young professionals with children, with infant children and very young children. They were an extraordinarily diverse group of young people.

And as I was walking along several of those homes, there was a little old woman -- that's the only way to describe her, just a little old woman sitting on the steps. And I talked to her for a moment. And she had spent most of her life there. And she said, "Governor," and she looked out at the kids riding their bikes in the street. She said, "Governor, I never thought I would see children riding their bikes again in this community." And her voice started to crack when she said that.

Now, to me that represents both the problem and part of the solution. People moved back because it was, bottom line, economically sensible to do so, because they could buy a home, they could receive tax credits, they could receive closing assistance and a renovation loan or a renovation grant. And that community in fact is working.

What I want to happen, in all candor, is I want little old women sitting on the front steps all across this country, with the voice cracking, saying, "I never thought I would see the children back here again." I think working together we can do it.

Thank you so very much for your invitation.

(Applause.)

I think the script is as well we're supposed to take a few questions here. Or I'll give options -- questions, comments, personal (facts/ attacks ?).

Q Hi, Governor Glendening. Sheryl Cassion (ph) with Georgetown Law Center. First of all, let me applaud your leadership. Maryland's giving us a tremendous example for the rest of the country.

I'd just like to hear you talk a little bit about the political challenges you faced in building a bipartisan coalition for the Smart Growth initiative. I'd like just to hear specifically what you did to educate people and how you were able to build that coalition.

GOV. GLENDENING: Interestingly, the -- everyone heard the question, right? Interestingly, the initial battles and I guess the strongest battles throughout the whole debate really weren't that partisan. Part of it is we have some strong, moderate, centralist Republican leadership in some of the older areas that immediately saw what we were trying to do, and they signed on.

For example, the minority leader, the Republican minority leader in the state senate lives in Baltimore County and was a strong supporter of doing something with this. And one of the county executives, Anne Arundel County, where the state's capital, Annapolis, is, ran as a Republican about neighborhood conservation. And so he stepped up as well. So it never really became a partisan issue.

Where the politics entered into it was, first of all, dealing with natural interest groups that are somewhat suspicious -- farmers, for example. Their retirement account is often the land, and they said, Are you going to prevent me from building on the land? And so we brought them in, if you will, by saying the rural legacy will buy the development rights and you still can retire if you want and get cash out of your land.

The business community. We had meeting after meeting with the business community talking about the straight economics of this. Do you understand how much this is costing in tax dollars? The biggest point of resistance on any of these efforts across the country is the concern from local governments that you'll be taking away either land use or zoning rights. And the public is fearful you'll be creating some big statewide czar, that they'll have no real influence, or a planning board.

We indicated clearly up front, there was no intention of having any planning board or a state czar or anything of that type, to deal with the public concern for the local governments. All of the municipalities were immediately identified, or automatically identified in the law as growth areas. And therefore, the municipal associations broke with the counties and immediately supported our program aggressively up front. The mayors came on board up front. And then within the counties, the older counties, the larger counties that had older areas were supportive. And so we broke that traditional hostile opposition from local government.

Q I'm Pam Neary (ph), and I'm at the Institute for Local Self-Reliance in Minnesota, and a former colleague of Representative Orfield's (ph) in the Minnesota House.

And my question for you is, while I think it's a very powerful tool to use state expenditures for trying to determine where growth goes, my experience has always been that the underlying fiscal structures, the tax codes, et cetera, and the reliance of local communities on a property tax base that's often declining when their needs are increasing, and schools' dependence in particular on that property tax base, have been a real difficult item to circumvent through spending alone.

And I wondered if you had attempted to update our fiscal structures as well as our spending structures in trying to deal with this.

GOV. GLENDENING: The issue, you say, of the tax disparity is valid, continues to be an issue across the country, is slightly less of an issue in Maryland simply because the state historically has had a very major involvement in the funding of education, including, unlike in many states, for example, we pay up to 60, 65 percent of the school construction costs and, for many jurisdictions, about 40 percent of the operating costs now. So we have a little bit more of an equalizer than in the past.

The tax disparity issue, however, is still there and is not resolved by this approach, with the exception that to the extent that it doesn't make any difference whether it's in a suburban or a central city area, if it is a growth area, it will be equally entitled to the same incentives, including tax credits and things of this type, and that will help mitigate a little bit as well. But the disparity issue all across the country will continue, and this does not fully resolve it.

Q Hi, Governor. My name is Peter Harnick (ph). First of all, thank you for an excellent speech.

I was wondering, as part of your Smart Growth initiative, whether you considered raising the gasoline tax? And if so, what happened? And if not, why not? And is that on the agenda anyplace?

(Laughter.)

GOV. GLENDENING: No, no and no.

(Laughter.)

We did not consider raising it. And in part, in all honesty, the state is doing so well, including in finances overall, that there wasn't I think much wisdom to go out and try to increase taxes. And in fact, on economic development, we've just reduced 14 taxes, and just reduced the income tax by 10 percent as well.

Q (Off mike.)

GOV. GLENDENING: No, we did not get into a discussion of any tax increase. I think that that would have politically complicated the entire approach.

Q Governor, my name is Clint Dinsmore (ph). I'm wondering whether your administration has thought about how to leverage the 15 billion (dollars) to expand the amount of funds that are going into areas intended to be benefitted by your Smart Growth initiative. And I'm thinking of, for example, monies that are at least temporarily on deposit with the state treasurer, monies that could be temporarily deposited with financial institutions that would commit to lending programs in support of activity in the Smart Growth areas or, for example, the new pre-paid college tuition fund as that develops and becomes a significant long-term investment fund, using funds from that fund to invest and to leverage additional credit for use in your intended benefitted areas.

GOV. GLENDENING: We did look at those areas, including briefly the transportation taxes and using pension funds and a variety of other approaches. When I saw we looked at them, as part of the community involvement process, what we did is I and many other elected officials and our staff and people from the environmental community and all went all over the state on a really massive outreach and said, here's the problem. And everyone clearly could see. And we had this wonderful video, by the way, that showed computer enhancement of the sprawl since the forming of Maryland. And you see this big amoeba eating up the whole state and all.

And so we said, here's the problem. Then we asked everyone, what do you think the solution should be? And we pulled those together. And in fact, I'd love Ron Young (ph) over here to get you a copy if you want. But Ron, we had what, about 200-and-something suggestions, including using funds, pension funds and other public funds this way. And then as we went through that entire list, we pulled out what we thought was a manageable bite in terms of getting a full package through the legislature in one session.

Now, the day I signed the bill, which was just five, six days ago, I did indicate clearly that while this was a huge step and a nationwide precedent step, it was not the solution, and we're going to have to continue to examine other activities to enhance that, such as what you're suggesting and many of the suggestions that were in this book.

Q Hi. My name's Nanette Goodman (ph). I was wondering how the billion-dollar inter-county connector fits into the Smart Growth initiative.

(Laughter.)

GOV. GLENDENING: For those from elsewhere, this is a road that connects 95 to 270. First of all, I love the question because if I were giving a governor's certificate to the Little Sisters of the Poor in downtown Cambridge, someone would say to me, how does this relate to the inter-county connector?

(Laughter.)

But it is a legitimate question. Let me handle this as a -- because as you know, we're coming into the final decision and we're under the federal provisions of not prejudging build, no build and all that sort of stuff. But what we wrestled with, and this was a difficult issue, what do you do on roads overall? And because you need -- what we decided, you need point-to-point roads. And obviously, if you have a growth center over here 100 percent contained, and properly so, and everything was working, we bought all the development rights around there and everyone was happy and it looked like an idealistic projection of, let's say, the Swedish village, and everyone's tickled about it, but we had another growth center over here, you still need the point-to-point roads on this.

And so what we tried to grapple with was how to do this. And the conclusion that we reached was that roads would be part of the smart growth except when they were point to point. And when they are point to point, then they must be designed in a way that does not encourage additional sprawl or lead to environmental degradation.

Now, we've got a huge issue on this one. We know what the point-to-point is, and we know the huge demand that is there, and what we're trying to figure out is how to handle it without promoting further sprawl. And I don't know the answer yet, and if I did, I would tell you.

Thank you all very much. I appreciate everyone's time. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MODERATOR: We thank Governor Glendening. He couldn't be with us this morning, but

I don't think he could have found a more effective way of drawing together the strands of our morning's discussions. We're grateful to you for your thoughtful remarks and your presence, and we'll all watch with great interest as you implement these fascinating ideas.

GOV. GLENDENING: Thank you very much. Thank you.

END GLENDENING