



PPIC

PUBLIC POLICY
INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA

Technical Appendices

Views from the Street

Linking Transportation and Land Use

Louise Bedsworth, Ellen Hanak, and Elizabeth Stryjewski

with research support from Davin Reed, Eliot Rose, and Maggie Witt

Contents

Appendix A. About the Survey

Appendix B. Survey Responses

Appendix C. Factors Associated with Tool Adoption and
Perceptions of Potential to Reduce Driving

References

Supported with funding from The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

Appendix A. About the Survey

Our survey was conducted between April and July 2010. We sent the questionnaire by e-mail and U.S. Mail to directors of planning agencies in each of California’s 480 cities and the 57 counties with unincorporated areas. (San Francisco County is geographically identical with the City of San Francisco and thus contains no unincorporated areas). Recipients were invited to refer the survey to the appropriate staff person for completion if desired. Respondents could complete the survey electronically or in hard copy. We followed up with non-respondents several times to encourage their participation.

Overall, we received 349 completed surveys from 39 counties and 310 cities, for a 65 percent response rate (Table A1). Because larger jurisdictions were slightly more likely to respond, this covers 73 percent of the state’s population. Looking across quartiles of jurisdictions by population, response rates were lowest for the lowest quartile, as is common in local government surveys (Table A2).

TABLE A1
Overall survey response rates

Jurisdiction type	Total jurisdictions surveyed	Surveys completed	Response rate (%)	Share of 2009 population
Cities	480	310	64.6	73.0
Counties	57	39	68.4	74.5
Total	537	349	65.0	73.3

SOURCE: Population data from California Department of Finance, 2009.

TABLE A2
Survey response rate by jurisdiction size

Jurisdiction size	2009 population	Total jurisdictions surveyed	Surveys completed	Response rate (%)
Small	95 – 12,024	135	75	55.6
Medium	12,025 – 31,808	134	85	63.4
Medium-large	31,809 – 73,174	134	95	70.9
Large	73,174 – 4,065,585	134	94	70.9

SOURCE: Population from California Department of Finance, 2009.

However, looking across a range of community characteristics, the jurisdictions that responded to the survey are statistically almost identical to those that did not respond (Table A3). There is no significant difference in most community demographic, economic, or commuting characteristics, with the exception of three areas. The jurisdictions that responded, on average, have a higher population density than the jurisdictions that did not respond. The responding jurisdictions also had a higher percentage of college-educated residents and a slightly lower share of residents who carpool. Overall, these comparisons indicate that the responding jurisdictions are representative of the state’s jurisdictions as a whole.

TABLE A3
Sample means of respondent and non-respondent jurisdictions

Variable	Respondent mean (SD)	Non-respondent mean (SD)
Population, 2009	80,402 (250,344)	54,428 (84,205)
Mean household Income, 1999	69,764 (37,444)	65,472 (46,275)
Population growth (%), 2000-2009	0.15 (0.23)	0.14 (0.21)
Part of an MPO (%)	0.89 (0.31)	0.85 (0.36)
Tract-weighted density (residents per mile ²), 2000	5,813** (4,349)	5,017 (3,963)
College education (%), 2000	27.0** (17.9)	22.6 (17.0)
Share of registered Republicans (%), 2010	0.33 (0.12)	0.33 (0.12)
City year of incorporation	1928 (41)	1927 (36)
Counties with self-help tax revenue (%)	0.66 (0.47)	0.64 (0.48)
Located in a Multicounty MPO (%)	0.68 (0.47)	0.62 (0.49)
Commute mode, 2000 (%)		
Drive alone	72.9 (7.9)	72.3 (8.2)
Carpool	14.4** (5.7)	15.9 (7.5)
Public transportation	3.0 (3.7)	2.4 (3.4)
Walking	3.4 (4.1)	3.5 (2.7)
Bicycle	0.9 (1.6)	0.7 (0.8)
Work at home	4.4 (2.6)	4.1 (2.6)
Median commute time (minutes), 2000	22.0 (5.8)	21.0 (6.4)

SOURCE: Population: California Department of Finance (2009). Republican voter share: California Secretary of State. Commute mode and median commute time: Census Transportation Planning Product (2000 Census); Year of incorporation: California League of Cities. Education, income, and density: 2000 Census.

NOTE: **Indicates significant difference in means with a 95% level of confidence in a two-tailed test. Tract-weighted density is calculated for cities only. (See Appendix C for an explanation of this variable.)

We also broke out the survey results by the major regional groups used in the California Air Resources' Board planning process for SB 375:

1. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC): Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano and Sonoma Counties;
2. Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG): El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties;
3. San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG): San Diego County;
4. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG): Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties;
5. San Joaquin Valley, including eight county-level MPOs that have engaged jointly in some common blueprint planning: San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Fresno, Kings, Kern, Merced, Tulare, and Madera;

6. "Other MPOs": a group of six counties with smaller populations, expected to experience slower growth (Butte, Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, Shasta);
7. "Non-MPOs": 24 rural counties not yet large enough to have MPOs.

Although there was some variation in the response rate by region, over 50 percent of jurisdictions in each region responded (Table A4). Response rates were lowest in the San Joaquin Valley and in the non-MPO group. Appendix B presents a complete set of survey responses by region.

TABLE A4
Survey response rates by region

Region	Total jurisdictions surveyed	Surveys completed	Response Rate (%)	Total population	Population covered by the survey	Share of 2009 population covered
San Francisco Bay Area (MTC)	109	78	71.6	7,375,678	5,796,495	78.6
Sacramento Region (SACOG)	29	22	75.9	2,323,112	2,041,802	87.9
San Diego (SANDAG)	19	15	78.9	3,173,407	2,882,489	90.8
Southern California (SCAG)	195	120	61.5	18,716,139	12,878,958	68.8
San Joaquin Valley	70	38	54.3	3,990,339	2,343,323	58.7
Other MPOs	48	38	79.2	1,864,057	1,696,117	91.0
Non-MPOs	67	38	56.7	849,955	421,000	49.5

SOURCE: Population data from California Department of Finance (2009).

Appendix B. Survey Responses

This appendix presents the answers to all closed-form survey questions. (The survey also contained several open-ended questions, the responses of which are used in the discussion of results in the main report). For the state as a whole, we report the share of all jurisdictions responding to the survey and the share of the sample population represented by these jurisdictions. We also present the responses by shares of jurisdictions for each of the Metropolitan Planning Organization groups used in the Air Resources' Board planning process for SB 375 (see Appendix A).

TABLE B1
What pace of population growth do you expect in your city/county over the next 20 to 30 years?
 (% jurisdictions)

MPO	Very fast	Fast	Moderate	No growth	Decrease	Don't know	n
MTC	0	3	80	17	1	0	78
SACOG	0	9	73	14	5	0	22
SANDAG	0	7	73	13	7	0	15
SCAG	1	6	79	13	0	1	120
SJV	0	13	87	0	0	0	38
Other MPO	3	5	76	11	3	3	38
Non-MPO	0	0	66	29	3	3	38
Statewide jurisdictions	1	5	78	14	1	1	349
Statewide population	1	9	86	3	1	0	

TABLE B2
Which of the following statements best describes land availability for new development in your city/county's sphere of influence? (% jurisdictions)

MPO group	Considerable land	Some land	Little or no land	Don't know	n
MTC	13	32	55	0	78
SACOG	46	36	18	0	22
SANDAG	7	33	60	0	15
SCAG	19	24	56	1	120
SJV	63	29	8	0	38
Other MPO	29	34	37	0	38
Non-MPO	41	51	8	0	37
Statewide jurisdictions	27	32	41	0	348
Statewide population	21	30	49	0	

TABLE B3

How important are the following considerations for your city/county government's decisions on development projects? (% jurisdictions)

a. Providing adequate housing

MPO group	One of the most	Important	Somewhat important	Not at all important	Don't know	n
MTC	22	53	26	0	0	78
SACOG	14	64	23	0	0	22
SANDAG	40	40	13	7	0	15
SCAG	22	45	25	5	3	119
SJV	16	50	29	5	0	38
Other MPO	14	65	22	0	0	37
Non-MPO	18	53	24	5	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	20	51	25	3	1	347
Statewide population	38	45	14	1	1	

b. Expanding the tax base

MPO group	One of the most	Important	Somewhat important	Not at all important	Don't know	n
MTC	40	38	14	8	0	77
SACOG	59	36	5	0	0	22
SANDAG	73	13	7	7	0	15
SCAG	58	29	7	3	4	119
SJV	71	16	8	3	3	38
Other MPO	60	30	11	0	0	37
Non-MPO	29	40	21	5	5	38
Statewide jurisdictions	53	30	10	4	2	346
Statewide population	44	38	11	1	6	

c. Creating jobs

MPO group	One of the most	Important	Somewhat important	Not at all important	Don't know	n
MTC	30	33	30	8	0	78
SACOG	59	36	5	0	0	22
SANDAG	53	27	13	7	0	15
SCAG	42	36	14	6	3	118
SJV	82	8	8	0	3	38
Other MPO	41	41	19	0	0	37
Non-MPO	56	22	17	3	3	36
Statewide jurisdictions	47	31	17	4	2	344
Statewide population	59	29	9	1	2	

d. Preserving undeveloped land

MPO group	One of the most	Important	Somewhat important	Not at all important	Don't know	n
MTC	17	40	28	13	3	76
SACOG	10	38	48	5	0	21
SANDAG	27	27	20	20	7	15
SCAG	9	32	31	25	3	118
SJV	3	29	55	13	0	38
Other MPO	8	44	22	25	0	36
Non-MPO	21	24	45	11	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	12	34	34	18	2	342
Statewide population	14	46	27	12	1	

e. Offsetting new infrastructure and service costs

MPO group	One of the most	Important	Somewhat important	Not at all important	Don't know	n
MTC	30	51	15	3	1	78
SACOG	36	50	9	5	0	22
SANDAG	47	27	20	7	0	15
SCAG	33	44	17	3	3	117
SJV	45	40	8	3	5	38
Other MPO	32	49	14	5	0	37
Non-MPO	32	50	13	3	3	38
Statewide jurisdictions	34	46	15	4	2	345
Statewide population	30	58	9	2	2	

f. Revitalizing and strengthening neighborhoods

MPO group	One of the most	Important	Somewhat important	Not at all important	Don't know	n
MTC	21	55	21	4	0	78
SACOG	24	48	29	0	0	21
SANDAG	60	33	0	7	0	15
SCAG	33	48	13	3	3	119
SJV	37	37	24	0	3	38
Other MPO	32	41	22	5	0	37
Non-MPO	24	29	34	13	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	30	45	20	4	1	346
Statewide population	27	58	12	1	1	

g. Restoring and protecting the environment

MPO group	One of the most	Important	Somewhat important	Not at all important	Don't know	n
MTC	21	62	17	0	0	77
SACOG	18	55	27	0	0	22
SANDAG	47	20	27	7	0	15
SCAG	17	54	23	3	2	116
SJV	11	46	38	5	0	37
Other MPO	14	57	26	3	0	35
Non-MPO	29	37	32	3	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	20	52	25	3	1	340
Statewide population	23	57	18	2	1	

TABLE B4

Has your city/county already conducted or made plans to conduct a greenhouse gas emissions inventory to determine current emissions levels from different activities? (% jurisdictions)

a. For city/county-run facilities and operations

MPO group	Yes, already done	Yes, in progress	Not yet, but plan to	No plans at this time	Don't know	n
MTC	65	18	9	4	4	77
SACOG	23	23	18	32	5	22
SANDAG	33	13	40	7	7	15
SCAG	14	25	31	28	3	118
SJV	8	19	24	38	11	37
Other MPO	31	17	28	22	3	36
Non-MPO	5	5	27	62	0	37
Statewide jurisdictions	27	19	24	26	4	342
Statewide population	42	28	16	12	2	

b. For the community as a whole

MPO group	Yes, already done	Yes, in progress	Not yet, but plan to	No plans at this time	Don't know	n
MTC	41	22	22	10	5	78
SACOG	18	27	18	36	0	22
SANDAG	13	13	40	27	7	15
SCAG	4	29	36	28	3	118
SJV	8	24	30	32	5	37
Other MPO	12	27	38	21	3	34
Non-MPO	3	8	26	63	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	15	23	30	28	3	342
Statewide population	17	34	36	12	2	

TABLE B5

Has your city/county already developed or made plans to develop a Climate Action Plan (or a similar plan that addresses climate change)? (% jurisdictions)

a. For city/county-run facilities and operations

MPO group	Yes, already done	Yes, in progress	Not yet, but plan to	No plans at this time	Don't know	n
MTC	33	42	12	9	4	78
SACOG	9	32	18	36	5	22
SANDAG	13	13	33	27	13	15
SCAG	5	27	34	30	4	118
SJV	0	19	27	46	8	37
Other MPO	0	22	36	39	3	36
Non-MPO	3	11	30	57	0	37
Statewide jurisdictions	11	27	27	31	4	343
Statewide population	35	30	18	15	2	

b. For the community as a whole

MPO group	Yes, already done	Yes, in progress	Not yet, but plan to	No plans at this time	Don't know	n
MTC	21	45	19	11	4	75
SACOG	9	36	18	36	0	22
SANDAG	7	20	27	40	7	15
SCAG	2	28	37	30	4	115
SJV	0	24	35	38	3	37
Other MPO	0	20	40	37	3	35
Non-MPO	0	13	32	55	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	6	29	31	31	3	337
Statewide population	7	56	22	15	1	

TABLE B6

If you have developed a greenhouse gas emissions inventory and/or adopted a Climate Action Plan, have these actions resulted in any stated goals, policies, or programs designed to reduce or shorten car trips (or reduce vehicle miles traveled) in your community? (% jurisdictions)

MPO group	Yes, already done	Yes, in progress	Not yet, but plan to	No plans at this time	Don't know	n
MTC	24	34	32	5	5	62
SACOG	20	40	40	0	0	10
SANDAG	14	43	29	0	14	7
SCAG	8	30	55	3	5	40
SJV	13	50	25	13	0	8
Other MPO	6	31	38	19	6	16
Non-MPO	17	33	33	17	0	6
Statewide jurisdictions	16	34	39	6	5	149
Statewide population	20	34	40	2	4	

Note: Results reported only for jurisdictions with plans already done or in progress who responded to the question.

TABLE B7

**Has your city/county used any of the following land use policies or tools?
(% jurisdictions)**

a. Urban growth boundary/greenbelt

MPO group	Yes	Under consideration	No	Don't know	n
MTC	55	1	44	0	78
SACOG	27	27	46	0	22
SANDAG	13	13	73	0	15
SCAG	10	6	83	1	120
SJV	51	19	27	3	37
Other MPO	47	6	47	0	36
Non-MPO	14	8	76	3	37
Statewide jurisdictions	30	8	61	1	345
Statewide population	32	12	56	0	

b. Priority sites or site-specific standards for transit-oriented development

MPO group	Yes	Under consideration	No	Don't know	n
MTC	53	18	28	1	76
SACOG	32	9	55	5	22
SANDAG	53	20	27	0	15
SCAG	24	24	50	1	119
SJV	27	30	41	3	37
Other MPO	22	33	44	0	36
Non-MPO	11	16	74	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	31	22	46	1	343
Statewide population	57	22	20	1	

c. Priority sites or site-specific standards for mixed-use, high-density, or infill development

MPO group	Yes	Under consideration	No	Don't know	n
MTC	66	16	18	0	77
SACOG	68	18	14	0	22
SANDAG	67	13	20	0	15
SCAG	60	18	23	0	119
SJV	43	43	14	0	37
Other MPO	58	36	6	0	36
Non-MPO	38	19	43	0	37
Statewide jurisdictions	58	22	20	0	343
Statewide population	76	14	10	0	

d. Reduced parking requirements for qualifying developments

MPO group	Yes	Under consideration	No	Don't know	n
MTC	57	18	23	1	77
SACOG	46	27	27	0	22
SANDAG	53	33	13	0	15
SCAG	41	27	32	1	120
SJV	32	24	35	8	37
Other MPO	39	28	33	0	36
Non-MPO	18	24	58	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	42	25	32	1	345
Statewide population	60	24	15	0	

e. Other incentives for qualifying developments (e.g., preferential fees or permit streamlining)

MPO group	Yes	Under consideration	No	Don't know	n
MTC	34	18	44	4	77
SACOG	41	27	32	0	22
SANDAG	33	47	20	0	15
SCAG	33	30	35	3	119
SJV	25	36	33	6	36
Other MPO	28	36	36	0	36
Non-MPO	16	16	68	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	30	28	40	2	343
Statewide population	43	33	22	2	

TABLE B8

If your city/county has any existing or planned transit-oriented, high-density, or infill development projects, what is the approximate mix between residential and commercial uses? (% jurisdictions)

MPO group	All residential	Mostly residential	Evenly split	Mostly commercial	All commercial	Don't know	No projects	n
MTC	1	43	21	5	1	9	20	77
SACOG	0	29	24	10	0	0	38	21
SANDAG	0	73	13	7	0	7	0	15
SCAG	2	30	17	10	0	3	38	116
SJV	6	31	6	3	0	3	53	36
Other MPO	0	27	33	3	0	0	36	33
Non-MPO	0	19	19	11	0	3	49	37
Statewide jurisdictions	2	33	19	8	0	4	35	335
Statewide population	0	45	31	6	0	3	15	

TABLE B9

In your opinion, what is the potential of the following land use policies/tools, if they were implemented, to reduce or shorten car trips in your city/county over the next few decades? (% jurisdictions)

a. Urban growth boundary/greenbelt

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	24	23	42	11	74
SACOG	9	32	46	14	22
SANDAG	20	20	53	7	15
SCAG	9	20	55	16	116
SJV	32	41	24	3	37
Other MPO	23	34	37	6	35
Non-MPO	5	19	68	8	37
Statewide jurisdictions	16	25	48	11	336
Statewide population	21	24	45	10	

b. Priority sites or site-specific standards for transit-oriented development

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	62	24	9	5	76
SACOG	57	24	14	5	21
SANDAG	80	13	7	0	15
SCAG	47	34	14	5	119
SJV	38	35	16	11	37
Other MPO	43	46	9	3	35
Non-MPO	16	24	47	13	38
Statewide jurisdictions	48	30	16	6	341
Statewide population	70	19	5	6	

c. Priority sites or site-specific standards for mixed-use, high-density, or infill development

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	72	20	5	3	76
SACOG	68	18	9	5	22
SANDAG	80	13	7	0	15
SCAG	58	31	6	5	119
SJV	60	35	3	3	37
Other MPO	57	37	6	0	35
Non-MPO	32	24	37	8	38
Statewide jurisdictions	60	27	9	4	342
Statewide population	76	17	2	5	

d. Reduced parking requirements for qualifying developments

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	53	37	4	7	74
SACOG	18	55	14	14	22
SANDAG	67	20	7	7	15
SCAG	32	46	14	8	119
SJV	32	43	19	5	37
Other MPO	31	46	17	6	35
Non-MPO	8	42	40	11	38
Statewide jurisdictions	34	43	15	8	340
Statewide population	55	29	6	10	

e. Other incentives for qualifying developments (e.g., preferential fees or permit streamlining)

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	22	40	17	21	72
SACOG	25	35	25	15	20
SANDAG	40	40	7	13	15
SCAG	25	44	17	14	118
SJV	22	47	14	17	36
Other MPO	23	52	19	7	31
Non-MPO	11	42	37	11	38
Statewide jurisdictions	23	43	19	15	100
Statewide population	21	34	24	21	

TABLE B10

Does your city/county assess developer fees to fund alternatives to single-occupancy cars (e.g., transit, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure)? (% jurisdictions)

MPO group	Yes	Under consideration	No	Don't know	n
MTC	19	15	64	3	74
SACOG	32	5	64	0	22
SANDAG	7	13	73	7	15
SCAG	10	8	74	9	117
SJV	8	16	68	8	37
Other MPO	11	8	78	3	37
Non-MPO	13	11	76	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	14	11	71	5	340
Statewide population	15	27	54	5	

TABLE B11**Has your city/county developed any of the following? (% jurisdictions)****a. Bicycle master plan**

MPO group	Yes, already done	Yes, in progress	Not yet, but plan to	No plans at this time	Don't know	n
MTC	71	17	5	5	1	75
SACOG	82	9	9	0	0	22
SANDAG	67	33	0	0	0	15
SCAG	49	17	13	21	1	117
SJV	72	14	8	3	3	36
Other MPO	73	14	5	5	3	37
Non-MPO	40	11	18	32	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	61	16	10	13	1	340
Statewide population	79	12	5	4	0	

b. Pedestrian master plan

MPO group	Yes, already done	Yes, in progress	Not yet, but plan to	No plans at this time	Don't know	n
MTC	35	15	18	28	4	74
SACOG	27	9	27	36	0	22
SANDAG	40	20	0	33	7	15
SCAG	13	9	18	54	6	117
SJV	14	6	31	47	3	36
Other MPO	22	0	19	57	3	37
Non-MPO	13	13	13	61	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	21	10	19	47	4	339
Statewide population	26	10	16	46	3	

c. "Complete Streets" or other alternative policy

MPO group	Yes, already done	Yes, in progress	Not yet, but plan to	No plans at this time	Don't know	n
MTC	9	17	29	39	5	75
SACOG	25	30	20	20	5	20
SANDAG	7	33	20	33	7	15
SCAG	5	19	18	47	10	115
SJV	14	16	30	32	8	37
Other MPO	5	11	27	57	0	37
Non-MPO	3	11	13	68	5	38
Statewide jurisdictions	8	18	23	45	7	337
Statewide population	17	39	16	24	4	

TABLE B12

**Which of the transportation options listed below are available in your city/county?
(% jurisdictions)**

a. Commuter rail/subway

MPO group	Yes	No, but planned	No	Don't know	n
MTC	46	12	43	0	77
SACOG	23	0	77	0	22
SANDAG	40	7	53	0	15
SCAG	23	7	70	1	119
SJV	5	8	87	0	37
Other MPO	3	0	97	0	36
Non-MPO	0	0	100	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	22	6	72	0	344
Statewide population	56	6	38	0	

b. Street cars/light rail

MPO group	Yes	No, but planned	No	Don't know	n
MTC	10	4	86	0	71
SACOG	19	14	67	0	21
SANDAG	60	0	40	0	15
SCAG	9	15	76	0	117
SJV	0	0	100	0	37
Other MPO	3	6	91	0	35
Non-MPO	0	0	100	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	9	8	83	0	334
Statewide population	43	7	51	0	

c. Any rail

MPO group	Yes	No, but planned	No	Don't know	n
MTC	47	14	39	0	77
SACOG	36	9	55	0	22
SANDAG	73	7	20	0	15
SCAG	27	14	59	0	119
SJV	5	8	87	0	37
Other MPO	6	6	89	0	36
Non-MPO	0	0	100	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	27	11	63	0	344
Statewide population	61	9	30	0	

NOTE: Includes both commuter rail/subway and light rail/street car responses (a and b above).

d. Local bus service

MPO group	Yes	No, but planned	No	Don't know	n
MTC	100	0	0	0	78
SACOG	91	0	9	0	22
SANDAG	100	0	0	0	15
SCAG	98	1	2	0	119
SJV	92	0	8	0	37
Other MPO	95	0	5	0	37
Non-MPO	84	0	16	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	95	0	4	0	346
Statewide population	100	0	0	0	

e. Express bus service

MPO group	Yes	No, but planned	No	Don't know	n
MTC	75	4	16	5	75
SACOG	57	5	38	0	21
SANDAG	40	13	47	0	15
SCAG	43	12	37	9	117
SJV	31	3	60	6	35
Other MPO	49	5	41	5	37
Non-MPO	18	3	79	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	47	7	40	5	338
Statewide population	72	7	18	3	

f. Express bus to rail lines

MPO group	Yes	No, but planned	No	Don't know	n
MTC	38	9	47	7	71
SACOG	24	5	67	5	21
SANDAG	27	13	60	0	15
SCAG	28	7	56	9	114
SJV	11	0	81	8	37
Other MPO	6	6	86	3	36
Non-MPO	5	0	95	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	23	6	65	6	332
Statewide population	52	5	36	7	

g. Continuous network of bicycle routes

MPO group	Yes	No, but planned	No	Don't know	n
MTC	53	34	12	1	76
SACOG	33	33	33	0	21
SANDAG	73	20	7	0	15
SCAG	40	32	27	2	119
SJV	43	41	16	0	37
Other MPO	38	46	14	3	37
Non-MPO	11	32	58	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	41	34	24	1	343
Statewide population	45	43	11	1	

TABLE B13

In your opinion, what is the potential of the following transit options to reduce or shorten car trips in your city/county over the next few decades? (% jurisdictions)

a. Commuter rail or subway

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	N
MTC	51	16	31	1	74
SACOG	19	19	57	5	21
SANDAG	39	23	39	0	13
SCAG	34	26	38	3	117
SJV	28	22	44	6	36
Other MPO	14	19	64	3	36
Non-MPO	3	3	92	3	38
Statewide jurisdictions	31	19	47	3	335
Statewide population	52	23	23	2	

b. Street cars/light rail

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	18	24	53	5	74
SACOG	23	14	59	5	22
SANDAG	57	21	21	0	14
SCAG	38	20	39	4	117
SJV	14	31	56	0	36
Other MPO	15	27	53	6	34
Non-MPO	3	5	90	3	38
Statewide jurisdictions	24	21	51	4	335
Statewide population	50	21	25	3	

c. Local bus service

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	49	45	5	1	74
SACOG	50	36	9	5	22
SANDAG	71	29	0	0	14
SCAG	64	30	3	3	116
SJV	61	39	0	0	36
Other MPO	69	28	3	0	36
Non-MPO	40	53	8	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	57	37	4	2	336
Statewide population	71	26	1	1	

d. Express bus service

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	54	40	3	3	70
SACOG	46	41	9	5	22
SANDAG	64	29	7	0	14
SCAG	53	29	12	6	116
SJV	57	26	14	3	35
Other MPO	58	31	11	0	36
Non-MPO	18	32	50	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	50	32	14	3	331
Statewide population	68	25	4	3	

e. Express bus to rail lines

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	59	32	7	3	73
SACOG	43	5	43	10	21
SANDAG	57	21	21	0	14
SCAG	45	36	14	5	116
SJV	39	36	22	3	36
Other MPO	14	43	40	3	35
Non-MPO	8	8	82	3	38
Statewide jurisdictions	40	30	26	4	333
Statewide population	62	24	10	4	

f. Continuous network of bicycle routes

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	58	41	1	0	76
SACOG	48	43	5	5	21
SANDAG	64	36	0	0	14
SCAG	49	40	9	3	117
SJV	51	46	3	0	35
Other MPO	39	53	8	0	36
Non-MPO	32	40	26	3	38
Statewide jurisdictions	49	42	8	2	337
Statewide population	63	34	3	1	

TABLE B14**Do businesses in your city/county provide free parking for employees?**

MPO group	All or almost all do	Most do	Some do	Few do	Don't know	n
MTC	67	24	5	3	1	75
SACOG	77	23	0	0	0	22
SANDAG	73	20	0	0	7	15
SCAG	86	11	0	0	3	118
SJV	89	11	0	0	0	37
Other MPO	65	27	3	3	3	37
Non-MPO	68	26	0	3	3	38
Statewide jurisdictions	77	18	2	1	2	342
Statewide population	67	24	1	3	5	

TABLE B15**Does your city/county require new commercial and office developments to provide employee parking? (% jurisdictions)**

MPO group	Yes	No	Don't know	N
MTC	88	10	3	73
SACOG	82	18	0	22
SANDAG	73	27	0	15
SCAG	87	12	1	119
SJV	89	8	3	37
Other MPO	95	5	0	37
Non-MPO	82	16	3	38
Statewide jurisdictions	87	12	2	341
Statewide population	86	10	4	

TABLE B16**Does your city/county charge fees for public parking in commercial neighborhoods? (% jurisdictions)**

MPO group	Yes, in all or most places	Yes, in some places	No	Don't know	n
MTC	8	9	82	1	76
SACOG	0	14	86	0	22
SANDAG	7	40	53	0	15
SCAG	3	9	87	1	118
SJV	0	5	95	0	37
Other MPO	3	24	73	0	37
Non-MPO	3	11	87	0	38
Statewide jurisdictions	4	12	84	1	343
Statewide population	6	36	58	0	

TABLE B17

If yes, when thinking about your city/county's central business district or town center, what is the average price for the following parking options? (% jurisdictions)

a. Price per hour

MPO group	Free	\$0.50 or less	\$0.51-1.00	\$1.01-1.50	\$1.51-2.00	\$2.01 or more	n
MTC	0	18	55	0	18	9	11
SACOG	0	0	50	50	0	0	2
SANDAG	0	40	60	0	0	0	5
SCAG	0	18	27	36	18	0	11
SJV	0	100	0	0	0	0	1
Other MPO	13	38	0	50	0	0	8
Non-MPO	0	75	25	0	0	0	4
Statewide jurisdictions	2	31	33	21	10	2	42
Statewide population	1	10	15	11	55	9	

b. Price per day

MPO group	Free	\$5 or less	\$5.01-10.00	\$10.01-15.00	\$15.01-20.00	\$20.01 and over	n
MTC	0	38	25	13	13	13	8
SACOG	0	0	50	50	0	0	2
SANDAG	50	0	50	0	0	0	2
SCAG	11	33	44	11	0	0	9
SJV	0	100	0	0	0	0	2
Other MPO	17	50	0	0	17	17	6
Non-MPO	0	0	100	0	0	0	1
Statewide jurisdictions	10	37	30	10	7	7	30
Statewide population	4	60	4	11	12	10	

TABLE B18

If your city/county does charge for parking, what are the purposes of your city/county's parking fee policy? (% jurisdictions)

MPO group	Managing congestion	Generating revenue	Promoting retail shopping	Turnover	Don't know	n
MTC	54	69	62	15	0	13
SACOG	33	100	33	0	0	3
SANDAG	57	57	57	14	29	7
SCAG	57	86	50	21	0	14
SJV MPOs	0	50	0	0	50	2
Other MPO	40	90	50	0	0	10
Non-MPO	20	60	40	0	0	5
Statewide jurisdictions	46	76	50	11	6	54
Statewide population	36	93	23	4	2	

Note: Respondents were instructed to choose all purposes that applied, so percentages do not sum to 100. This table only shows responses for jurisdictions that charge for parking.

TABLE B19

In your opinion, if the following measures were implemented, what is their potential to reduce or shorten car trips in your city/county over the next few decades? (% jurisdictions)

a. Higher parking fees

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	35	49	11	5	75
SACOG	14	41	41	5	22
SANDAG	29	64	0	7	14
SCAG	32	33	29	6	118
SJV	16	43	38	3	37
Other MPO	28	36	36	0	36
Non-MPO	5	14	73	8	37
Statewide jurisdictions	26	38	31	5	339
Statewide population	52	30	14	4	

b. Higher gas price

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	65	28	3	4	75
SACOG	71	19	10	0	21
SANDAG	87	7	7	0	15
SCAG	59	26	8	7	118
SJV	73	16	5	5	37
Other MPO	66	34	0	0	35
Non-MPO	38	32	30	0	37
Statewide jurisdictions	62	26	8	4	338
Statewide population	82	11	3	4	

c. Carpool lanes

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	15	54	24	7	74
SACOG	14	46	32	9	22
SANDAG	36	43	14	7	14
SCAG	18	49	25	8	118
SJV	6	42	39	14	36
Other MPO	11	42	47	0	36
Non-MPO	3	3	87	8	37
Statewide jurisdictions	14	43	36	7	337
Statewide population	19	45	30	6	

d. Toll lanes

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	14	38	28	20	74
SACOG	5	46	36	14	22
SANDAG	21	64	7	7	14
SCAG	16	34	37	13	117
SJV	8	31	53	8	36
Other MPO	19	19	53	8	36
Non-MPO	3	5	81	11	37
Statewide jurisdictions	13	32	42	13	336
Statewide population	17	49	22	12	

e. Variable road pricing based on congestion

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	26	30	22	22	73
SACOG	9	50	27	14	22
SANDAG	29	43	14	14	14
SCAG	26	29	31	15	117
SJV	8	22	44	25	36
Other MPO	22	22	50	6	36
Non-MPO	0	0	81	19	37
Statewide jurisdictions	20	27	37	17	335
Statewide population	44	23	15	17	

f. Pay-as-you-drive car insurance

MPO group	High	Low	None	Don't know	n
MTC	14	44	8	34	73
SACOG	27	41	14	18	22
SANDAG	21	36	14	29	14
SCAG	24	33	22	21	116
SJV	14	36	19	31	36
Other MPO	23	37	23	17	35
Non-MPO	8	22	54	16	37
Statewide jurisdictions	19	35	22	24	333
Statewide population	38	31	8	24	

TABLE B20

In your opinion, which of the following three areas has the most potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in your city/county over the next few decades? (% jurisdictions)

MPO group	Land use policies	Investment in transit and alternatives to driving	Policies that affect cost of driving	n
MTC	32	36	33	76
SACOG	48	14	38	21
SANDAG	36	36	29	14
SCAG	28	42	30	118
SJV	49	24	27	37
Other MPO	34	31	34	35
Non-MPO	49	32	19	37
Statewide jurisdictions	36	35	30	338
Statewide population	27	48	25	

TABLE B21

Which of the following statements best describes the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through land use and transportation policies in your city/county compared to other communities in your region? (% jurisdictions)

MPO group	Greater potential	About the same	Lower potential	n
MTC	22	36	42	76
SACOG	29	29	43	21
SANDAG	27	40	33	15
SCAG	24	37	39	117
SJV	30	24	46	37
Other MPO	31	29	40	35
Non-MPO	19	43	38	37
Statewide jurisdictions	25	35	41	338
Statewide population	45	28	27	

TABLE B22

How serious a barrier are the following public sector funding constraints for development decisions in your city/county regarding programs that could reduce or shorten car trips? (% jurisdictions)

a. Planning

MPO group	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not at all serious	Don't know	n
MTC	34	34	24	4	4	76
SACOG	52	33	14	0	0	21
SANDAG	20	67	7	7	0	15
SCAG	41	25	20	10	4	117
SJV	49	38	14	0	0	37
Other MPO	36	33	18	9	3	33
Non-MPO	44	19	6	14	17	36
Statewide jurisdictions	40	31	17	7	5	335
Statewide population	47	35	14	3	2	

b. Transit/bus capital projects

MPO group	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not at all serious	Don't know	n
MTC	63	23	3	3	8	73
SACOG	67	19	5	10	0	21
SANDAG	60	20	7	0	13	15
SCAG	48	29	12	3	8	116
SJV	43	43	11	0	3	37
Other MPO	52	30	6	6	6	33
Non-MPO	37	23	14	11	14	35
Statewide jurisdictions	52	28	9	4	8	330
Statewide population	46	38	10	1	5	

c. Transit/bus operations

MPO group	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not at all serious	Don't know	n
MTC	66	23	0	3	8	73
SACOG	71	5	10	10	5	21
SANDAG	73	13	7	0	7	15
SCAG	50	29	10	4	8	115
SJV	49	35	11	3	3	37
Other MPO	67	18	6	6	3	33
Non-MPO	44	19	14	11	11	36
Statewide jurisdictions	57	24	8	5	7	330
Statewide population	69	18	8	1	4	

d. Redevelopment projects

MPO group	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not at all serious	Don't know	n
MTC	28	36	21	7	8	72
SACOG	43	33	10	5	10	21
SANDAG	50	36	7	0	7	14
SCAG	47	24	17	9	3	116
SJV	51	27	14	5	3	37
Other MPO	27	33	12	15	12	33
Non-MPO	39	14	6	19	22	36
Statewide jurisdictions	40	28	15	9	8	329
Statewide population	50	31	12	5	3	

e. Infrastructure to support infill development

MPO group	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not at all serious	Don't know	n
MTC	43	26	22	4	5	74
SACOG	40	45	15	0	0	20
SANDAG	40	40	20	0	0	15
SCAG	41	32	19	4	4	117
SJV	51	27	19	0	3	37
Other MPO	52	30	9	6	3	33
Non-MPO	50	14	11	11	14	36
Statewide jurisdictions	45	29	18	4	5	332
Statewide population	65	22	10	1	2	

TABLE B23

Please choose the public sector funding constraint that is the most important. (% jurisdictions)

MPO group	Planning	Transit bus capital	Transit bus operations	Redevelopment projects	infrastructure for infill	Other	n
MTC	11	20	37	16	17	0	71
SACOG	19	19	14	29	19	0	21
SANDAG	14	7	43	7	29	0	14
SCAG	16	20	17	30	18	0	113
SJV	36	3	14	17	31	0	36
Other MPO	3	13	25	22	34	3	32
Non-MPO	28	3	16	3	50	0	32
Statewide jurisdictions	17	15	23	21	25	0	319
Statewide population	27	11	20	14	28	0	

TABLE B24

How serious a barrier is each of the following factors to the "on the ground" implementation of policies and programs that could reduce or shorten car trips in your city/county? (% jurisdictions)

a. Lack of developer support for transit-oriented or infill development

MPO group	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not at all serious	Don't know	n
MTC	7	32	41	16	4	73
SACOG	29	33	24	14	0	21
SANDAG	0	36	14	43	7	14
SCAG	13	35	32	14	6	116
SJV	25	56	14	0	6	36
Other MPO	27	35	29	3	6	34
Non-MPO	24	15	27	15	21	34
Statewide jurisdictions	16	35	30	13	7	328
Statewide population	9	28	30	30	3	

b. Lack of lender support for transit-oriented or infill development

MPO group	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not at all serious	Don't know	n
MTC	23	36	15	4	22	73
SACOG	33	33	0	14	19	21
SANDAG	14	36	14	0	36	14
SCAG	26	33	15	5	22	116
SJV	38	35	3	3	22	37
Other MPO	32	27	15	3	24	34
Non-MPO	12	21	12	12	44	34
Statewide jurisdictions	26	32	12	6	25	329
Statewide population	25	30	15	16	14	

c. Insufficient transit availability

MPO group	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not at all serious	Don't know	n
MTC	43	38	16	3	0	74
SACOG	29	52	14	5	0	21
SANDAG	53	33	13	0	0	15
SCAG	39	41	14	4	2	116
SJV	38	27	22	11	3	37
Other MPO	44	18	27	9	3	34
Non-MPO	46	26	14	9	6	35
Statewide jurisdictions	41	35	17	5	2	332
Statewide population	40	30	12	18	1	

d. Existing land use patterns

MPO group	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not at all serious	Don't know	n
MTC	21	49	25	4	0	75
SACOG	19	29	43	10	0	21
SANDAG	33	40	20	7	0	15
SCAG	33	33	27	6	2	117
SJV	30	27	35	8	0	37
Other MPO	32	41	15	9	3	34
Non-MPO	21	29	15	29	6	34
Statewide jurisdictions	28	36	26	9	2	333
Statewide population	26	32	38	4	1	

e. Existing zoning codes

MPO group	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not at all serious	Don't know	n
MTC	15	26	49	11	0	74
SACOG	10	24	43	24	0	21
SANDAG	13	60	20	7	0	15
SCAG	11	33	39	15	3	116
SJV	11	24	51	14	0	37
Other MPO	6	35	35	21	3	34
Non-MPO	9	15	41	29	6	34
Statewide jurisdictions	11	29	42	16	2	331
Statewide population	12	31	46	10	1	

f. Jobs-housing imbalance

MPO group	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not at all serious	Don't know	n
MTC	24	27	32	14	3	74
SACOG	43	14	24	19	0	21
SANDAG	43	57	0	0	0	14
SCAG	22	39	25	12	3	117
SJV	46	27	19	3	5	37
Other MPO	53	27	12	6	3	34
Non-MPO	43	23	14	9	11	35
Statewide jurisdictions	33	31	22	10	4	332
Statewide population	25	45	23	7	1	

g. Public opposition to higher-density development

MPO group	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not at all serious	Don't know	n
MTC	39	37	23	1	0	75
SACOG	52	29	14	5	0	21
SANDAG	67	27	7	0	0	15
SCAG	39	45	13	2	2	116
SJV	30	57	14	0	0	37
Other MPO	35	50	12	0	3	34
Non-MPO	47	24	24	0	6	34
Statewide jurisdictions	40	41	16	1	2	332
Statewide population	53	34	12	1	1	

h. Public opposition to higher charges for driving

MPO group	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not at all serious	Don't know	n
MTC	33	33	5	3	25	75
SACOG	43	29	5	10	14	21
SANDAG	57	21	14	0	7	14
SCAG	50	28	7	2	14	117
SJV	51	32	11	0	5	37
Other MPO	53	27	6	0	15	34
Non-MPO	40	29	9	9	14	35
Statewide jurisdictions	45	29	7	3	15	333
Statewide population	55	26	4	1	14	

i. Public resistance to using transit alternatives

MPO group	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not at all serious	Don't know	n
MTC	29	49	13	1	7	75
SACOG	43	33	14	5	5	21
SANDAG	7	71	7	7	7	14
SCAG	23	45	22	3	7	117
SJV	39	39	17	3	3	36
Other MPO	41	27	21	3	9	34
Non-MPO	15	44	18	6	18	34
Statewide jurisdictions	28	44	18	3	8	331
Statewide population	37	42	11	3	7	

j. Ranking of barriers

MPO group	Lack of developer support for TOD/infill	Lack of lender support for TOD/infill	Insufficient transit availability	Existing land use patterns	Existing zoning codes	Jobs-housing imbalance	Public opposition to density	Public opposition to driving charges	Public resistance to transit	Overall average
MTC	0.45	0.82	1.24	0.92	0.56	0.76	1.15	1.00	1.08	0.89
SACOG	0.91	1.00	1.10	0.67	0.43	1.00	1.33	1.14	1.19	0.97
SANDAG	0.36	0.64	1.40	1.07	0.87	1.43	1.60	1.36	0.86	1.06
SCAG	0.61	0.85	1.19	0.98	0.55	0.83	1.22	1.27	0.92	0.94
SJV	1.06	1.11	1.03	0.86	0.46	1.19	1.16	1.35	1.17	1.04
Other MPO	0.88	0.91	1.06	1.06	0.47	1.32	1.21	1.32	1.09	1.04
Non-MPO	0.62	0.44	1.17	0.71	0.32	1.09	1.18	1.09	0.74	0.82
Statewide jurisdictions	0.66	0.84	1.17	0.92	0.52	0.97	1.22	1.20	0.99	0.94
Statewide population	0.46	0.80	1.10	0.83	0.55	0.94	1.39	1.36	1.16	0.95

Note: Table presents ranked scores for each barrier, constructed by summing the percentage of respondents answering "very serious" (score of 2) and the percentage of respondents answering "serious" (score of 1). The three highest-scoring barriers for each region are highlighted in boldface.

TABLE B25

Does your city/county work with the following entities on a regular basis in the following areas? (% jurisdictions)

a. Metropolitan planning organization (MPO) or Regional Transportation Planning Agency

MPO group	Transportation	Housing	Jobs/ economic development	None	n
MTC	88	71	29	8	76
SACOG	100	82	41	0	22
SANDAG	93	93	60	7	15
SCAG	84	67	48	12	119
SJV	86	59	30	11	37
Other MPO	86	56	17	8	36
Non-MPO	53	14	17	44	36
Statewide jurisdictions	88	66	37	14	341
Statewide population	94	82	38	4	

Note: Respondents were asked to choose all that apply, so percentages do not sum to 100. Percentages are calculated for all jurisdictions that responded to the question ('n'). Jurisdictions were assigned a response of 'none' if they did not choose any of the options but did go on to complete other parts of the question or subsequent questions.

b. Air district

MPO group	Transportation	Housing	Jobs/ economic development	None	n
MTC	45	13	3	53	76
SACOG	59	32	18	36	22
SANDAG	27	7	0	73	15
SCAG	51	15	10	45	119
SJV	65	24	19	30	37
Other MPO	69	25	14	31	36
Non-MPO	50	28	19	44	36
Statewide jurisdictions	55	20	11	46	341
Statewide population	55	24	10	43	

Note: See note to Table B29(a).

c. County transportation agency (if different from MPO)

MPO group	Transportation	Housing	Jobs/ economic development	None	n
MTC	84	28	17	14	76
SACOG	41	5	9	59	22
SANDAG	0	0	0	0	0
SCAG	60	16	10	40	119
SJV	0	0	0	0	0
Other MPO	69	6	0	31	16
Non-MPO	44	8	11	56	36
Statewide jurisdictions	64	17	12	36	269
Statewide population	61	20	16	39	

Note: See note to Table B29(a). The sample for this question includes only jurisdictions in counties where there is a transportation agency separate from the MPO.

d. Local transit agency(ies)

MPO group	Transportation	Housing	Jobs/ economic development	None	n
MTC	76	13	5	24	76
SACOG	82	27	23	14	22
SANDAG	80	7	0	20	15
SCAG	70	10	7	30	119
SJV	65	5	3	32	37
Other MPO	75	8	3	25	36
Non-MPO	58	14	8	42	36
Statewide jurisdictions	71	11	6	28	341
Statewide population	71	9	5	29	

Note: See note to Table B29(a).

e. Other cities and counties within your region

MPO group	Transportation	Housing	Jobs/ economic development	None	n
MTC	58	47	20	24	76
SACOG	77	55	68	14	22
SANDAG	73	27	27	27	15
SCAG	71	38	37	25	119
SJV	68	41	54	27	37
Other MPO	67	33	25	31	36
Non-MPO	47	33	39	42	36
Statewide jurisdictions	65	40	35	27	341
Statewide population	64	38	28	32	

Note: See note to Table B29(a).

f. Builders and developers

MPO group	Transportation	Housing	Jobs/ economic development	None	n
MTC	25	80	54	17	76
SACOG	45	86	77	9	22
SANDAG	47	87	53	13	15
SCAG	30	75	58	20	119
SJV	38	84	62	14	37
Other MPO	22	67	56	25	36
Non-MPO	31	69	28	28	36
Statewide jurisdictions	31	77	55	19	341
Statewide population	37	90	56	8	

Note: See note to Table B29(a).

TABLE B26
Was a blueprint or regional visioning exercise completed in your region?
(% jurisdictions)

MPO	Yes	No	Don't know	n
MTC	50	16	34	76
SACOG	100	0	0	22
SANDAG	100	0	0	15
SCAG	61	16	23	118
SJV	95	3	3	37
Other MPO	56	42	3	36
Non-MPO	29	49	23	35
Statewide jurisdictions	63	19	19	339
Statewide population	78	11	11	

TABLE B27**If yes, what has been your city/county's experience with the exercise? (% jurisdictions)**

MPO group	Participated in the development	Adopted the final plan	Adopted policies consistent with the plan	None of the above	Participated but no action	n
MTC	62	5	27	24	43	37
SACOG	82	18	50	14	36	22
SANDAG	80	13	33	20	47	15
SCAG	74	9	26	13	55	69
SJV	83	9	20	11	66	35
Other MPO	95	0	5	5	90	20
Non-MPO	89	0	0	11	89	9
Statewide jurisdictions	77	8	25	14	57	207
Statewide population	68	15	50	8	38	

Note: Respondents were instructed to choose all that apply, so percentages do not sum to 100.

Appendix C. Factors Associated with Tool Adoption and Perceptions of Potential to Reduce Driving

This appendix presents tables summarizing the statistical analysis we conducted to examine factors associated with survey responses. We focused on adoption of general climate policies and individual land use and transportation tools as well as planners' perceptions of the potential to reduce driving using these tools. We considered the role of a variety of community characteristics, including demographic factors, public attitudes, tools available to reduce VMT (such as access to rail), and a set of variables capturing geographic and economic characteristics of the locality.

The analysis focuses on cities within MPOs. The city focus allows us to include some variables that are not meaningful for unincorporated county areas—such as jobs-housing ratio, distance to carpool and toll lanes, and residential density. The MPO focus allows us to concentrate on areas that will need to respond to SB 375 and permits us to exclude small rural jurisdictions for which some measures, like distance to central business district, are not meaningful. In basic regressions,¹ counties (especially those within MPOs) were significantly more likely than cities to adopt urban growth boundaries (UGBs) and greenbelts and less likely to adopt several other land use tools. County planners were also more optimistic than city planners about the potential of UGBs and carpool lanes, and less optimistic about transit-oriented development and bike routes. Localities within MPOs were more likely to adopt general climate policy tools and their planners were more optimistic about the potential for most tools than planners in rural counties.

The regressions reported here are for our preferred specification, which includes our main variables of interest. Additional runs were conducted using some variables not shown here; these results are noted in the variable descriptions.

Description of Variables

The variables used in this analysis fall under five broad categories: size and resources; public attitudes; assets for reducing VMT; geographic and economic characteristics; as well as some aggregate measures of overall capacity and constraints. This discussion covers the variables in each group, their hypothesized roles, and their sources and construction.

Size and Resources

- We include two variables that capture local resources: population and household income.
- **Population.** Size is likely to reflect scale economies in local planning activities: Larger jurisdictions typically have larger planning departments, and sometimes also environmental departments that are active in climate policy. Population data for California cities are from the California Department of Finance (2009). The variable enters the regression in natural log form.

¹ These regressions included population, household income, party affiliation, and population growth, as well as county and MPO dummy variables.

- **Household income.** Localities with higher household incomes are also likely to have greater resources and may strongly support environmental policies.² On the other hand, higher income households may be less responsive to some tools that can reduce driving, including pricing and transit availability. Mean income was derived by dividing total income (1999 values) from the 2000 Census by the number of households in each jurisdiction, based on California Department of Finance (2009). The variable enters the regression in natural log form.

Public Attitudes

We include two types of measures of public attitudes: the share of Republican voters, and survey respondent assessments of serious public opposition to various tools that have the potential to reduce VMT.

- **Republican voter share.** Party affiliation is a factor in attitudes about climate policy in California (Baldassare et al., 2010), and it has been shown in other work to be related to support for environmental policies more generally. We use the share of registered Republican voters for the June 2010 primary election.³ Data was extracted from the April 9, 2010, Report of Registration, available on the California Secretary of State website.⁴
- **Public opposition to VMT-reducing tools.** Binary variables measuring public opposition to density, public transit use, and charges for driving are set equal to 1 if public opposition in these areas is ranked as a “very serious” barrier to implementing policies and programs that could reduce driving trips (Appendix Table B-24). These variables are included in regressions that look at the perceived potential of individual policy tools in the three areas (land use, transit alternatives, and pricing) (Appendix Tables C-5-C-7). We also calculate a general public opposition score for inclusion in the regression estimating factors associated with a locality’s overall potential to reduce GHG emissions relative to other cities and counties in the region (Appendix Table C-8). This score sums the intensity of public opposition to higher density, higher charges for driving, and transit use. For each of these areas a score of 2 was given if public opposition was ranked as a “very serious” barrier, and a score of 1 was given if public opposition was ranked as a “somewhat serious” barrier, for a maximum of six points. We then rebased the combined score to range between 0 and 1.⁵

Assets for Reducing VMT

We include variables to control for the current and anticipated availability of a range of tools that can reduce VMT: public transit, pricing policies, and local land use tools. Unless otherwise indicated, they are drawn from survey responses.

- **Rail access.** This binary variable is equal to 1 for jurisdictions that already have some form of rail transit (commuter rail/subway, street cars/light rail). We expect rail access may be associated with higher perceived potential of a variety of tools, given its potential to raise transit use and capitalize on denser development.⁶
- **Land use actions.** This variable is a tally of how many of the five land-use actions covered in the survey are already being used (Appendix Table B-7). These actions cover urban growth boundary/greenbelt; sites and standards for transit-oriented development; sites and standards for

² Lubell, Feiock, and Handy (2009), Zahran et al. (2008), and Gale and Hart (1992) find that size, income, and party affiliation are significant factors in the adoption of environmental policies.

³ In public opinion surveys, Democratic voters express the strongest support for the state’s climate policies, followed by independents and then Republicans. Republican support has fallen over the past two years (Baldassare et al., 2008, 2010).

⁴ Data from the Secretary of State is available here: http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/elections_u.htm

⁵ Some regressions were also run using a “lack of developer support” variable (from Appendix Table B-24), but this was never significant and is not reported in the results shown here.

⁶ We also ran regressions in which this variable included localities with express bus to rail bus service and planned rail service, but we found that neither of those variables on their own were systematically associated with higher perceived potential, in contrast with the availability of rail.

mixed-use, high-density, and infill; reduced parking requirements; and other incentives such as preferential fees or permit streamlining. “Other land use actions” is a similar variable used when one of these land use actions is the dependent variable; it includes the remaining land use actions, for a maximum value of 4. Similar to the rail access variable, this variable is a measure of the degree to which the locality already has smart-growth land use tools in place, which might be expected to raise perceived potential of other tools. “Other land use actions” should also be positively associated with the adoption of individual land use tools if there are economies of scope in smart-growth land use, making adoption of packages of tools more likely.

- **Parking fees in place.** This binary variable, set to 1 if a locality charges for public parking in commercial neighborhoods (Appendix Table B-16), is used as a measure of locality experience with pricing. We might expect these localities to view the potential for parking fees more optimistically, but possibly also other tools, given the potential for pricing to enhance the effects of land use and transit.
- **Existing or planned availability of transit and land use tools.** In regressions examining the perceived potential of individual tools, we also include a binary variable set to 1 if the tool is already available, and a separate variable set to 1 if the tool is not yet available but planned (Appendix Tables B-7 and B-12). Localities are likely to choose tools that they believe are most suited to their circumstances. However, if they rank available tools as high or higher than planned tools, this also suggests that experience with the tool is favorable.
- **Existing or planned availability of regional pricing (Express and HOV lanes).** These variables show whether there are existing or planned express, or high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes, and high-occupancy vehicle (HOV), or carpool, lanes within five miles of each jurisdiction. These variables were constructed using January 2010 maps of HOV/Express Lane status, available from the California Department of Transportation, Divisions of Transportation Planning and Traffic Operations. Using an ArcGIS map of lane and jurisdiction location, four dummy variables were created for existing and proposed Express and HOV lanes. Each variable is equal to 1 if the lane type is within five miles of the boundaries of the jurisdiction. As above, these tools should be ranked higher if experience with them is favorable.

Geographic and Economic Characteristics

We included several variables intended to capture geographic and economic factors that might relate to a locality’s likelihood of adopting certain land use tools as well as their perceived potential to reduce VMT: residential density, population growth, jobs-housing ratio, distance from the Central Business District (CBD).

- **Residential density.** Residential density is positively related to transit usage (Kolko 2011) and might therefore be positively related to perceived potential for transit alternatives to reduce driving. Conversely, density might pose constraints on smart-growth land use tools such as infill, given the higher costs associated with retrofitting infrastructure to accommodate denser development. We use a tract-weighted measure of density, which reflects where concentrations of the population live (Glaeser and Kahn 2004; Kolko 2011). The density measure is constructed using tract-level population data from the 2000 Census Neighborhood Change Database and tract-level area data from the Missouri Census Data Center’s MABLE/Geocorr2k. We calculated tract-level densities, then took the average density across tracts within each jurisdiction, weighted by tract population. This method of measuring jurisdiction density allows us to capture the average jurisdiction resident’s experience of density within a city better than a simple unweighted measure of people per total land area. Tract-weighted density is strongly correlated with survey respondents’ qualitative assessments of how much land is available for development in their communities (Appendix Table B-2). The variable enters the regression in natural log form.
- **Population growth.** In principle, localities that are growing faster have more potential to use land use tools to influence development patterns. As a measure of growth, we use the rate of

population growth in each jurisdiction from 2000 to 2009, based on California Department of Finance estimates.

- **Jobs-housing ratio.** In localities with a higher ratio of jobs to housing, planners may perceive higher potential for various tools to reduce VMT, since residents are more likely to work locally than when they live in “bedroom” communities. The jobs-housing ratio, from Kolko (2011), uses 2006 tract-level employment data from the National Establishment Time Series (NETS) and 2006 household data from the California Department of Finance 2006 population estimates, Table E.2. Employment data is aggregated to the jurisdiction level and divided by the number of households to give the number of jobs per household. The variable enters the regression in natural log form.
- **Distance from the nearest Central Business District (CBD).** This variable provides a measure of “edgeness” or “suburbanness.” Localities that are at a greater distance from the metropolitan area downtown employment centers may have less flexibility to reduce driving. To obtain this measure, we generated block-population-weighted centroids of each jurisdiction based on 2000 Census data from the Missouri Census Data Center’s MABLE/Geocorr2K. CBD centroids, from Kolko (2011), are based on the 1982 Economic Census or constructed as the centroid of the tract in each remaining Core Based Statistical Area (CBSA) with the highest employment density. Distance to CBD was then calculated as the “crow-flies distance” between jurisdiction centroids and the CBD of each jurisdiction’s CBSA.

Aggregate Measures of Overall Capacity and Constraints

In the analysis of a locality’s overall potential to reduce VMT (Appendix Table C-8), we also explored the role of several aggregate measures from the survey that might affect local capabilities: whether a locality participated in the development of the regional Blueprint (Appendix Table B-26); how much each jurisdiction coordinates with other entities (Appendix Table B-25);⁷ how serious a range of local baseline constraints were to implementing VMT-reducing policies and programs (Appendix Table B-24);⁸ and the intensity of funding constraints (Appendix Table B-22).⁹

Regression Tables

Because most dependent variables under consideration have ordered responses (e.g., “adopted,” “plan to adopt,” “no plans at this time,”; or “high potential,” “low potential,” “no potential”), most regressions are run as ordered logits. To facilitate interpretation of the regression coefficients, we include calculations of the “average partial effect” (APE) for each coefficient (shown in brackets [] after the standard error.¹⁰ For binary independent variables, these APEs express the percentage point difference in the probability of moving from the lowest to highest ordered response (e.g., of moving from “no” to “high” potential) when the independent variable equals 1. For continuous independent variables, the APEs express the percentage point difference in

⁷ This variable attributed one point for each entity jurisdictions coordinate with (including MPO or RTPA, air district, county transportation agency, local transit agency, other cities and counties, builders and developers) across each of three categories (transportation, housing, and jobs/economic development).

⁸ This variable attributed one point for each of four baseline conditions in Appendix Table B-24 (existing transit availability, land use patterns, zoning codes, and jobs-housing balance) that were ranked as a somewhat serious barrier, and two points for those ranked as a very serious barrier.

⁹ This variable attributed one point for each of five funding areas in Appendix Table B-22 that were ranked as a somewhat serious barrier, and two points for those ranked as a very serious barrier.

¹⁰ We computed the APEs by calculating a variable’s effect on the probability of observing the highest-valued outcome (e.g., “adopted” or “high potential”) separately for each observation and then averaging the resulting differenced values across the complete sample. See Wooldridge (2002). We thank Rob Valletta for preparing the STATA code for these calculations.

the probability of moving from the lowest to highest ordered response with an increase of one standard deviation in the independent variable.

TABLE C1
Factors associated with GHG inventory and Climate Action Plan (CAP)
development

	GHG- city	GHG- community	CAP- city	CAP- community
Population (ln)	0.37***	0.45***	0.54***	0.51***
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)
	[0.08]	[0.08]	[0.07]	[0.05]
Income (ln)	1.95***	1.19***	1.78***	1.80***
	(0.34)	(0.31)	(0.33)	(0.34)
	[0.15]	[0.07]	[0.08]	[0.06]
Republican share	-4.28***	-3.64***	-5.26***	-5.43***
	(1.15)	(1.12)	(1.18)	(1.20)
	[-0.08]	[-0.05]	[-0.05]	[-0.03]
Density (ln)	-0.59***	-0.67***	-0.72***	-0.66***
	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.21)
	[-0.08]	[-0.06]	[-0.04]	[-0.03]
Population growth	-0.24	0.03	0.03	1.56***
	(0.57)	(0.57)	(0.59)	(0.59)
	[-0.01]	[0.00]	[0.00]	[0.03]
Rail access	0.12	0.37	0.32	0.41
	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.30)	(0.30)
	[-0.20]	[-0.20]	[-0.27]	[-0.28]
Planned rail	0.14	0.38	0.12	0.25
	(0.40)	(0.38)	(0.39)	(0.39)
	[-0.19]	[-0.21]	[-0.30]	[-0.30]
Land use actions	0.17**	0.16*	0.21**	0.11
	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.08)
	[0.04]	[0.03]	[0.03]	[0.01]
Jobs-housing ratio (ln)	-0.08	0.00	-0.29*	-0.21
	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.16)
	[-0.01]	[0.00]	[-0.02]	[-0.01]
Distance from CBD (miles)	-0.03***	-0.02**	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
	[-0.07]	[-0.03]	[-0.02]	[-0.01]

(continues on next page)

TABLE C1 (continued)

	GHG-city	GHG-community	CAP-city	CAP-community
cut 1	17.34***	9.90**	16.55***	17.16***
	(4.10)	(3.91)	(4.03)	(4.18)
cut 2	18.78***	11.53***	18.03***	18.77***
	(4.11)	(3.92)	(4.05)	(4.20)
cut 3	19.96***	13.05***	20.15***	21.26***
	(4.14)	(3.94)	(4.10)	(4.25)
p-value for regression	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Observations	264	263	263	259

NOTE: Corresponds to responses in Appendix Tables B-4 and B-5.

Dependent variables: GHG-city and GHG-community refer to conduct of GHG emission inventories for the municipality and the broader community, respectively. CAP-city and CAP-community refer to the development of Climate Action Plans for the municipality and the community, respectively. Values: 1=no plans, 2=plan to, 3=in progress, 4=already done.

Mean (s.d.) of dependent variables: GHG-city: 2.58 (1.14); GHG-community: 2.33 (1.03); CAP-city: 2.22 (1.01); CAP-community: 2.16 (0.94)

Mean (s.d.) of independent variables: population (ln): 10.50 (1.25); income (ln): 11.10 (0.42); Republican share: 0.32 (0.12); density (ln): 8.49 (0.83); growth: 0.18 (0.24); rail access: 0.30 (0.46); planned rail: 0.11 (0.31); land use actions: 2.03 (1.45); jobs-housing (ln): 0.72 (0.91); distance to CBD: 18.63 (13.75)

***, **, * indicates that the coefficient is different from 0 in two-tailed tests at the 99, 95, and 90 percent confidence levels, respectively.

TABLE C2
Factors associated with land use policy adoption

	Growth boundary/ greenbelt	Sites/ standards for TOD	Sites/ standards for mixed- use/ density/ infill	Reduced parking require- ments	Other incentives	Tally of land use actions
Population (ln)	-0.03	0.32**	0.17	0.21	0.37***	0.29***
	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.10)
	[-0.01]	[0.07]	[0.04]	[0.06]	[0.10]	
Income (ln)	-0.19	-0.26	-0.02	0.25	-0.57*	-0.14
	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.33)	(0.30)	(0.31)	(0.22)
	[-0.01]	[-0.02]	[-0.00]	[0.02]	[-0.04]	
Republican share	-1.23	-2.72**	1.39	-0.40	-1.32	-0.89
	(1.27)	(1.29)	(1.29)	(1.18)	(1.14)	(0.82)
	[-0.03]	[-0.05]	[0.03]	[-0.01]	[-0.03]	
Density (ln)	-0.82***	-0.05	0.40*	0.16	-0.17	-0.05
	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.23)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.15)
	[-0.11]	[-0.01]	[0.06]	[0.03]	[-0.03]	
Population growth	0.51	0.60	0.68	0.37	-0.97	0.13
	(0.60)	(0.60)	(0.66)	(0.51)	(0.69)	(0.40)
	[0.02]	[0.02]	[0.03]	[0.02]	[-0.04]	
Rail access	-0.03	1.40***	-0.09	0.41	-0.49	0.40*
	(0.35)	(0.32)	(0.35)	(0.31)	(0.30)	(0.22)
	[-0.01]	[0.26]	[-0.02]	[0.09]	[-0.09]	
Planned rail	-0.18	1.23***	0.35	0.50	0.07	0.48*
	(0.44)	(0.43)	(0.52)	(0.41)	(0.40)	(0.28)
	[-0.03]	[0.22]	[0.06]	[0.11]	[0.01]	
Other land use actions	0.43***	0.56***	1.02***	0.58***	0.45***	
	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.15)	(0.11)	(0.10)	
	[0.11]	[0.12]	[0.18]	[0.14]	[0.12]	
Jobs-housing ratio (ln)	-0.60***	0.09	-0.17	0.14	0.25*	0.07
	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.11)
	[-0.09]	[0.01]	[-0.03]	[0.03]	[0.05]	
Distance from CBD (miles)	-0.02**	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.03***	-0.00
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
	[-0.05]	[-0.01]	[-0.03]	[0.03]	[0.09]	

(continues on next page)

TABLE C2 (continued)

	Growth boundary/greenbelt	Sites/standards for TOD	Sites/standards for mixed-use/ density/ infill	Reduced parking requirements	Other incentives	Tally of land use actions
cut 1	-9.18**	0.28	4.41	6.56*	-3.59	1.13
	(4.51)	(4.54)	(4.49)	(3.97)	(4.00)	(2.85)
cut 2	-8.87**	1.52	5.85	7.76*	-2.16	
	(4.50)	(4.54)	(4.49)	(3.97)	(3.99)	
p-value for regression	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Observations	275	270	275	271	266	278

NOTE: Corresponds to responses in Appendix Table B-7.

Tally of Land Use actions results are for an ordinary least squares regression.

Dependent variables of other variables: 1=no, 2=under consideration, 3=yes

Mean (s.d.) of dependent variables: growth bound/greenbelt: 1.67 (0.91); sites/standards for TOD: 1.91 (0.88); reduced parking requirements: 2.18 (0.85); other incentives: 1.94 (0.84); tally of land use actions: 2.02 (1.46)

Mean (s.d.) of independent variables: population (ln): 10.49 (1.24); income (ln): 11.09 (0.41); Republican share: 0.32 (0.12); density (ln): 8.49 (0.81); growth: 0.18 (0.24); rail access: 0.29 (0.46); planned rail: 0.11 (0.31); other land use actions: 1.73 (1.28); jobs-housing (ln): 0.72 (0.91); distance from CBD: 18.37 (13.60)

***, **, * indicates that the coefficient is different from 0 in two-tailed tests at the 99, 95, and 90 percent confidence levels, respectively.

TABLE C3
Factors associated with adoption of other local tools

	Developer fees to fund alternatives to single-occupancy car	"Complete Streets" or other alternative transportation plan	Continuous network of bicycle routes
Population (ln)	0.33**	0.34**	0.14
	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.14)
	[0.05]	[0.08]	[0.04]
Income (ln)	0.23	-0.34	1.07***
	(0.42)	(0.33)	(0.32)
	[0.01]	[-0.03]	[0.10]
Republican share	-2.16	0.46	0.92
	(1.52)	(1.19)	(1.16)
	[-0.03]	[0.01]	[0.02]
Density (ln)	-0.27	-0.17	-0.03
	(0.27)	(0.21)	(0.21)
	[-0.02]	[-0.03]	[-0.00]
Population growth	1.37**	0.26	1.10
	(0.63)	(0.61)	(0.68)
	[0.04]	[0.01]	[0.06]
Rail access	0.51	0.64**	0.44
	(0.38)	(0.32)	(0.31)
	[0.06]	[0.12]	[0.10]
Planned rail	0.42	0.46	0.09
	(0.47)	(0.42)	(0.38)
	[0.05]	[0.09]	[0.02]
Land use actions	0.23**	0.18**	0.21**
	(0.11)	(0.09)	(0.09)
	[0.04]	[0.05]	[0.07]
Jobs-housing ratio (ln)	0.13	0.07	-0.04
	(0.22)	(0.16)	(0.16)
	[0.01]	[0.01]	[-0.01]
Distance from CBD (miles)	-0.01	-0.02*	0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
	[-0.01]	[-0.05]	[0.02]

(continues on next page)

TABLE C3 (continued)

	Developer fees to fund alternatives to single-occupancy car	"Complete Streets" or other alternative transportation plan	Continuous network of bicycle routes
cut 1	5.16	-1.42	12.66***
	(5.36)	(4.17)	(4.09)
cut 2	5.96	-0.24	14.43***
	(5.36)	(4.17)	(4.11)
p-value for regression	0.00	0.00	272.00
Observations	256	252	272

NOTE: Corresponds to responses in Appendix Tables B-10 and B-11.

Dependent variables: 1=no, 2=planned/under consideration, 3=Yes, done or in progress

Mean (s.d.) of dependent variables: developer fees: 1.39 (0.72); alternative transportation plan: 1.81 (0.85); bicycle routes: 2.26 (0.76)

Mean (s.d.) of independent variables: population (ln): 10.45 (1.25); income (ln): 11.09 (0.40); Republican share: 0.31 (0.12); density (ln): 8.47 (0.82); growth: 0.18 (0.25); rail access: 0.29 (0.45); planned rail: 0.11 (0.31); land use actions: 2 (1.44); jobs-housing (ln): 0.72 (0.92); distance from CBD: 18.39 (13.94)

***, **, * indicates that the coefficient is different from 0 in two-tailed tests at the 99, 95, and 90 percent confidence levels, respectively.

TABLE C4
Factors associated with local parking policies

	Require commercial/office developments to provide employee parking	Charge fees for public parking in commercial neighborhoods
Population (ln)	0.01	0.62***
	(0.02)	(0.21)
		[0.04]
Income (ln)	-0.02	0.79
	(0.06)	(0.57)
		[0.01]
Republican share	-0.08	-0.22
	(0.19)	(2.16)
		[-0.00]
Density (ln)	-0.02	0.62
	(0.04)	(0.47)
		[0.02]
Growth	0.04	-4.20*
	(0.09)	(2.30)
		[-0.02]
Rail access	0.00	0.29
	(0.05)	(0.44)
		[0.01]
Planned rail	0.06	0.28
	(0.07)	(0.56)
		[0.01]
Land use actions	0.00	-0.03
	(0.01)	(0.14)
		[-0.00]
Jobs-housing	0.02	0.06
	(0.03)	(0.33)
		[0.00]

(continues on next page)

TABLE C4 (continued)

	Require commercial/office developments to provide employee parking	Charge fees for public parking in commercial neighborhoods
Distance from CBD	0.00	-0.06***
	(0.00)	(0.02)
		[-0.02]
Constant	1.16	
	(0.71)	
cut 1		21.11**
		(8.831)
cut 2		22.93***
		(8.869)
p-value for regression	0.94	0.00
Observations	269	272

Regression for “requires commercial/office developments to provide employee parking” is an ordinary least squares regression.

Dependent variables: employee parking: 0=city does not require developments to provide employee parking, 1=city does require developments to provide employee parking; fees for public parking in commercial areas: 1=no, 2=yes, in some places, 3=yes, in all places.

Mean (s.d.) of dependent variables: employee parking: 0.88 (0.32); fees for public parking in commercial areas: 1.21 (0.51)

Mean (s.d.) of independent variables: population(ln): 10.51 (1.23); income (ln): 11.07 (0.38); Republican share: 0.32 (0.12); density (ln): 8.50 (0.81); growth: 0.18 (0.25); rail access: 0.29 (0.46); planned rail: 0.11 (0.32); land use actions: 2.01 (1.45); jobs-housing (ln): 0.71 (0.91); distance from CBD: 18.54 (13.91).

***, **, * indicates that the coefficient is different from 0 in two-tailed tests at the 99, 95, and 90 percent confidence levels, respectively.

TABLE C5
Factors associated with land use policy potential

	Growth bound/greenbelt	Sites/standards for TOD	Sites/standards for mixed/density/ infill	Reduced parking requirements	Other incentives
Population (ln)	0.18	0.38**	0.15	0.23	-0.07
	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.15)	(0.17)
	[0.02]	[0.07]	[0.03]	[0.06]	[-0.01]
Income (ln)	-1.65***	-0.12	0.16	0.49	-0.36
	(0.51)	(0.39)	(0.40)	(0.36)	(0.39)
	[-0.06]	[-0.01]	[0.01]	[0.04]	[-0.02]
Republican share	-0.73	-2.68*	-1.72	-4.32***	-0.79
	(1.45)	(1.40)	(1.41)	(1.33)	(1.31)
	[-0.01]	[-0.05]	[-0.04]	[-0.10]	[-0.02]
Density (ln)	-0.92***	-0.02	-0.14	-0.42*	-0.12
	(0.30)	(0.26)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)
	[-0.06]	[-0.00]	[-0.02]	[-0.07]	[-0.02]
Population growth	-0.86	0.41	0.60	-0.19	-0.93
	(0.76)	(0.63)	(0.76)	(0.56)	(0.69)
	[-0.02]	[0.02]	[0.03]	[-0.01]	[-0.04]
Rail access	0.19	1.12***	1.05***	0.72**	0.62*
	(0.36)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.32)	(0.33)
	[0.02]	[0.20]	[0.19]	[0.16]	[0.12]
Land use actions	0.17	0.06	0.00	0.19	-0.12
	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.12)	(0.13)
	[0.03]	[0.01]	[0.00]	[0.06]	[-0.03]
Jobs-housing ratio (ln)	0.39	0.36*	0.09	-0.20	-0.27
	(0.29)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.19)
	[0.02]	[0.05]	[0.01]	[-0.03]	[-0.04]
Distance from CBD (miles)	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
	[0.01]	[-0.03]	[-0.02]	[0.02]	[0.03]
Adopted policy	2.80***	1.76***	1.32***	0.40	2.14***
	(0.40)	(0.45)	(0.51)	(0.40)	(0.46)
	[0.35]	[0.32]	[0.26]	[0.08]	[0.40]
Considering policy	2.30***	1.24***	1.31***	1.36***	1.60***
	(0.61)	(0.37)	(0.46)	(0.39)	(0.37)
	[0.28]	[0.21]	[0.22]	[0.28]	[0.29]
Parking fees in place	-0.13	-0.16	-0.05	0.08	-0.40
	(0.46)	(0.44)	(0.43)	(0.40)	(0.42)
	[-0.01]	[-0.03]	[-0.01]	[0.02]	[-0.07]

(continues on next page)

TABLE C5 (continued)

	Growth bound/greenbelt	Sites/standards for TOD	Sites/standards for mixed/ density/ infill	Reduced parking requirements	Other incentives
Public opposition—density	-0.49	-0.40	-0.13	-0.29	-0.30
	(0.33)	(0.31)	(0.32)	(0.29)	(0.30)
	[-0.05]	[-0.07]	[-0.03]	[-0.06]	[-0.05]
Constant					
cut 1	-22.82***	0.26	-0.56	1.50	-6.95
	(6.07)	(4.77)	(4.87)	(4.44)	(4.78)
cut 2	-20.53***	2.65	2.11	4.26	-4.19
	(6.04)	(4.77)	(4.86)	(4.45)	(4.77)
p-value for regression	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Observations	229	244	253	241	209

NOTE: Corresponds to responses in Appendix Table B-9.

Dependent variables: 1=no potential, 2=low potential, 3=high potential

Mean (s.d.) of dependent variables: growth bound/greenbelt: 1.65 (0.77); sites/standards for TOD: 2.44 (0.70); sites/standards for mixed use/density/infill: 2.63 (0.57); reduced parking requirements: 2.32 (0.67); other incentives: 2.12 (0.70)

Mean (s.d.) of independent variables: population (ln): 10.5 (1.13); income (ln): 11.06 (0.38); Republican share: 0.32 (0.12); density (ln): 8.51 (0.68); growth: 0.20 (0.26); rail access: 0.28 (0.45); land use actions: 2.05 (1.47); jobs-housing (ln): 0.61 (0.59); distance from CBD: 18.45 (14.05); adopted policy: 0.31 (0.46); considering policy: 0.06 (0.24); parking fees in place: 0.16 (0.37); public opposition: 0.39 (0.49)

***, **, * indicates that the coefficient is different from 0 in two-tailed tests at the 99, 95, and 90 percent confidence levels, respectively.

TABLE C6
Factors associated with potential of transit options

	Commuter rail/subway	Street cars/ light rail	Local bus service	Express bus service	Express bus to rail lines	Continuous network of bicycle routes
Population (ln)	0.09	0.35*	-0.01	-0.12	0.27	-0.18
	(0.16)	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.15)
	[0.02]	[0.05]	[-0.00]	[-0.03]	[0.05]	[-0.05]
Income (ln)	-0.25	-0.79*	-1.24***	-0.82**	0.21	-0.17
	(0.38)	(0.41)	(0.36)	(0.39)	(0.35)	(0.35)
	[-0.01]	[-0.03]	[-0.11]	[-0.06]	[0.01]	[-0.01]
Republican share	-0.20	-0.47	1.66	2.85*	-0.20	1.07
	(1.33)	(1.46)	(1.30)	(1.49)	(1.43)	(1.29)
	[-0.00]	[-0.01]	[0.04]	[0.06]	[-0.00]	[0.03]
Density (ln)	0.20	0.37	0.12	0.55**	0.15	0.26
	(0.23)	(0.27)	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.24)	(0.26)
	[0.02]	[0.04]	[0.02]	[0.08]	[0.02]	[0.04]
Population growth	-0.01	-0.20	0.01	0.35	-0.55	0.52
	(0.61)	(0.68)	(0.62)	(0.58)	(0.59)	(0.62)
	[-0.00]	[-0.01]	[0.00]	[0.02]	[-0.02]	[0.03]
Rail access	0.27	0.76**	0.87***	0.58	0.89**	1.23***
	(0.59)	(0.39)	(0.34)	(0.36)	(0.37)	(0.33)
	[0.04]	[0.10]	[0.18]	[0.12]	[0.17]	[0.28]
Land use actions	-0.00	-0.12	-0.07	0.02	-0.13	0.02
	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.10)
	[-0.00]	[-0.02]	[-0.02]	[0.01]	[-0.03]	[0.01]
Jobs-housing ratio (ln)	0.31*	0.68***	0.00	-0.02	0.24	-0.24
	(0.16)	(0.21)	(0.18)	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.19)
	[0.04]	[0.07]	[0.00]	[-0.00]	[0.03]	[-0.04]
Distance from CBD (miles)	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.00	-0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
	[0.02]	[-0.02]	[0.02]	[-0.05]	[-0.00]	[-0.02]
Option available	2.54***	2.91***	1.12	1.58***	1.87***	0.64*
	(0.65)	(0.73)	(0.72)	(0.34)	(0.38)	(0.38)
	[0.52]	[0.50]	[0.25]	[0.33]	[0.37]	[0.14]
Option planned	3.03***	2.99***	-1.29	1.84***	2.44***	1.01***
	(0.69)	(0.61)	(2.12)	(0.61)	(0.82)	(0.39)
	[0.52]	[0.50]	[-0.29]	[0.31]	[0.41]	[0.22]
Parking fees in place	0.26	0.46	0.12	-0.05	-0.01	0.23
	(0.42)	(0.44)	(0.41)	(0.43)	(0.44)	(0.39)
	[0.04]	[0.06]	[0.03]	[-0.01]	[-0.00]	[0.05]

(continues on next page)

TABLE C6 (continued)

	Commuter rail/subway	Street cars/light rail	Local bus service	Express bus service	Express bus to rail lines	Continuous network of bicycle routes
Public opposition—transit	-0.07	-0.21	-0.19	-0.74**	-0.84***	-0.09
	(0.30)	(0.32)	(0.30)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.29)
	[-0.01]	[-0.02]	[-0.04]	[-0.15]	[-0.14]	[-0.02]
Constant						
cut 1	0.62	-1.69	-14.51***	-6.57	4.94	-3.47
	(4.84)	(4.97)	(4.81)	(4.72)	(4.40)	(4.71)
cut 2	1.89	-0.12	-11.47**	-4.34	7.00	-0.47
	(4.84)	(4.97)	(4.76)	(4.70)	(4.42)	(4.70)
pvalue for regression	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.01
Observations	248	239	254	228	220	252

Dependent variables: 1=no potential, 2=low potential, 3=high potential

Mean (s.d.) of dependent variables: commuter rail/subway: 1.92 (0.89); street cars/light rail: 1.81 (0.86); local bus service: 2.59 (0.56); express bus service: 2.47 (0.69); express bus to rail lines: 2.28 (0.77); continuous network of bicycle routes: 2.49 (0.59)

Mean (s.d.) of independent variables: population (ln): 10.51 (1.22); income: 11.07 (0.39); Republican share:0.32 (0.12); density (ln): 8.51 (0.77); growth:0.19 (0.25); rail access: 0.30 (0.46); land use actions: 1.99 (1.47); jobs-housing (ln): 0.71 (0.89); distance from CBD:18.46 (13.77); option available: 0.25 (0.44); option planned: 0.06 (0.24); parking fees in place: 0.17 (0.37); public opposition: 0.30 (0.46);

***, **, * indicates that the coefficient is different from 0 in two-tailed tests at the 99, 95, and 90 percent confidence levels, respectively.

TABLE C7
Factors associated with potential of pricing measures

	Higher parking fees	Higher gas price	Pay-as-you-drive car insurance	Variable road pricing based on congestion	Toll lanes	Carpool lanes
Population (ln)	0.31**	0.46***	0.41**	0.48***	0.33**	0.30*
	(0.15)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)
	[0.07]	[0.10]	[0.10]	[0.10]	[0.06]	[0.04]
Income (ln)	0.13	-1.23***	-0.10	-0.22	0.06	-0.32
	(0.33)	(0.37)	(0.39)	(0.40)	(0.39)	(0.37)
	[0.01]	[-0.09]	[-0.01]	[-0.02]	[0.00]	[-0.01]
Republican share	-1.61	0.66	-2.90**	-3.60**	-2.63*	-3.02**
	(1.19)	(1.30)	(1.34)	(1.46)	(1.47)	(1.39)
	[-0.03]	[0.01]	[-0.06]	[-0.06]	[-0.04]	[-0.04]
Density (ln)	-0.04	-0.21	-0.16	0.16	0.29	0.35
	(0.22)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.26)
	[-0.00]	[-0.03]	[-0.02]	[0.02]	[0.03]	[0.03]
Population growth	-0.60	0.45	0.48	0.51	1.04	0.01
	(0.59)	(0.72)	(0.57)	(0.59)	(0.69)	(0.67)
	[-0.02]	[0.02]	[0.02]	[0.02]	[0.03]	[0.00]
Rail access	1.46***	0.69*	0.54	0.79**	0.19	0.45
	(0.31)	(0.36)	(0.34)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.31)
	[0.29]	[0.13]	[0.10]	[0.14]	[0.02]	[0.05]
Land use actions	-0.08	-0.05	-0.15	-0.10	-0.06	0.04
	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)
	[-0.02]	[-0.01]	[-0.04]	[-0.02]	[-0.01]	[0.01]
Jobs-housing ratio (ln)	0.48***	0.15	0.18	0.67***	0.79***	0.55***
	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)
	[0.08]	[0.03]	[0.03]	[0.10]	[0.10]	[0.06]
Distance from CBD (miles)	0.01	-0.02*	-0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
	[0.01]	[-0.06]	[-0.01]	[0.00]	[0.00]	[0.00]
Parking fees in place	0.82**	0.58	-0.83**	0.34	0.67*	-0.40
	(0.36)	(0.46)	(0.41)	(0.40)	(0.39)	(0.38)
	[0.15]	[0.10]	[-0.13]	[0.06]	[0.09]	[-0.04]
Express lane proposed				0.27	0.50	
				(0.33)	(0.33)	
				[0.04]	[0.06]	
Express lane existing				0.72	0.98	
				(0.95)	(0.80)	
				[0.13]	[0.15]	

(continues on next page)

TABLE C7 (continued)

	Higher parking fees	Higher gas price	Pay-as-you-drive car insurance	Variable road pricing based on congestion	Toll lanes	Carpool lanes
HOV lane proposed						1.65***
						(0.59)
						[0.25]
HOV lane existing						0.96***
						(0.32)
						[0.11]
Constant						
cut 1	3.30	-13.54***	-0.32	3.13	6.59	1.93
	(4.19)	(4.66)	(4.68)	(4.78)	(4.84)	(4.58)
cut 2	5.60	-11.22**	1.97	4.85	8.73*	4.90
	(4.20)	(4.62)	(4.69)	(4.79)	(4.85)	(4.58)
p-value for regression	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
Observations	256	256	197	220	231	246

Dependent variable: 1=no potential, 2=low potential, 3=high potential

Mean (s.d.) of dependent variables: higher parking fees: 2.05 (0.75); higher gas price: 2.63 (0.59); pay-as-you-drive insurance: 2.02 (0.72); congestion pricing: 1.87 (0.81); toll lanes: 1.71 (0.73); carpool lanes: 1.81 (0.66)

Mean (s.d.) of independent variables: population (ln): 10.48 (1.25); income (ln):11.07 (0.38); Republican share: 0.32 (0.12); density (ln): 8.49 (0.81); growth: 0.18 (0.25); rail access: 0.29 (0.46); land use actions: 2.02 (1.47); jobs-housing (ln): 0.72 (0.92); distance from CBD: 18.34 (13.90); parking fees in place: 0.18 (0.38). Mean (s.d.) of express lane variables for observations included in the 'variable road pricing' regression: express lane proposed: 0.37 (0.48); express lane existing: 0.03 (0.16). Mean (s.d.) of HOV variables for observations included in the 'carpool lanes' regression: HOV lane proposed: 0.07 (0.25); HOV lane existing: 0.38 (0.49).

***, **, * indicates that the coefficient is different from 0 in two-tailed tests at the 99, 95, and 90 percent confidence levels, respectively.

TABLE C8
Factors associated with a locality's relative potential to reduce GHG

	Relative potential
Population (ln)	0.56***
	(0.15)
	[0.12]
Income (ln)	-1.59***
	(0.38)
	[-0.10]
Republican share	-3.75***
	(1.28)
	[-0.07]
Density (ln)	-0.55**
	(0.23)
	[-0.07]
Population growth	-0.38
	(0.67)
	[-0.02]
Rail access	0.70**
	(0.30)
	[0.12]
Planned rail	0.07
	(0.40)
	[0.01]
Land use actions	0.09
	(0.09)
	[0.02]
Jobs-housing ratio (ln)	0.15
	(0.18)
	[0.02]
Distance from CBD (miles)	0.01
	(0.01)
	[0.01]
Public opposition score	-1.14**
	(0.49)
	[-0.05]
Funding constraints score	-0.43
	(0.43)
	[-0.02]

(continues on next page)

TABLE C8 (continued)

	Relative potential
Baseline conditions score	0.38
	(0.53)
	[0.02]
Participated in Blueprint development	-0.03
	(0.26)
	[-0.01]
Constant	
Cut 1	-18.24***
	(4.72)
Cut 2	-16.47***
	(4.70)
p-value for regression	0
Observations	272

Dependent variable: 1=lower, 2=same, 3=greater

Mean (s.d.) of dependent variable: 1.87 (0.80)

Mean (s.d.) of independent variables: population (ln): 10.51 (1.20); income (ln): 11.08 (0.41); Republican share: 0.32 (0.12); density (ln): 8.50 (0.81); growth: 0.18(0.24); rail access: 0.29 (0.46); planned rail: 0.11 (0.31); land use actions: 2 (1.45); jobs-housing (ln):0.69 (0.79); distance from CBD: 18.62 (13.83); public opposition score: 0.56 (0.28); funding constraints score: 0.60 (0.30); baseline conditions score: 0.43 (0.25); participated in Blueprint development: 0.51 (0.50)

***, **, * indicates that the coefficient is different from 0 in two-tailed tests at the 99, 95, and 90 percent confidence levels, respectively.

References

- Baldassare, Mark, Dean Bonner, Jennifer Paluch, and Sonja Petek. 2008. *Californians and the Environment*. PPIC Statewide Survey. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Baldassare, Mark, Dean Bonner, Jennifer Paluch, and Sonja Petek. 2010. *Californians and the Environment*. PPIC Statewide Survey. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Gale, D. E., and S. Hart. 1992. "Public Support for Local Comprehensive Planning under Statewide Growth Management: Insights from Maine." *Journal of Planning Education & Research* 11 (3): 192–205.
- Glaeser, Edward, and Matthew Kahn. 2004. "Sprawl and Urban Growth." *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics*, vol. 4, ed. J. V. Henderson and J. F. Thisse. (Amsterdam: Elsevier), 2481–2527.
- Kolko, Jed. 2011. "Making the Most of Transit: Density, Employment Growth, and Ridership around New Stations." San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Lubell, M., Feiock, R., and S. Handy. 2009. "City Adoption of Environmentally Sustainable Policies in California's Central Valley." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 75 (3): 293–307.
- Zahran, S., S. D. Brody, A. Vedlitz, M. G. Lacy, and C. L. Schelly. 2008. "Greening local energy: Explaining the geographic distribution of household solar energy use in the United States." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 74 (4): 419–34.
- Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. 2002. *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

The Public Policy Institute of California is dedicated to informing and improving public policy in California through independent, objective, nonpartisan research on major economic, social, and political issues. The institute's goal is to raise public awareness and to give elected representatives and other decisionmakers a more informed basis for developing policies and programs.

The institute's research focuses on the underlying forces shaping California's future, cutting across a wide range of public policy concerns, including economic development, education, environment and resources, governance, population, public finance, and social and health policy.

PPIC is a private operating foundation. It does not take or support positions on any ballot measures or on any local, state, or federal legislation, nor does it endorse, support, or oppose any political parties or candidates for public office. PPIC was established in 1994 with an endowment from William R. Hewlett.

Mark Baldassare is President and Chief Executive Officer of PPIC.

Walter B. Hewlett is Chair of the Board of Directors.

Short sections of text, not to exceed three paragraphs, may be quoted without written permission provided that full attribution is given to the source and the above copyright notice is included.

Research publications reflect the views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the staff, officers, or Board of Directors of the Public Policy Institute of California.

Copyright © 2011 Public Policy Institute of California
All rights reserved.
San Francisco, CA

PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA
500 Washington Street, Suite 600
San Francisco, California 94111
phone: 415.291.4400
fax: 415.291.4401
www.ppic.org

PPIC SACRAMENTO CENTER
Senator Office Building
1121 L Street, Suite 801
Sacramento, California 95814
phone: 916.440.1120
fax: 916.440.1121