



Morrison Institute for Public Policy
School of Public Affairs, Arizona State University

**Growth and the Future
of
Greater Phoenix:
Quantity, Quality, or Both?**

Prepared by
Rob Melnick
Morrison Institute for Public Policy
Arizona State University

for
Greater Phoenix Economic Council

December 1995

GROWTH AND THE FUTURE OF GREATER PHOENIX: QUANTITY, QUALITY, OR BOTH?

"Urban growth." "Sprawl." "Infill." "An acre an hour." "Becoming like Los Angeles." Such terms and concepts are constantly being used these days by our region's politicians, public officials, and business leaders.

Sound familiar? You bet. As the cliché goes, "It's *deja vú* all over again" in the Valley of the Sun. We have alternately avoided and wrestled with urban growth issues for years.

The Phoenix metropolitan area is known worldwide for the rapid and continuous expansion of its population, economy, and development of desert land. Even during recessionary periods, it has continued to grow. Leaders in other metropolitan areas envy this achievement and the many benefits it has created for Valley residents. But some members of our region, both leaders and lay people alike, consider the Valley's phenomenal growth to be a mixed blessing. Indeed, they would say we are plagued by success.

As we enter 1996 with the region's economy ascending, dealing with urban growth has once again become a priority. In fact, some valley leaders consider it to be the issue as we approach the next century. But, in order to find solutions, we need to recognize that urban growth is really an umbrella under which many complex issues interact. This is why most rapidly growing metropolitan areas never really seem to entirely solve this "nice problem to have." Instead, they tend to discuss overall growth problems, slide around on the proverbial ice, and occasionally come to grips with one aspect of the problem or another. Or, they just decide to let the good times roll.

There is increasing recognition, however, that this mentality is dangerous. A recent study of sprawl in California, sponsored by a coalition of organizations including the Bank of America, clearly makes this point:

We can no longer afford the luxury of sprawl. Our demographics are shifting in dramatic ways. Our economy is restructuring. Our environment is under increasing stress. We cannot shape California's future successfully unless we move beyond sprawl. (Bank of America, et al., 1995, p. 1)

Today, no one in California is unaffected by the cost of sprawl. Its consequences spread across all groups, regardless of geography, race, income, or political status. (Bank of America, 1995, p. 5)

Since the Valley's history of growth has proven to be much like Southern California's, it would be wise to heed this warning.

The purpose of this brief paper is to create a framework for discussion of how our region's future growth can embody *quality*. It is not intended to be a comprehensive

treatment of the myriad issues of urban growth. Because of this paper's brevity, some important details about growth are not included. Fortunately, detailed studies of the Valley's growth have been done before (*e.g.*, by Gruen Associates/Maricopa Association of Governments in 1975 and the Morrison Institute in 1988). Instead, this paper identifies key concepts and suggests questions to be used as a point of departure for steering a future course.

THE REGION'S DESTINY

Continued, rapid growth of the Valley is inevitable. And, as has been a constant pattern for cities in the western U.S. since World War II, such growth is fundamentally characterized by low density sprawl. Carl Abbott, an expert in western urbanology, describes these urban regions as "multi-centered" areas. Greater Phoenix, with its 24 low density cities and towns, certainly fits this description.

There are many reasons why our region will continue to grow. First of all, it has some very attractive features—great weather, plentiful land, economic opportunities, relaxed lifestyle. Given these considerable assets and a continued strong marketing effort, the result is easy to figure out. Second, the Valley has historically had a pro-growth philosophy. It is human nature to want one's business or home or land to become more valuable, and promoting growth tends to do just that. And, growth has also created significant cultural, recreational and educational opportunities for Valley residents. In short, an object in motion tends to stay in motion. Finally, we live in a democratic, free market society with a justice system which is currently ensuring ever-stronger private property rights. The fact is, we really couldn't stop the region's growth even if we wanted to. A recent article in *Newsweek* put it this way: "Viewed from the air, there's no apparent reason why a city like Phoenix, Arizona, already the seventh largest in the nation, couldn't keep growing forever." (Adler, 1995, p. 42)

So, our region's future is clear. We *will* get bigger. But will we get *better*? Will the future bring growth or *quality* growth? The California study mentioned earlier puts it this way—

This is not a call for *limiting* growth, but a call for California to be *smarter* about how it grows—to invent ways we can create compact and efficient growth patterns that are responsive to the needs of people at all income levels, and also help maintain...quality of life and economic competitiveness. (Bank of America, 1995, p.1)

The Backlash Against Growth

In spite of its inevitability, the region certainly has its share of naysayers about growth. Unfortunately, there is a tendency to inappropriately lump all these people together in the “tree hugger” category. This significantly distorts the growth issue as merely a zero-sum game of the economy versus the environment.

In reality, people who are concerned about the negative impacts of valley growth cover an incredibly wide range of “types.” Besides environmentalists, they include inner city residents who believe, correctly or incorrectly, that their city spends more at its growing fringe than in its established middle; economic development professionals who are concerned that the region’s image could be tarnished by the “next Los Angeles” syndrome; local officials who have to figure out how to pay for the infrastructure and services which growth demands; business executives who recognize the productivity and energy costs associated with longer commute times and bigger service areas; government leaders who are responsible for maintaining air and water quality; and parents who are just plain scared to let their young children cross ever-wider streets with ever-faster traffic.

People in the region who feel this way about growth have not formed a coalition. But an anti-growth movement could develop in Arizona. Two citizens groups, concerned about growth and density issues, recently attempted to recall some Maricopa County supervisors because of pro-growth zoning decisions; radical Earth First activists have been caught “monkey wrenching” infrastructure development in the Arizona desert; the local media have constantly been writing this year about urban decay and sprawl; there was very strong support in 1995 for a referendum which limited growth in the McDowell Mountains; when successfully seeking re-election this year, one of Phoenix Mayor Skip Rimza’s main campaign messages was “infill”; and a group in Tucson is considering circulating petitions to put a statewide “urban growth boundary” law on the ballot via initiative.

Even without a formal coalition, most people who recognize the downsides of growth share one very basic concern—they realize that their will be a price to pay for inaction. Or, as they say in California, they want Valley leaders to get *smarter* about growth.

The Big Questions

Getting smarter about growth is a tall order which will require information sharing, frank discussions, thinking “outside the box,” and compromise. Indeed, this paper is intended to stimulate just these things. As part of the GPEC forum on “Building For the Future,” readers have the opportunity to be at the forefront of a “getting smarter” process.

The very complex issue of Valley growth can be broken into several key public policy components and each can be expressed as a question for discussion. The components

include policies on governance, density, transportation, finance, and quality of life. Some corresponding questions, in simplified form, are—

- ! *What is the best way to govern the region?*
- ! *What density(s) do we want to achieve?*
- ! *Where do we go from here on mass transit and freeways?*
- ! *How should we pay for growth?*
- ! *How can we improve the region's quality of life?*

What is the Best Way to Govern the Region?

Once upon a time, all the Valley really needed was a small county government. Things were much simpler then. Today, Maricopa County government is a billion dollar a year institution and the region has two and a half million people, 24 cities and towns, a federally designated planning organization (MAG), numerous special districts, dozens of regional service organizations, more than 50 school districts, and hundreds of neighborhood associations. ASU's John Hall puts it this way—"Who governs regions? Everyone and no one."

Like the overarching issue of urban growth, its regional governance component has been discussed for years. Arizona town halls have dealt with it, the state legislature has debated it in the context of county home rule, MAG has commissioned studies to consider it, and a 1988 Morrison Institute book on growth policy came to this conclusion:

Arizona's urban growth problems are often regional. Existing intergovernmental relations have made it difficult to resolve many of these problems and have not overcome the fact that Arizona lacks an adequate government structure for dealing with regional issues. (Melnick, *et al.*, 1988, p. 313)

There are many mechanisms and institutional arrangements for regional decisionmaking which the Valley could consider (some of these are listed later in this paper). But before deciding on the "best" way to govern a region, a preliminary issue must be addressed; namely, whether or not the region should be formally "governed" at all.

There is a growing difference between government and governance. Through informal and non-authoritative arrangements, it is possible to have regional governance without government. Thus, in considering solutions to our regional growth problems, we face one of the most fundamental and venerable political questions of all time—how much government do we want and what should government control? Until we answer these questions, growth will create its own way in the region and fierce competition among local governments for the spoils of this growth will continue largely unabated.

This is where Arizona state government could come in. State government has, of course, some degree of *de facto* responsibility for the governance of all its regions. In fact, the driving force in growth management across the country has been state government (*e.g.*,

Florida, North Carolina, Oregon, New Jersey, Washington), not local or regional government. States have established growth standards, growth management plans, and intergovernmental arrangements for addressing problems associated with growth. Local or regional institutions then act in response to such state policies on growth. In Arizona, however, state government has not played a very conscious role in regional growth. The one exception, Arizona's State Land Department, is very idiosyncratic. Although the Department manages significant tracts of land in the region whose use has a profound effect on where the Valley grows, its decisions are legally restricted by the nature and purpose of the State Land Trust.

As much as we may want Valley cities to work cooperatively toward solving regional growth problems, prevailing tax policies compel them to compete more than to cooperate. And Maricopa County government is likely to remain insufficiently empowered to effectively govern the region. Thus, as anathema as it may seem considering Arizona's "limited government" philosophy, state government could play an important and direct role in determining the quality and nature of the Valley's future growth.

What Densities Do We Want to Achieve?

By any measure, the Phoenix metropolitan area is very low density compared to other metropolitan regions. We have grown out, not up. For many people, this is one of the most appealing aspects of our region, the very reason why they came here in the first place. The American dream is very much alive in the Valley, with many relatively affordable single family homes on quarter-plus acre lots to choose from.

However, on the other side of this coin there are questions of viability, cost, and consequences. Can low density be achieved forever? What is its impact on our fragile desert environment and our natural resources? Can we afford to pay for the additional infrastructure it requires? Will mass transit ever be feasible under a continued low density scenario? If not low density, then what?...and where?

This perplexing component of the region's growth puzzle is often typified by frustrations which local government planners have with the development community and visa-versa. City planners love high densities. They are efficient for delivery of public services and more cost-effective than lower densities from a municipal perspective. Unfortunately, government rules which demand high density fly in the face of free market philosophy and the concept of private property rights. This has led many Valley developers and their allies to decry the higher density approach as "the arrogance of the central planner." These developers believe they have a product (*i.e.*, single family homes on large tracts of land at the region's boundaries) which they know how to produce well and at a profit and for which there is a demand. So, why not give people what they seem to want?

To date, local policies to promote infill and concentrations of high density residential development have proven largely unsuccessful. Just ask a city councilmember in the

Valley how his or her constituents would feel about multi-family development coming to *their* neighborhood. Yet higher density policies are consistent with what journalist Neal Peirce and others have called the “New Urbanism.” This approach is now being attempted in Florida, California, Oregon, and Washington, D.C. Peirce describes this movement as a—

...returning to an America of more compact neighborhoods of houses and walk-up apartments on smaller, less sterile streets, places with real town centers.... The idea is that such communities, by consuming less land than strung out strip malls and cul-de-sac suburban subdivisions, will curb sprawl while they give a rebirth to warmer design and friendlier community life. (Peirce, 1995, p. F5)

Would this prescription for urban growth improve the quality of the Valley? If so, what are the first steps in following it? If not, how should we make the most of the alternative—a sprawling, low-density future?

Where Do We Go From Here on Mass Transit and Freeways?

The phrasing of this question is largely borrowed from a soon-to-be-released report by the Morrison Institute which was commissioned by the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce. At its beginning, this report links transit and regional growth issues. “The decision on where to go with transit requires the Valley to also decide what kind of region it wants to become.” (Waits and Johnson, 1995, p. 1)

Indeed, patterns of urban growth almost always follow patterns of transit. Once an area is built-out, it is very difficult and very costly to retrofit transit. But it is not impossible, with sufficient vision, patience and, of course, money.

As the Valley has grown and sprawled, and as traffic has become congested, our response has mainly been to build more freeways. Compared to the hundreds of millions of dollars and countless hours we have spent on new freeway construction, we have allocated only paltry resources to mass transit and consideration of innovative land use. But most planners and urban experts will tell you that the Valley simply cannot build its way out of traffic and air pollution problems. In the end, they argue freeway construction alone will just stimulate more sprawl.

Unfortunately, our recent ballot box history has not been very supportive of mass transit. When transit “went it alone” in 1989, the Valtrans proposal was soundly defeated; when mass transit was “packaged” with freeway construction via Proposition 400 in 1994, it lost again. Does this mean that Valley residents just don’t want mass transit? Or, does it mean that they would support well developed mass transit ideas, but these two proposals just were not sufficiently sound or not properly understood? Analysts disagree about the answers to these questions because of contradictory results in public opinion polling. But perhaps the answer is “yes” to both. As Morrison Institute’s 1988 study concluded—“Arizonans may be willing to pay for public transportation, but they expect their neighbors to use it rather than give up their own vehicles.” (Melnick, 1988, p. xxvi)

Thus, the transportation variable in the region's growth equation is very complicated in and of itself. And, make no mistake about it, the viability of our transit system will continue to have many impacts on our region's growth pattern and quality. As western urban architect Peter Calthorpe puts it—

The quality of growth is dependent on the technology of mobility—the mix and interaction of the automotive, mass-transit, and pedestrian worlds. The car is now the defining technology of our built environment. It sets the form of our cities and towns.... The car wants lots of pavement and low density development that preserves plenty of space for it... The requirements of a transit system are quite different. Its fundamental desire is more riders. This requires higher density land uses...and big, mixed-use destinations like city cores. (Calthorpe, 1991, p. 45)

How Should We Pay for Growth?

There is plenty of evidence that growth has created and will continue to create significant economic benefits for the Greater Phoenix area. This is something to be proud of. But Valley growth also costs a lot of money. In order to do a cost-benefit analysis of our growth, we need to address some tough questions, which are the focus of this section—

- ! *Are our current public policies for paying for growth fair? If not, who wins and who loses?*
- ! *What is the private sector's responsibility for paying for growth?*
- ! *Can growth pay for itself?*
- ! *What is the actual cost of the Valley's growth?*
- ! *Since a substantial reliance on sales tax revenue has prompted Valley cities to grow and annex, what are innovative and alternative ways to pay for growth?*

All levels of government in the Valley—city, school district, special district, county and state—incur substantial costs when paying for the infrastructure and services demanded by a growing population and employment base. Equitably distributing such costs and providing the necessary revenue requires negotiating a technical and political maze. And, in addition to the obvious up-front costs of building roads, sewers, water treatment plants, and schools and the ongoing costs of providing police, fire, education, and social services, there are many “hidden” and indirect costs of growth as well.

For example, the region's growth is a significant factor in our violations of EPA air quality standards. Such violations have, among other things, triggered regulations which increase the cost of conducting private business. They also have cost implications regarding public health care for people with respiratory ailments. Another “hidden” cost of growth comes from the fact that sprawl at our region's edges tends to isolate our inner city core (especially because of our inadequate public transit system). This isolation creates all sorts of economic and social costs, including—a geographic mismatch between where many new jobs are created (in tourism-oriented and manufacturing businesses at the edge) and where many of the people who can fill these jobs live (in the

inner city); a decrease in the value of existing personal and business investments in older, established communities; and the permanent loss of agricultural and recreational land.

The fact is, we really don't know what is the net financial gain or loss of Valley growth. We don't even have a formula for computing it. But a recent economic analysis of Arizona and other western states by the Western Office of the Council of State Governments concluded that "The faster we grow, the poorer we become." (Grose, 1995)

The State of New Jersey recently faced-up to the fact that it didn't know the cost of growth, either. So, in order to make an informed public policy decision about a controversial, proposed state development plan (which would both direct and limit growth), the State made a detailed calculation of the cost of growth. Using simulations, economic models and case studies, their study compared what the state's costs would be with and without the plan, given projected growth to the year 2010. Their assessment was that both with and without a growth management policy, "At the state and regional levels, growth would be essentially the same...accommodating 520,000 in new population, 408,000 new households, and 654,000 new jobs." (Rutgers University, 1992, p. 10) But their conclusions on the public costs of growth with and without the plan are startling. With the development plan, they figured that over a 20 year period \$400 million in annual savings would be realized by municipalities and school districts due to "containing population and jobs in already developed areas and creating or expanding centers in newly developing areas," 130,000 less acres would have to be developed, 80 percent fewer acres of frail environment would be affected, \$740 million would be saved in road construction, and \$440 million would be saved in water supply and sewer infrastructure. (Rutgers University, 1992, pp. 11-15)

While we need not infer too much about the Valley from either the Council of State Governments or New Jersey studies, it stands to reason that it is very difficult to have an enlightened discussion of how to pay for our region's future growth when we don't have a handle on the net costs.

But, even with such information in-hand, we would still face an historic and daunting issue of public finance which has significantly contributed to the sprawl and fragmented growth of our region—the competition among Valley cities for sales tax. Due to state law, Arizona cities are largely dependent on this source of revenue. This has sparked many "annexation wars" and spontaneous changes to so-called "long term" city general plans in order to capture valuable sales tax generators (*e.g.* large-scale retailers, desirable developments, shopping centers).

When cities fight over a particular revenue producing entity, there are winners and losers. In some cases, a large sales tax generator becomes located near the boundary of two cities and one city gets a bundle in net, new revenue while its neighbor ends-up with only the infrastructure (*e.g.*, roads) and service (*e.g.*, police) costs associated with proximity. In this regard, Morrison Institute's urban growth study politely concluded that —"Competition for sales tax can overcome rational land use and transportation

planning.” (Melnick, 1988, p. 170) These problems would be reduced by policies that prescribe greater equity in the distribution of sales tax revenues. Such policies would also serve to “level the playing field” among cities for purposes of economic development.

Finally, since we know we are going to grow and will almost certainly continue to be aggressive about the region’s economic development, it is important to recognize the net differences in cost between population-driven economic growth and value-added economic growth. While, for example, shopping centers (driven by population growth) create sales tax revenue for individual cities, much of this revenue comes from “moving money around” that *already* exists in the region (the exception in this example is tourist money). This is a very different type of economic growth than the establishment of a new, export driven industry in the Valley which would bring *new* money to individuals, cities, and the state.

The point is that not all new businesses add the same amount of wealth to our region’s economy as it grows. A value-added approach to economic development is very helpful in getting a region’s growth to pay more of its own way. Fortunately, GPEC has embraced this philosophy (consistent with ASPED and GSPED) and utilizes it as a guiding principle in its marketing strategy. Some cities in the Valley have done so as well. Hopefully, more of them will do so in the future.

How Can We Improve the Region’s Quality of Life?

“Quality of life” is a concept which is used endlessly and indiscriminantly by Valley politicians, journalists, policy analysts, business executives, and civic leaders. Yet, without adequate definition, it is a term that conceals more than it reveals.

Aristotle wrote “Men come together in cities for security, they stay together for the good life.” The question for the region remains, what exactly is “the good life?”

For one person, the most significant improvement in quality of life may mean less gang violence in their neighborhood; another person could consider protection of a desert recreational area an important contribution to a quality lifestyle; still a third person may feel that better job prospects would add the most to his or her quality of life; and a fourth might be most concerned with the quality of public education.

Meaningful discussions, let alone calculations, of our region’s quality of life are doomed until we make them more precise.

A task force which MAG convened last year was a step in the right direction. It dealt with “regional values” as a way of creating a context for discussions of growth, planning and quality of life. Another useful cue on quality of life is available from Oregon’s public policy approach to this elusive concept. Both their state and local governments have specific, detailed indicators of and benchmarks for quality of life. These measures were developed with input from thousands of residents and leaders alike and fall under four

broad categories—“natural environment, vital communities, accessible services, and responsive political and social institutions” (Oregon Progress Board, 1994, p. 43). Oregon’s annual report on its quality of life can be very instructive as we consider how to improve this aspect of our own region’s growth:

Population growth in other western states has tended to create a host of unwanted problems. These include increased pollution, resource depletion, urban sprawl, gridlock, skyrocketing housing prices, rising crime and overloaded public and private support systems. One of our main tasks in the next two decades will be to fight off such problems as our population grows and as our economy diversifies. The benchmarks [on quality of life] focus on what we must preserve and what we must resist. (Oregon Progress Board, 1994, p. 43)

Finally, we need to consider the notion that while growth *can* lead to prosperity, it does not automatically do so. As stated earlier, the Greater Phoenix areas will certainly continue to grow. *We will* have a larger population and more jobs in the future. But will this population have *good* jobs available and will incomes rise faster than the costs of growth? In short, will Valley residents be able to afford “the good life”?

What Other Regions Have Done

Valley leaders are not alone in trying to best chart a quality course for the future of a fast-growing region. Many other metropolitan areas, cities, and states have struggled with the same issues we face. In doing so, they have utilized many public policies, institutional arrangements, and management strategies.

Since each region’s problems and politics are idiosyncratic, there is no “formula” for determining what would be the right combination of policy tools for the Valley. But, if we can first agree on what we want the region to be like in the 21st century, there are mechanisms for attaining that goal.

The arrangements and strategies that are listed in the chart that follows have been implemented to deal with growth issues in other areas of the country. Some are state policies which affect regions, others have been locally or regionally initiated. Each has had its measure of success or failure. These “tools” are listed for purposes of discussion only; it is not the intention of this paper to advocate for any of them or to suggest that any are especially well-suited to the Valley’s circumstances.

Public Strategies for Dealing with Growth

| Growth Issue | Strategy of Mechanism |
|------------------------------|---|
| M Regional Governance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ! Metro-gov (regional authority) ! Uni-gov (city-county combined) ! County home rule ! Local boundary commission ! Council of government with enforcement authority for planning |
| M Density | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ! Urban growth boundary ! State development "cabinet" ! Integrated, intergovernmental planning process ! Regional open spaces ! Focus growth on select geographic areas ! Tax and regulatory incentives for infill or high density use ! Visual preference survey |
| M Transportation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ! Mass transit ! Make auto-users pay "true" cost of freeway travel ! High density zoning along transportation corridors |
| M Public Finance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ! Regionally shared sales tax ! Real estate transfer tax ! Regionally standard impact and development fees ! Economic/growth impact assessment studies |
| M Quality of Life | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ! Benchmarking ! Standards boards ! Regional forums/growth "summit" |

Rob Melnick, Morrison Institute for Public Policy, 1995.

Use of virtually any combination of the aforementioned strategies or mechanisms would be, *de facto*, a pro-regulatory approach. That is, if put into effect, each of these techniques would expand government or its authority. Is this taboo in our region? Is there a combination of strategies which would improve the quality of the Valley while keeping governance to a minimum? Or, should we try to "manage" regional growth primarily through voluntary mechanisms, both public and private? In the final analysis, of course, we do not *have* to manage growth anymore than we do at present.

The Cost of Inaction

Valley leader's concerns about the region's growth have been decidedly cyclical in nature. When the Valley is booming, as it is at present, we become concerned about the consequences of growth. However, when the region's economy slows, we concentrate

on how to rev the growth engine. As Edna St. Vincent Millay said: “It is not true that life is one damn thing after another—it is one damn thing over and over.” Such is the case with our cyclical, love-hate relationship with the Valley’s growth.

It is expressly the purpose of GPEC’s forum on growth and the quality of life to once again stimulate discussion of these topics among the leaders of the region. Perhaps this time we will make profound progress toward deciding where we want to go and how we will get there. The alternative—the one we have chosen thus far—is characterized mostly by a tendency to abdicate responsibility for the consequences of growth and, instead, pretty much just enjoy the benefits which unmanaged, free-market centered growth has brought to the Valley. Our collective decision when it comes to growth has been to “grow now and pay later,” as the case of transportation and air quality in the region underscore.

To be sure, the benefits from our status quo approach to growth have been quite substantial and have provided much to many people. At some point, however, the growth *will* reach its natural limits. At that time, given good luck and good management, the region could have a desirable, high-quality of life. Or, history may judge today’s Valley leaders harshly for having “blown it” when they had the opportunity to deal with growth issues before they got beyond repair.

Creating a Quality Future Requires Leadership, Trust, and Commitment

Finally, there is the paramount issue—leadership. If Valley leaders decide that it is time to create new arrangements, policies, and institutions to deal with regional growth, who (or what organization) will initiate such action and see it through? This is perhaps the biggest challenge of all, because talk is cheap and a sincere commitment to create better public policy is quite another matter.

Finding and sustaining an organization or arrangement of organizations that becomes looked upon as the long-term leader on regional growth issues is necessary if we are going to move beyond the rhetoric that has typified our leadership on this complex problem in the past. Trusting and supporting an appropriate leader(s) is truly an important decision if we ever hope to stop simply debating the issues every so often and begin the serious business of achieving “quality” growth.

People argue endlessly about growth—where, how much, what type, what density, and if it is really necessary at all. Sprawl is bad, infill is good (if it is not in our neighborhood), new towns destroy open space, master planned communities are sterile, and urban redevelopment is fine for “other people.” In all cases, we have been doing a terrible job of building our cities, suburbs and new growth areas; our patterns of growth are dysfunctional, regardless of location or type. The problems of growth are not to be solved by limiting its scope or location; they must be solved by rethinking the nature and quality of growth itself, in every context. (Calthorpe, 1991, p. 45)

Bibliography

Abbott, Carl, *The Metropolitan Frontier: Cities in the Modern American West*, Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1993.

Adler, Jerry, "The New Suburban Dream," *Newsweek*, September 15, 1995, 41-53.

Bank of America, California Resources Agency, Greenbelt Alliance, the Low Income Housing Fund, "Beyond Sprawl: New Patterns of Growth to Fit the New California," Executive Summary, 1995.

Calthorpe, Peter, "The Post-Suburban Metropolis," *Whole Earth Review*, Winter 1991, 44-51.

Grose, Andrew, "The Loss of Prosperity in the Midst of Growth," presentation to the Arizona Economic Forum, June 23, 1995.

Melnick, Rob, et al., *Urban Growth in Arizona: A Policy Analysis*, Morrison Institute for Public Policy, Arizona State University, 1988.

Oregon Progress Board, "Oregon Benchmarks: Standards for Measuring Statewide Progress and Institutional Performance," Report to the 1995 Legislature, December 1994.

Peirce, Neil, "New Urbanism's Answer to Sprawl," *The Arizona Republic*, March 26, 1995, F5.

Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research, "Impact Assessment of the New Jersey Interim State Development and Redevelopment Plan," Executive Summary, Rutgers University, February 1992.

Waits, Mary Jo and Johnson, Ryan, "Transit in the Valley: Where Do We Go From Here," Morrison Institute for Public Policy, Arizona State University, December 1995.

