CALIFORNIA PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT REPORT

June 1988 | William Fulton, Editor & Publisher | Vol. 3, No. 6

Cranston Pushes Housing As Post-Reagan Issue

Trying to get a jump on the new presidential administration, housing advocates — led by U.S. Sen Alan Cranston, D-Calif. — are working hard to re-establish housing as a public-policy priority in California and Washington. In so doing, Cranston and the housing industry are trying to ride the political popularity of homelessness and home ownership — but they must address the question of whether the growth-control movement, also politically popular, is harming efforts to provide affordable housing.

Building on the recommendations of the National Housing Task Force, which he helped appoint, Cranston is expected to introduce a package of housing bills in July. The legislation will probably address two issues in particular: a renewed federal role in the provision of low-income housing, and the huge amount of cash most first-time homebuyers must come up with to buy a home.

Cranston has said he does not expect President Reagan to sign such legislation even if it is approved by Congress. Rather, he apparently hopes to make housing an issue in the presidential campaign and force the next president, whether it is George Bush or Michael Dukakis, to give it higher priority than Reagan has. Bush is a question mark, but of Dukakis Cranston said recently: "He has already made very plain that he will do what he can to inject it into the presidential campaign." *Continued on page 5*

Growth Control Continues To Win Political Support

As Orange County's scheduled vote on a major growth-control initiative on June 7 drew near, growth issues continued to dominate local headlines throughout the state, particularly in Southern California.

The Orange County initiative, which would dramatically prohibit new development in areas with heavy traffic congestion, is widely regarded as a bellwether. If it passes, slow-growth advocates in Riverside and San Diego counties will get a boost for their initiatives, expected to appear on the November ballot. But no matter what the outcome of the Orange County election, the slow-growth movement appeared to continue gaining momentum throughout May. Here are some of the more important developments:

- Pressure from the newly organized slow-growth coalition in Southern California apparently contributed to the death of one legislative bill designed to slow the movement down, but a second bill passed a legislative committee and remained alive.
- San Diego Mayor Maureen O'Connor endorsed a numerical cap on building permits for the first time.
- The City of Los Angeles pursued an effort to restrict new sewer hook-ups in the communities it serves, including Santa Monica and Burbank.
- Builders won court victories in Moorpark and Costa Mesa, though in the second community a ballot referendum still could overturn the court ruling. *Continued on page 4*

Deukmejian Vetoes Bill On Indian Wells Housing

Gov. George Deukmejian has vetoed a precedent-setting bill that would have permitted the City of Indian Wells to use redevelopment funds to build low-income housing outside its city boundaries.

But that doesn't mean that the city's deal with poverty lawyers to build 750 low-income units in the Indian Wells area is dead. Rather, the 600 units likely to be constructed outside city limits must now be paid for by Sunrise Co., a private developer building a large resort in Indian Wells, said Jonathan Lehrer-Graiwer, an attorney with Western Center on Law and Poverty in Los Angeles.

In his veto message, Deukmejian said he could not find "sufficient cause" to grant Indian Wells special permission to export its housing money and added that he did not want to set a precedent. "It would be difficult to deny other jurisdictions similar relief in the future," Deukmejian said.

The Indian Wells bill, SB 1719, had received considerable publicity throughout the state. Though it would not have relieved the desert city of its "fair share" obligation to provide low- and moderate-income housing as determined by the Southern California Association of Governments, it would have exempted the city from a state law requiring that redevelopment funds used for affordable housing be spent within a city's boundaries.

As such, the Indian Wells case was representative of a larger *Continued on page 2*

UPDATE

Sacramento County Sues to Stop Citrus Heights Cityhood

The lengthy battle over cityhood in the Sacramento suburb of Citrus Heights continues to drag on. Sacramento County supervisors, who have refused to schedule a cityhood election since last July, have now filed a lawsuit challenging the cityhood process. Meanwhile, local officials await an upcoming report on proposed city-county consolidation.

The county sued the Sacramento Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) in late April, charging that the state's incorporation process is unconstitutional. The county also charged that an environmental impact report on the incorporation should have been prepared.

The conflict is basically a matter of money. All local sales taxes, and a substantial portion of property taxes, are transferred from county to city coffers when a new city incorporates. The incorporation of Citrus Heights is expected to cost Sacramento County $4.7 million per year, including $2 million just from sales taxes generated by Sunrise Mall, a regional shopping center in Citrus Heights.

The Sacramento LAFCO voted last June to permit an incorporation election, but since then the Board of Supervisors has used administrative procedures to hold the election up. The controversy led to the creation of a city-county reorganization commission to investigate the possibility of a consolidated metropolitan government. That commission's report is expected to be released soon.

Unlike most other growing California counties, Sacramento has not seen the incorporation of a new city since 1946, when Folsom and Galt won cityhood. As a result, more than 60% of the county's population lives in unincorporated areas, the highest figure for any populous county in the state. More people live in unincorporated areas in Sacramento County — almost 600,000 — than in any other county in the state except Los Angeles.

Deukmejian Vetoes Bill on Indian Wells Housing

Continued from page 1

public issue in California — that of wealthy local redevelopment agencies that set aside money for housing, as required by law, but do not spend it. (See *CP&DR Special Report: Housing and Redevelopment*, February 1988.) Under state law, local redevelopment agencies must set aside 20% of their tax revenues for low- and moderate-income housing. But no state law requires those agencies to spend the money. Particularly in affluent communities, spending the money can be a politically sensitive issue, since many residents do not particularly want low-income housing near them. As a result, redevelopment agencies are sitting on at least $160 million in housing funds.

Thus, housing advocates are faced with the problem of whether to allow redevelopment agencies to bank the funds or free the money to be spent in some other jurisdiction. And this is exactly what occurred in the Indian Wells case.

Last November, voters in Indian Wells approved a $1 billion area. However, the plan made little provision for housing that would be needed for low-paid service workers. So Western Center on Law and Poverty and California Rural Legal Assistance sued. The resulting legal settlement required the city and Sunrise to provide 750 units of low-income housing — about 150 within the city limits, as required by "fair share" allocation, and 600 across the city line in unincorporated Riverside County.

Sunrise and city officials, however, sought a change in state law to permit the export of redevelopment housing funds across the city boundary, because Indian Wells officials claimed the city had no vacant land to accommodate the low-income housing and could not annex appropriate territory. The Marriott Corp. — which owns a new resort in nearby Palm Desert and had financed a referendum campaign against the Sunrise project — engaged in an intense lobbying effort, and Legislative Counsel Bion M. Gregory issued an opinion that the measure was unconstitutional. Nevertheless, the proposal breezed through the legislature.

At that point, however, SB 1719 ran into some unfavorable publicity — specifically, a front-page story in the Los Angeles Times on May 2, complete with a photograph of Indian Wells's former mayor, Frank Chilson, sitting on the bumper of his Rolls-Royce and saying: "This is an a place for affluent people who want it quiet and want to be left alone." Within three weeks, Deukmejian had vetoed the bill.

Price Club Pulls Out of Deal With Pension Fund

Price Club has pulled out a land deal in Sacramento, leaving the city pension fund with likely ownership of a piece of property that has a rezoning application pending before the city planning commission.

Unknown to the city council, the pension fund had loaned Price Club $2.45 million to purchase the 14-acre parcel of land, on which it hoped to build a large retail warehouse. Price Club then sought a zone change on the property, now zoned for office use — leading members of the city council to question the propriety of voting on a matter in which the city pension fund had a financial interest. (*CP&DR*, January 1988.)

Although the city planning department recommended approval of the deal, more than 1,000 residents opposed the rezoning. On May 18, the day before the matter was to be taken up by the city planning commission, Price Club pulled out of the deal. Under the terms of the agreement, that means the pension fund will take ownership of the land but receive none of its money back. The only "out" is a provision that permits the original seller of the property, developer Steve Wong, to buy the land back for $2.45 million.

Unlike many of its counterparts, the city pension fund in Sacramento is controlled by a board appointed entirely by the city council. Both the city manager and the city treasurer sit on the board.

CALIFORNIA PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT REPORT

is published monthly by Torf Fulton Associates

1275 Sunnycrest Avenue
Ventura, California 93003
(805) 642-7838
Subscription price: $179 per year

Editor & Publisher: William Fulton
ISSN No. 0891-382X

COURT CASES

Irvine Can't Vote on Freeway Financing, Supreme Court Rules

In a decision that could have broad implications for the California growth debate, the state Supreme Court has prohibited the city the City of Irvine from holding an election on whether to join a financing plan to build new freeways in Orange County.

Ruling May 31 in *COST v. Superior Court*, L.A. No. 32181, the high court said that the state legislature had pre-empted local initiative powers by declaring the freeway financing plan to be a matter of statewide concern.

"The projects contemplated ... are of the kind likely to require coordination on a regional basis and to have substantial impacts on persons living outside the boundaries of the city," wrote Justice Marcus M. Kaufman for the court. The only dissenter in the 6-1 decision was Justice Stanley Mosk.

COST could be an important ruling for the building industry if establishes the principal that local initiative powers — the chief weapon of local slow-growth forces around the state — may be usurped by state legislation. Though *COST* was not a case involving a land-use initiative, the principle could be applied to land-use cases.

Indeed, it is very unusual for the high court to restrict voters' access to the ballot via initiative. Typically the only time a measure will be knocked off the ballot is when a court rules that the proposed ordinance or law is unconstitutional or invalid on its face. This tactic has been used successfully several times in recent years to attack both local and statewide ballot measures. However, the most recent attempt — the Building Industry Association's attempt to get the Orange County growth initiative knocked off the ballot — failed. (*CP&DR*, April and May 1988.)

The *COST* case arose out of state legislation, passed in 1984, authorizing Orange County and cities within that county to impose fees on new development to pay for half of the cost of three new freeways in the county. Under the law, Gov't Code section 66484.3, Irvine was expected to produce about 25% of the development fees, or about $150 million. After considerable dispute, the city council in Irvine authorized collection of the fees, which so far total more than $9 million.

Meanwhile, citizens in Irvine (the Committee of Seven Thousand, or COST) qualified an initiative for the ballot that would have subjected the development-fee scheme to a vote. Before a vote on that initiative could be held, however, the Building Industry Association of Southern California sued. Lower courts postponed the election even though, as the Court of Appeal wrote, "any judicial restraint of the electoral process is immediately suspect.".

At oral argument in January, Building Industry lawyer Alvin S. Kaufer argued that the state law delegated the development-fee power specifically to the Irvine City Council and not to the city's voters, and further suggested that under the state constitution no local initiative can take the power to raise revenue away from the city council.

Frederic D. Woocher of the Center for Law in the Public Interest, COST's lawyer, responded at oral argument by saying, "The legislature did not impose these fees. The legislature said the city could impose fees if they wanted to." Though Woocher obviously had Mosk's support all along, in the end Kaufer's arguments prevailed.

BRIEFS

New director of the governor's Office of Planning and Research will be 40-year-old Robert Martinez, now director of the state Department of Economic Opportunity.

Martinez is a career state bureaucrat, serving as assistant secretary of the state personnel board from 1977 to 1983 and as chief deputy commissioner of the state Department of Real Estate until Gov. George Deukmejian appointed him to the Economic Opportunity job in 1984.

Huston T. Carlyle Jr. had served as OPR director during most of the Deukmejian administration until his resignation earlier this year.

The future of the Santa Clarita Valley may lie in a series of Wall Street moves and countermoves involving the Newhall Land & Farming Co., the prime developer of the area.

Newhall has been developing Santa Clarita, in northern Los Angeles County, for 20 years. The result is one of the fastest-growing population and business centers in Southern California. Just last November voters in the area approved the creation of the City of Santa Clarita, but the company had maneuvered deftly to keep most of its undeveloped land outside the new city limits.

Last year, however, rumors began to float that prominent investors might attempt a takeover of the company, a limited partnership traded on the New York Stock Exchange. As a result, Newhall's "unit holders" (similar to shareholders) approved stiff anti-takeover measures in May. But some unit holders have now sued, charging that the company did not reveal that its largest unit holder had attempted to take the company private. The plaintiffs lost their initial attempt to block the anti-takeover moves, but have vowed to fight on.

The sale of Veterans Administration land in Los Angeles has been prohibited under a law signed by President Reagan in late May.

The provisions were included in H.R. 2616, an omnibus VA health-care bill passed by Congress in early May. They were included at the insistence of Sen. Alan Cranston, D-California, and Rep. Anthony Beilenson, D-Los Angeles, who opposed an earlier Reagan Administration proposal to sell VA land to help balance the federal budget.

The prohibition applies to portions of VA land in Westwood and in the Sepulveda section of the San Fernando Valley. According to Beilenson's office, those two locations were the only tracts of land in the entire country singled out for protection.

Lake Tahoe, Nev., won't be a city but Malibu, Calif., might be.

A cityhood vote in the resort communities across the state line from South Lake Tahoe, Calif., was defeated on May 25. And though the election took place in Nevada, the issues may sound similar to cityhood veterans in California.

Residents who favored incorporation pointed out they make up 25% of Douglas County's population but contribute 60% of the county's tax revenue. However, incorporation was opposed by the casinos who are the largest taxpayers and also by the Douglas County commissioners, who stood to lose $1.8 million a year in tax revenue by the creation of the proposed 6,500-resident city.

Meanwhile, after a lengthy battle, the Los Angeles County Local Agency Formation Commission has finally authorized a cityhood vote in Malibu, the thin and affluent coastal strip that has long chafed under county rule.

After hearing pleas from Ali McGraw and Michael Landon,

Continued on page 6

Growth Control Continues to Win Political Support

Continued from page 1

- A new study reported that California will add 2 million new jobs, 4 million new residents, and 2 million new households in the next seven years, further adding to the state's growth pressure.

State Legislation

As the newly formed Southern California Coalition for Responsible Controlled Growth takes shape, its main target appears to be the state legislature, where the building industry has always had a strong lobby. At meetings in April and May, the coalition — made up of slow-growthers from six Southern California counties — agreed to hire a Sacramento lobbyist and began investigating a possible statewide initiative.

Though any statewide initiative has yet to take shape, battles in the legislature have already begun. And for the slow-growthers, so far it's one up and one down.

In early May, slow-growth opposition forced Assemblyman Pete Chacon to withdraw a bill that the California Building Industry Association had hoped it could pass: AB 4678, which would have subjected initiatives to the California Environmental Quality Act — not before an election (that idea was already dead), but afterward.

Earlier this year, CBIA lobbyist Don Collin said this bill seemed to be the building industry's best hope in the legislature. But the sponsor was Chacon, who represents San Diego, where the Sierra Club has played an important role in shaping the slow-growth movement and urged its members to be vocal about opposition to AB 4678. Even the San Diego City Council went on the record against it.

Though he withdrew the bill, Chacon did not back away from his anti-slow-growth rhetoric, saying growth control has "negative consequences" on affordable housing and said he would try to craft a similar bill with a better chance of passing the legislature.

The slow-growthers have been less successful, however, in attacking another bill aimed at defusing their political power. AB 956, introduced by Sen. John Seymour, a Republican from Anaheim, would withhold housing subsidies from growth-control communities if the state finds those controls lessen the availability of low-income housing in the community. That bill passed the Assembly Housing and Community Development Committee on May 16.

The growth-control part of SB 956 is kind of a last-minute addition. In its original genesis it was aimed at rent-control communities, a favorite target of the powerful California Housing Council, a lobbying group made up mostly of large apartment owners. At the committee hearing, San Diego City lobbyist Kathryn C. Rees unsuccessfully argued that the bill should be killed because it provides no standards for the state to use in withholding the funds.

The state distributes some $62 million per year in housing and community development funds to local governments. Seymour's bill moved from the Housing and Community Development Committee to the Assembly Ways and Means Committee, which deals with financial matters.

San Diego

In San Diego, which is fast becoming a center of slow-growth sentiment, the leading issue in public debate has been whether new development should be controlled by general growth management techniques or by a permanent numerical cap on residential building permits.

In May, Mayor Maureen O'Connor, who had been reluctant to commit herself previously, came out in favor of a permanent numerical cap. She said she made up her mind after she learned that as many as 60,000 residential units may be exempt from any numerical cap, either because they are contained in development agreements or because builders have acquired a vested right to build them.

City planners pointed out that most of the 60,000 units are part of 10- or 20-year development plans.

The city council is drafting a growth-management measure for the November ballot that would compete with an initiative drafted by Citizens for Limited Growth. The Limited Growth initiative would restrict construction to 4,000 units per year unless certain performance standards are met. Last year, in an interim ordinance, the city council adopted a cap of 8,000 units per year, but some city council members have been reluctant to build their ballot measure around a numerical cap.

Meanwhile, San Diego County Supervisor Brian Bilbray proposed creating a regional planning board that would allocate industrial development among the county's 18 cities and unincorporated area. Bilbray said he made the proposal because jobs-housing imbalance is one of the most important reasons for traffic congestion. He said he hoped the county would include the idea in an advisory measure for the November ballot that would compete with Citizens for Limited Growth's countywide measure dealing with unincorporated areas.

Los Angeles

In Los Angeles, city officials are proceeding with plans to restrict new sewer hook-ups not just within city limits, but among some 30 jurisdictions which contract with L.A. for sewer services.

City engineers say the sewage system, which now handles about 400 million gallons of sewage per day, can only handle an increase of 7 million gallons between now and 1991 or 1992, when a sewage plant expansion is scheduled to be completed. On average, the city and its contractors have been adding some 10 million gallons per day of sewage each year.

Mayor Tom Bradley engendered considerable hostility last December, when he proposed restricting new sewer hook-ups among the 30 other jurisdictions — and proposed a moratorium on new development in Santa Monica, Burbank, and San Fernando, all of which were depositing more sewage in the system than their contract called for. Bradley also called for water conservation measures in Los Angeles.

In May, the L.A. City Council finally accepted Bradley's proposal, establishing an allocation system for new development in the city. The ordinance reserves 65% of new sewage capacity for residential construction and exempts many large public and private projects, including the Library Square office complex downtown, Los Angeles County's proposed private office and hotel developments downtown, and the Pan Pacific Auditorium redevelopment.

A separate ordinance restricts about 30 other jurisdictions, including many other cities in the L.A. basin, to sewer hook-ups totalling 1 million gallons per day.

Court Cases

Though they were getting knocked around in political circles in May, builders didn't do so badly in the courts.

In Moorpark, Urban West Communities — the leading residential builder in the city — persuaded a trial judge that it should be exempt from the city's growth-control initiative, passed in 1986.

Measure F, which restricted all residential construction to 250 homes per year (and individual developers to no more than 150), interrupted Urban West's plans to complete a 2,500-unit subdivision in the city. Though Urban West pulled some 800 building permits in 1986 before the initiative was passed, subsequent efforts to win an exemption from the city council failed, and earlier this year the company sued the city. (*CP&DR Special Report: Growth Control*, April 1988.)

The case revolved around the question of whether Urban West had a contract with the city to complete all 2,500 units. A development

Continued on page 5

Cranston Pushes Housing as Post-Reagan Issue

Continued from page 1

Cranston's efforts come at a time when the question of home prices is re-emerging as a major issue in California. Despite the intensity of the slow-growth movement, home construction has boomed in the state in recent years. Yet home prices are appreciating at rates that have not been seen since the real-estate boom of the late '70s.

Syndicated housing columnist Bradley Inman, who is based in Oakland, found recently that in 1987, building permits in California's major metropolitan areas exceeded the annual need, as identified by the state Department of Housing and Community Development, by almost 30%. In Los Angeles County alone, permits exceeded need by more than 40%.

But a recent nationwide study by RELO/Inter-City Relocation Service found that home prices in major California metropolitan areas, already among the highest in the nation, are growing more rapidly than elsewhere in the country. Home appreciation was close to 30% in the San Francisco-Oakland area (where the average home now costs $240,000) and almost 20% in Los Angeles and San Jose. In all, California's largest metropolitan areas — those three plus San Diego — ranked in the national top 10 in both home price and rate of appreciation.

Cranston's proposals to assist first-time home buyers will probably take two forms. First, he will probably suggest that the limit on FHA-insured loans be raised from the current level of $101,250 to 95% of the median home price in any given metropolitan area. The average home price in several California metropolitan areas is between $150,000 and $180,000, meaning FHA loans, which require only 3-5% down payment, are of little help.

Second, Cranston probably will seek to allow first-time home buyers to use Individual Retirement Account money for down payments tax-free, or else establish a similar fund, an Individual Housing Account, to save tax-free dollars for down payments.

The cornerstone of Cranston's low-income housing proposal is likely to be the Housing Opportunity Program, or HOP, a block-grant-type idea first put forth by the National Housing Task Force in its report earlier this spring. Under the task force's proposal, the federal government would put $3 billion into HOP the first year, with state and local governments required to kick in $1.5 billion in matching funds.

Essentially, the HOP idea is an attempt to recognize that during the Reagan years, when the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development drastically cut back its low-and moderate-income housing programs, a vast array of other organizations were created to provide such housing. These organizations included not just state and local governmental agencies, but also local non-profit housing development corporations and nationwide groups, such as the Local Initiative Support Corp. and the Enterprise Foundation, which find resources nationally to support non-profits locally. "Everyone's agreed we're not going to go back to a HUD-dominated system," said William Apgar, co-author of a recent Harvard study on the problems of low-income housing. "It has to be worked out among the other players."

As Cranston and other housing advocates attempt to provide more — and more affordable — housing, however, they keep running into a problem in California: local growth-control ordinances and unbalanced local development patterns. The building industry regularly blames growth control (and impact fees) for virtually all housing affordability problems. In fact the effect of growth problems on housing affordability appears to be a little more subtle.

At a public hearing on housing issues in Los Angeles in April, Cranston produced one ordinary citizen: Susan Jiminez, a housewife and preschool teacher from Moreno Valley, near Riverside. Jiminez explained that her husband works in Irvine but they could not afford a home in Orange County, so he spends some three hours per day commuting.

Cranston used Jiminez's testimony to elicit support for the Individual Housing Account idea, because the preschool teacher said she and her husband might have been able to save money for an Orange County-size down payment if they could have used tax-free dollars to do so. But clearly, housing advocates see cases like Jiminez's as part of a larger pattern of regional job-housing imbalances that have afflicted most coastal areas in California. And any attack on housing affordability may also include an attack on local growth ordinances, which the building industry sees as creating those imbalances.

At a recent UCLA housing conference, for example, David Maxwell, president of the Federal National Mortgage Association and co-chair of the National Housing Task Force, levelled harsh criticism at local growth-control ordinances and hinted that the feds may attach restrictions to HOP funds if local controls are used.

Such strong-arming of local governments — by the feds or the state — is not politically popular. In 1982, President Reagan's housing task force initially proposed a cutoff of federal housing subsidies to communities with rent control, but was forced by political considerations to drop the idea. State officials have never been too successful in getting local governments to fulfill their "fair share" housing obligations, though a bill to cut off state housing aid to growth-and rent-control communities is gaining in the legislature this year. (More information on that legislation is contained in an accompanying story beginning on page 1.)

Growth Control Continues to Win Political Support

Continued from page 4

agreement with the city was defeated in 1986, but the company claimed prior zoning agreements with Ventura County constituted a contract. Superior Court Judge Edwin Osborne sided with Urban West, ruling that a contract does exist and further concluding that Urban West's agreement to build infrastructure for 2,500 units up-front required timely completion of the entire project.

Meanwhile, in Orange County, Superior Court Judge Tully Seymour ruled that C.J. Segerstrom & Sons could proceed with the $400 million Home Ranch project because the city had corrected defects in the city's general plan.

Immediately affected is Segerstrom's plan to build a 20-story office building, the county's tallest, in the first phase of the project. However, Costa Mesa citizens qualified a referendum on the project approval for the ballot, and the city council may decide to place the measure on the ballot this November.

Growth Forecast

As if all this wasn't enough news for one month, right in the middle of it came an economic forecast that that rapid job and population growth in California, which has created so much of the slow-growth sentiment, would continue unabated over the next decade.

The Center for the Continuing Study of the California Economy predicted that by 1995, the state would attract 2.2 million new jobs and 4.3 million new residents, creating 2.1 million more households. Those figures would mean that the rapid growth the state has seen since 1980 would continue at about the same rate.

However, the report predicted that per-capita income would not grow as rapidly as population and jobs, making it even more difficult for the state to make necessary investment in public infrastructure, which many cite as necessary to accommodate growth more effectively.

Population Hike Concentrated in South, State Figures Show

California's population grew by 681,000, or about 2.5%, during 1987, according to figures recently released by the state Department of Finance's Population Research Unit.

Not surprisingly, 57% of the population growth occurred in five Southern California counties — Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Orange, Riverside, and San Diego. Among large counties (200,000 population or more), San Bernardino and Riverside were by far the fastest growing, with growth rates in excess of 6%. Stanislaus (4.1%) was the fastest-growing large county in Central California, while Solano County (3.8%) was the most rapidly growing large county in the North.

Almost half the population growth (47%) occurred in the 400 or so small cities with less than 100,000 population, though those cities account for only 38% of the population as a whole. About 28% of the growth occurred in the state's 32 large cities, where another 38% of the state's population resides. Unincorporated areas, which hold about 22% of the state's population, received about 24% of the population growth last year.

Among cities with a population of 100,000 or more, the fastest growing were Santa Rosa (5.6%), Fremont (4.7%), and Ontario (4.6%). However, Rancho Cucamonga grew at a rate of 17.7%, ending the year with a population of about 94,000. In fact, Rancho Cucamonga added more new residents last year than any city in the state except Los Angeles and San Diego, both of which are more than 10 times its size.

The rankings of the largest cities in the state remained the same — in order, Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, Long Beach, and Oakland. However, San Jose is gaining fast on San Francisco and No. 7 Sacramento is picking up ground on Oakland. Among other large cities, Stockton passed Torrance in the No. 12 spot, Modesto passed Torrance as No. 17, and Inglewood, which actually lost population, yielded the No. 30 spot to Orange. The state estimated that Alpine, the smallest county, and Vernon, the smallest city, both suffered a net loss of 10 residents last year, dropping Alpine to 1,210 people and Vernon to 80.

Highlights of State Population Estimates

Most New Residents Gained During 1987 (Counties)

1. Los Angeles	137,300
2. San Diego	79,200
3. San Bernardino	73,000
4. Riverside	58,700
5. Orange	43,000
6. Alameda	23,200
7. Contra Costa	17,400
8. Ventura	17,100
9. Santa Clara	16,600
10. Fresno	15,900
Statewide	681,000

Growth Rates Among Populous Counties

(All counties of over 200,000 population)

Growing Faster Than Statewide Average

South	
Riverside	6.6%
San Bernardino	6.2
Ventura	2.8
Central	
Stanislaus	4.1
Fresno	3.7
San Joaquin	3.2
San Luis Obispo	3.1
North	
Solano	3.8
San Diego	3.5
Sacramento	3.4
Sonoma	3.3
Statewide	2.5%

Growing Slower Than Statewide Average

South	
Orange	2.0%
Los Angeles	1[illegible]
Santa Barbara	1.[illegible]
Central	
Kern	2.5
Tulare	2.3
Monterey	1.7
North	
Contra Costa	2.4
Santa Cruz	2.3
Alameda	1.9
San Mateo	1.2
Santa Clara	1.2
Marin	0.6
San Francisco	-0.1

BRIEFS

Continued from page 3

among others, LAFCO approved a cityhood vote in late May. However, the L.A. County supervisors, who are opposed to incorporation, immediately asked LAFCO to reconsider the decision.

San Diego's Mexican sewage problems may be alleviated with the help of a federal appropriation now working its way through Congress.

More than 11 million gallons of sewage flows across the border via the Tijuana River each day. For years, San Diego officials have been seeking federal funds to build a pipeline that would send the sewage back to a Tijuana treatment plant.

The pricetag is estimated at about $50 million. San Diego is seeking $27 million in federal aid. Despite opposition from the Reagan Administration, the funding passed a key House appropriations subcommittee in mid-May. In return for financing part of the system, San Diego would be able to use part of the pipe's capacity to deal with its own sewage problems.

ROUNDUP: The Yorba Linda City Council has approved general plan and zone changes, as well as an environmental impact report, to accommodate the **Nixon Presidential Library**; purchase of the land will cost the city $1.3 million. ... Slow-growth council member Marvin Braude and developer George Rosenthal join forces on a **design competition** for West L.A.'s Olympic Boulevard corridor. ... A state Court of Appeal has ordered the state Water Resources Control Board to review **L.A.'s Mono Lake water licenses**, though city officials say they'll appeal.