Smart Valley Places:
Taking Advantage of the Great Reset

Mike Dozier
Lead Executive - California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley

Rob Woolley
City Manager - City of Clovis, California

Genoveva Islas-Hooker
Program Coordinator - Central California Regional Obesity Prevention Program

William Fulton
Principal – The Planning Center | DC&E
Vice President – Smart Growth America
Smart Planning for a new San Joaquin Valley

Collaboration to develop a regional plan for sustainable development to guide the implementation of smart growth principles in our Valley communities for years to come.
Geography
• 8 counties, 62 cities, 4 million people, 25,000 sq miles
• Larger than 10 states, more populous than 24 states
• Population expected to double in the next 30 years

Economy
• Recognized by Congress in 2005 as one of the most economically distressed regions in the country
• Unemployment rate is over 18%, significantly higher than the state and national averages of 13% and 9%, respectively
Environment
• Extreme non-attainment areas for a number of **air pollutants**
• **Water quality and quantity** impacted by a growing demand, reduced supply and multi-year droughts resulting in an increase in groundwater overdraft and fallowing ag land

Poverty
• Average family **income is 35% lower** than state average
• **Poverty rate of 25%**; among the top three highest poverty rates in the nation
• **Access to healthcare** is 31% lower than state average
Housing

- **Overbuilt** during the housing boom of early 2000s
- Since the crash of 2008, homes have **lost 50% or more of their value**
- **Foreclosure rates** consistently above 13% with four counties consistently ranking among the top five highest rates in the country
- The region includes the 2\textsuperscript{nd} (Stockton), 3\textsuperscript{rd} (Bakersfield), 4\textsuperscript{th} (Modesto), and 6\textsuperscript{th} (Merced) **highest foreclosure rates in the country**
Smart Valley Places is a roadmap to creating more...

- transportation choices
- equitable-affordable housing
- economic competitiveness
- healthier, safe, walkable neighborhoods
- sustained civic engagement

...in the San Joaquin Valley, CA
Builds on:

- Six initiatives of California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley
- San Joaquin Valley Regional Blueprint and its smart growth principles
- Livability Principles of the Federal Partnership for Sustainable Communities (HUD-DOT-EPA)
Driven by a regional consortium:

• 14 urban cities from the eight-county region
  – Lodi, Manteca, Stockton, Modesto, Turlock, Merced, Madera, Clovis, Fresno, Hanford, Visalia, Tulare, Porterville and Delano

• Broad range of regional partners
  – California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley
  – Four regional nonprofits: California Coalition for Rural Housing, Central California Regional Obesity Prevention Program, Local Government Commission and American Farmland Trust
  – California Central Valley Economic Development Corporation
  – San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council
Smart Growth-The Great Reset
Fiscal Reality and Challenges
Local Government Perspective

Synopsis-
• Smart growth, there are no disagreements about the long term benefits to the environment, creating healthier communities and providing more affordable housing options. But how are the fiscal challenges currently facing cities going to impact the implementation of smart growth principles and how does smart growth contribute to fiscal sustainability of the local government. Consideration of local government’s current fiscal condition should be considered when implementing a growth model, smart or otherwise, or the full benefits of smart growth may not be fully realized.

• Smart Valley Places help facilitate valley communities to come together and share knowledge and resources in order to address and correct the many problems that have plagued the area for many years, including fiscal sustainability, in order to prepare for a brighter future in the valley.
The Calm before the Storm 2002-2007

City of Clovis General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007-8</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>92,269</td>
<td>95,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>$55,095,000</td>
<td>$51,762,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$10,471,000</td>
<td>$9,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>$14,267,000</td>
<td>$13,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sworn Police Officers</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefighters</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Field Employees</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City Revenues

- Cities Fund Core Services primarily through Taxes, Sales and Property Taxes
  - Prior to 2008 development was booming
  - Property values Increasing
  - Houses were like ATM’s
- Fiscalization of land Use
- Cities Gave Raises and Increased Benefits
- New Programs Started
The Storm: Economic Challenges for Cities

- Thursday, Apr. 09, 2009
  City layoff picture becomes clearer
  Street, traffic cuts touch manager (Modesto Bee)

- Stockton: We're No Vallejo, But ...
  Chap. 9 Talk Dogs Debt-Laden City

- County parks poised for layoffs, center closures
  JAMES BURGER, Bakersfield, CA staff writer
  | Thursday, Jun 02 2011 10:00 PM

- Thursday, Apr. 14, 2011
  64 Merced city employees get layoff notices
Stockton, CA

Unemployment Rate: 18%
Mortgages 90+ Days delinquent: 7.78%
12 month Home Price Forecast: 1% decrease
2011 Job Growth .54% increase

Forbes.Com, March 16, 2011
Maslow’s Pyramid

Self-actualization
- morality, creativity, spontaneity, problem solving, lack of prejudice, acceptance of facts

Esteem
- self-esteem, confidence, achievement, respect of others, respect by others

Love/Belonging
- friendship, family, sexual intimacy

Safety
- security of body, of employment, of resources, of morality, of the family, of health, of property

Physiological
- breathing, food, water, sex, sleep, homeostasis, excretion
Government Employment

![Graph showing three-month change in government employment '000]

- **Localised pain**
- Three-month change in government employment '000
- **Source:** Bureau of Labour Statistics

*The Economist, January 7, 2012*
CITY SERVICE FUNDING PROFILE

LAND USE BY ECONOMIC BASE REVENUE CATEGORY

Historical Service Level

Actual Service Level

100% Of Land

4% Business to Business w/ POS/Use
5% Hospitality
2% Auto Dealers
6% Retail
1% Private Inst Church School
8.5% Multi-Resi
5% Service Non-Financial
32% Single Family Resi.
8% Business to Business no POS/Use
2% Financial Inst.
5% Freight
4% Govt non-profit
22% Rights of Way

MUNICIPAL RESOURCE CONSULTANTS
Economic Development

• Creating Jobs is Critical For Residents and Communities
• Attracting New Business to the Valley Has Proven Difficult
• High Speed Rail
• Smart Valley Places
PERCENT OF PERSONS BELOW POVERTY LEVEL

Source: 2005-2009 American Community Survey, U.S. Census

1 Huron 61.5%
2 Orange Cove 45.3%
3 San Joaquin 42.8%
4 Mendota 37.5%
8 Firebaugh 34.8%
30 Parlier 25.5%
49 Reedley 23.2%
50 Fresno 23.0%
55 Sanger 22.3%
77 Kerman 20.0%
87 Coalinga 19.2%
96 Fowler 18.8%
124 Selma 17.2%
200 Kingsburg 12.9%
254 Clovis 10.1%
480 Belvedere 0.7%

United States 13.5%
California 13.2%
Fresno County 20.9%
PERCENT OF PERSONS 25 YEARS OF AGE AND OLDER WHO HAVE COMPLETED HIGH SCHOOL OR EQUIVALENCY

Rank

1 Huron 26.0%
2 Mendota 26.9%
3 Orange Cove 28.3%
5 San Joaquin 32.5%
6 Parlier 36.4%
7 Firebaugh 38.7%
49 Sanger 60.5%
57 Reedley 62.2%
61 Coalinga 63.0%
64 Kerman 63.3%
67 Selma 63.3%
85 Fowler 67.6%
131 Fresno 74.4%
230 Kingsburg 84.1%
299 Clovis 88.8%
480 Portola Valley 99.5%

Source: 2005-2009 American Community Survey, U.S. Census

United States 84.6%
California 80.5%
Fresno County 72.6%
MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME

Source: 2005-2009 American Community Survey, U.S. Census

1. Huron $17,726
2. Orange Cove $24,480
3. Mendota $25,414
4. San Joaquin $26,494
6. Firebaugh $30,218
17. Parlier $34,738
49. Coalinga $41,008
76. Reedley $45,975
85. Selma $47,252
93. Sanger $48,046
94. Fresno $48,257
115. Fowler $50,938
128. Kerman $52,592

United States $62,363
California $68,909
Fresno County $52,071

241. Kingsburg $68,602
291. Clovis $76,863
480. Hidden Hills $250,001
UNEMPLOYMENT RATE
CIVILIAN PERSONS 16 YEARS OF AGE AND OLDER

Sources: State of California Employment Development Department, United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, Annual Average 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mendota</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Parlier</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Huron</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Orange Cove</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Reedley</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Firebaugh</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sanger</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Kerman</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Selma</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Coalinga</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Kingsburg</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fresno County</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2005-2009 American Community Survey, U.S. Census

313 Clovis 9.1%

480 Amador 0.0%
480 Sand City 0.0%
PERCENT OF PERSONS 5 YEARS OF AGE AND OLDER WHO SPEAK A LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH AT HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Huron</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mendota</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Firebaugh</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Orange Cove</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Parlier</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Kerman</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Reedley</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Sanger</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Selma</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Coalinga</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Kingsburg</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Clovis</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>Sutter Creek</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

United States 19.6%
California 42.2%
Fresno County 41.9%

Source: 2005-2009 American Community Survey, U.S. Census
PERCENT OF PERSONS BELOW POVERTY LEVEL

Source: 2005-2009 American Community Survey, U.S. Census

1 Huron 61.5%
2 Orange Cove 45.3%
3 San Joaquin 42.8%
4 Mendota 37.5%
8 Firebaugh 34.8%
30 Parlier 25.5%
49 Reedley 23.2%
50 Fresno 23.0%
55 Sanger 22.3%
77 Kerman 20.0%
87 Coalinga 19.2%
96 Fowler 18.8%
124 Selma 17.2%
200 Kingsburg 12.9%
254 Clovis 10.1%
480 Belvedere 0.7%

United States 13.5%
California 13.2%
Fresno County 20.9%
# Fresno County Major Employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC Bartending School</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Bartending Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetna</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargill Meat Solutions</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Locker Plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Medical Ctr</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections Dept</td>
<td>Coalinga</td>
<td>State Govt-Correctional Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Farms</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Poultry Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno County Economic Comm</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Social Service &amp; Welfare Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno County Public Health</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>County Government-Public Health Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno County Sheriffs</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Police Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno Police Dept</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Police Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno Police Dept</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Police Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno Police-Mgmt Support</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Police Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno State</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Schools-Universities &amp; Colleges Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Ranch Beef Co</td>
<td>Selma</td>
<td>Meat Packers (Mfrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITO Packing Co Inc</td>
<td>Reedley</td>
<td>Packaging Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Fresno Medical Ctr</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelco Inc</td>
<td>Clovis</td>
<td>Security Guard &amp; Patrol Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play It Safe Intl</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Safety Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest Diagnostics</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Laboratories-Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save Mart</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Grocers-Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Agnes Medical Ctr</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamoulus Produce Co</td>
<td>Mendota</td>
<td>Fruits &amp; Vegetables-Wholesale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun-Maid Growers of California</td>
<td>Kingsburg</td>
<td>Fruits-Dried (Whls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valhalla Sales &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>Kingsburg</td>
<td>Fruits &amp; Vegetables-Growers &amp; Shippers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacky Farms</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Broiler Fryer &amp; Roaster Chickens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year in which each metro will regain jobs lost since pre-recessionary peak employment.

Figure 2: Return to Peak Employment for Metro Areas


February 2012
Challenges

• Declining Revenues
  – Fiscalization of land use
  – Proposition 13
• Stakeholder expectations
  – Community
    • Live in the past
    • Perception- Higher density higher crime, lower property values
    • NIMBY
  – Development Community
    • Property owners
    • Financial Market
    • Politically connected

Smart Valley Places
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Challenges (continued)

• Stakeholder expectations (cont.)
  – Future Homebuyers
    • Higher density is not the norm in the valley
    • Willing to commute
  – Employees
• State and Federal Government
  – Provide funding for plans
  – Infrastructure but normally not ongoing maintenance
• Loss of Redevelopment
Opportunities

• Economic Development
  – Rising tide raises all ships
  – Smart growth with jobs and emphasis on economic development
  – High Speed Rail
• Lower Service Expectations
• Raising Fees and Taxes
  – CFD’s, LMD’s
• Regional Sharing of Revenues
• Public-Private Partnerships
• Federal and State and Non-Profit Partnerships
• Reduce Employee Pay and Benefits
• Wait for a Better Day
• Smart Valley Places
Conclusion
California’s Central Valley

- Central California stretches almost 300 miles.
- It’s home to more than 3.8 million residents. The population is expected to more than double by 2050.
- Our families represent over 70 ethnicities and speak over 105 languages; one of the most culturally diverse areas in California and the nation.
# Overweight & Obesity by Age Group, San Joaquin Valley and California, 2001, 2005 and 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Ages 12-17</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Ages 18-64</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Age 65+</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>19.8%*</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>7.7%*</td>
<td>9.6%*</td>
<td>6.5%*</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>7.5%*</td>
<td>17.7%*</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>11.5%*</td>
<td>4.8%*</td>
<td>27.1%*</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>18.2%*</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>17.1%*</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>12.2%*</td>
<td>15.0%*</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>12.9%*</td>
<td>17.0%*</td>
<td>17.0%*</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>7.6%*</td>
<td>21.10%</td>
<td>20.7%*</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Valley</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy People 2010</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically unstable

Source: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, 2003; 2007; 2009
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Why are we at risk?

OBESITY IN VALLEY COMMUNITIES
Poverty

- Economic Transitions
- Low tax base
- Disinvestment
- Neglect
Healthy Foods/Beverages

- Food Deserts
- Food Swamps
- Unhealthy Food Marketing
Physical Activity

- Limited Opportunities
- Locked school gates
- Limited park infrastructure
- Limited Recreational Programs

Smart Valley Places
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Transportation

• Limited multi-model transportation options
• Challenge to food access and physical activity
Environmental Injustice

- Water
- Air
Our environments cultivate our communities and our communities nurture our health

When inequities are high and community assets are low, health outcomes are worst

Substance Abuse  Violence  Smoking
HIV/AIDS  Infant Mortality  Depression
Stress  Obesity  Heart Disease

When inequities are low and community assets are high, health outcomes are best

HIV/AIDS  Heart Disease  Malnutrition
Infant Mortality  Stress  Depression
Obesity  Smoking  Violence

Fragmented Systems  Restricted Power  Disinvestment  Disconnected Members

Quality Schools  Access to Healthy Foods  Access to Healthcare
Access to Recreational Facilities  Adequate Income  Transportation Resources
Clean Environment  Health Insurance  Quality Housing
Jobs

Adverse Living Conditions  Poverty  Segregation
Poor Quality Schools  Occupational Hazards  Institutional Racism
Marketing for Tobacco and Alcohol  Environmental Toxins  Unemployment
Discrimination
Life Enhancing Resources

- Food Supply
- Housing
- Economic & Social Relationships
- Transportation
- Education
- Health Care
There is a silver lining!
Access to Decision Makers

• Less Bureaucracy
• Less complex department structures
• Stronger existing relationships
• More opportunities for finding consensus and mutually beneficial activities

Open Space

• Unlike urban centers, rural communities have an opportunity to plan the development of their open spaces.
Concentrated Scale

• Allows for perfect pilot projects and learning opportunities.

Proximity to Farmers

• Opportunity to recreate food systems.
• New market opportunities
Philosophical Alignment

• Rural community members are hard workers. We have a history of growing our own food, and being active. Returning to our roots is not unrealistic.
• Organically grown.
• Green.
Creating healthy communities in California’s Central Valley.

CCROPP SUCCESS
Our Partnership Model

CCROPP

Regional:
- Fresno
- Kern
- Kings
- Madera
- Merced
- Tulare
- Stanislaus
- San Joaquin

Local:
- Grassroots Community
- City Departments
- Community-Based Organizations

Smart Valley Places
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Access to Healthy Foods

Maximizing Nutrition Programs

Farmer’s Markets & School Farm Stands

Small Store Makeovers
EBT, WIC, Senior Vouchers, School Meals, etc...
Farmer’s Markets & School Farm Stands

Smart Valley Places

February 2012
Small Store Makeovers

Smart Valley Places
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Safe Places to Play

Joint-use
Park Improvements
Community Design
Building Community

Smart Valley Places
Unlocking school space for community recreation and physical activity.
Park Improvements
Working in partnership with Planners and Community Members
Neighborhoods are safer when neighbors are connected with each other.
Communities must join together in advocating for change.

CALL TO ACTION
Why is public participation important?

- Planning processes have historically excluded and marginalized low-income communities and communities of color.
- This exclusion has resulted in many of these communities being cut off from access to opportunity throughout regions.
- Lack of engagement in the process has also sometimes resulted in opposition to results that didn’t reflect community needs.
- Knowledge and perspective of low-income communities and communities of color is vital to turning regional visions for sustainability into reality.
Principles for public participation

• Empower residents through meaningful inclusion and partnerships
• Build capacity of communities to engage
• Prioritize community knowledge and concerns
• Target resources to support ongoing engagement
• Facilitate mechanisms that encourage mutual learning

Source: PolicyLink
More equitable public engagement

- **Inclusive:** What communities and interests are represented and in what capacity?
- **Accessible:** Will people and organizations from a diversity of backgrounds feel comfortable and engaged?
- **Transparent:** How does public engagement interact and influence decision-making?
SVP: Community Leadership Development

• Phase 1 – Outreach & Curriculum Development
  – Identification of local lead agencies
    • Located within target community
    • Experienced in community engagement
  – Curriculum development
    • Low-literacy
    • Culturally & Linguistically Appropriate
SVP: Community Leadership Development

- Phase 2 – Leadership Institutes
  1. Local Government 101
  2. Land Use and General Plans
  3. Housing and Community Development
  4. Local and Regional Transportation
  5. Environmental Equity
  6. Water/Wastewater Management
SVP: Community Leadership Development

• Phase 3 – Civic Engagement
  – Identification of local opportunities for public input.
  – Facilitating public participation
  – Assuming leadership roles
  – Influencing future projects
What I see is an empty lot, with trash and dry grass. People are littering the empty lot and the grass is getting dry, and soon the lot is probably going to be full of trash. If the grass was green children would use this place to play. This is a problem because the city people haven’t made a park and the empty lot is just empty and full of trash.

What we can do is build a park so we children can play and take care of this place. This way the empty lot would be full of green grass.
I see a Fastrip fuel store that I pass by everyday. Candy is being sold at a low price. Across the street is a mini market that sells healthy food for more money than candy. If Candy sell for more and healthy food sell for less people would rather buy healthy food than candy.

It’s easier to buy cheap candy than to buy expensive healthy food.

Because the junk food is cheaper and healthy food is expensive so it’s a problem. Make the price for candy and junk higher and healthy food lower.

Pablo, age 10
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Youth Engagement
Informed General
Plan Update
Thank you!

Genoveva Islas-Hooker, MPH
Regional Program Director
Central CA Regional Obesity Prevention Program
The Public Health Institute
veryveva@gmail.com
(661) 319-8029
Regional Trends in San Joaquin Valley

• Population: 4 million – up 19% in Census
• 14 SVP cities have 52% of Valley population and grew 24% according to Census
• Rapid growth expected to continue
• Few topographical barriers to growth
• Huge glut of single-family housing inventory from boom years
SVP fits in with other efforts

- Regional Blueprint effort has been underway for many years
- Strong Cities, Strong Communities (SC2)
- Counties obliged to produce Sustainable Communities Strategies under SB 375
- State’s Proposition 84 grants are performing similar role in smaller communities
How SVP can help the Valley lead the way:

- Large Valley cities are growing more rapidly than rest of Valley, so better planning can curb sprawl and strengthen existing neighborhoods
- Partnership with NGOs can lead to more meaningful participation on planning processes
- Ideas can be valuable in fast-growing rural areas nationwide
www.smartvalleyplaces.org
www.sjvpartnership.org
www.valleyblueprint.org

Mike Dozier
559-294-6021
mdozier@csufresno.edu