

APPENDIX A:
LAND USE POLITICS SURVEY



FLORIDA PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY

LAND USE POLITICS SURVEY

These questions are designed to provide a picture of the land-use practices and issues related to urban growth that might exist in local jurisdictions. These questions are also designed to provide a better understanding of how different groups or coalitions influence the effectiveness of land-use policies aimed at containing growth. For the purpose of this survey, effectiveness is defined as the ability for land-use policies to attain their intended goals and objectives.

SECTION I: Background Information on Your Jurisdiction

The following questions are intended to get some information about the characteristics of your jurisdiction and the community sentiment about urban growth.

1. Please rate the current situation and future outlook in your jurisdiction for each of the areas. **Circle one number for each policy area for the current situation and for the future outlook** (1 = Very poor... 5 = Excellent).

POLICY AREA	CURRENT SITUATION					FUTURE OUTLOOK				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	Very poor				Excellent	Very poor				Excellent
Economic opportunity	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Housing affordability	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Housing quality	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Urban aesthetics	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Traffic flow	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Vitality of the downtown	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Open space	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Farmland preservation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Recreation opportunity	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Air quality	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Water quality	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Neighborhood quality	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Public safety	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Urban land consumption	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Infrastructure	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

2. What is, in your opinion, your jurisdiction’s sentiment toward the growth of business and industry? **Circle the letter indicating best answer.**

- a) There is general consensus that it should be restricted
- b) There is consensus that it should be restricted in some cases
- c) There is much disagreement on the issue
- d) There is consensus it should be encouraged in some cases
- e) There is general consensus it should be encouraged

3. What is, in your opinion, your jurisdiction’s sentiment toward residential development? **Circle the letter indicating best answer.**

- a) There is general consensus that it should be strictly restricted
- b) There is consensus that it should be restricted in some cases
- c) There is much disagreement on the issue
- d) There is agreement it should be encouraged in some cases
- e) There is general consensus it should be strongly encouraged

4. To the best of your understanding, what is your jurisdiction's attitude toward development? **Circle one number for each type of development** (1 = Highly discourage... 5 = Highly encourage).

TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT	ATTITUDE				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	Highly discourage			Highly encourage	
Commercial development	1	2	3	4	5
Industrial development	1	2	3	4	5
Residential development	1	2	3	4	5
Multi-family housing	1	2	3	4	5
Affordable housing	1	2	3	4	5

5. According to your own view, which of the following issues should be a priority in your jurisdiction? **Circle one number for each issue** (1= Low priority... 5 = High priority).

ISSUES	PRIORITY				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	Low				High
Traffic congestion	1	2	3	4	5
Supply of land for residential development	1	2	3	4	5
Sewer capacity limits	1	2	3	4	5
Urban sprawl	1	2	3	4	5
Loss of agriculture to urbanization	1	2	3	4	5
High housing costs	1	2	3	4	5
Insufficient low-income housing	1	2	3	4	5
School crowding	1	2	3	4	5
Wastewater treatment facility capacity	1	2	3	4	5
Limited water supply	1	2	3	4	5
Water pollution	1	2	3	4	5
Destruction of important wildlife and their habitats	1	2	3	4	5
Urban decline	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of fund for government projects	1	2	3	4	5
Government encroachment on private property rights	1	2	3	4	5
Long delays in the development permitting process	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION II: Your Jurisdiction's Land-Use Management System

The following questions are intended to provide information concerning the land-use management system in place in your jurisdiction.

1. Does your jurisdiction have an adopted comprehensive plan or its equivalent?

No – Go to Question 5

Yes

↳ 2. Does state planning legislation require you to adopt a comprehensive plan?

No – Go to Question 3

Yes – Go to Question 4

3. Does state planning legislation encourage you to adopt a comprehensive plan?

No – Go to Question 5

Yes – Go to Question 4

4. What role has the state government played in influencing land-use planning in your jurisdiction in terms of? Circle one number for each state role (1 = Weak... 5 = Strong).

STATE'S ROLE	STRENGTH OF STATE MANDATE				
	1	2	3	4	5
	Weak				Strong
Defining specific goals and objectives	1	2	3	4	5
Providing technical and financial assistance	1	2	3	4	5
Building local commitment to state goals	1	2	3	4	5
Emphasizing stakeholder involvement	1	2	3	4	5
Facilitating intergovernmental cooperation	1	2	3	4	5
Monitoring compliance	1	2	3	4	5

5. Various mechanisms, programs or practices may be employed to manage urban growth and protect farmlands and environmentally sensitive lands. Please identify the mechanisms, programs or practices that are used in your jurisdiction from the following list and indicate the approximate time in use. Check all that apply.

PROGRAMS	Not used	< 1 year	In use 1-5 years	5+ years
Urban Services and Facilities				
a) Urban service area <i>(geographic limit of the extent of services)</i>				
b) Infrastructure phasing <i>(plan for location and timing of future urban service extensions)</i>				
c) Municipal boundary <i>(municipal provision of key facilities and services)</i>				
d) Urban growth boundary <i>(containment of urban-scale development within boundary)</i>				
e) Level of service standards <i>(performance standards for urban services)</i>				
f) Spatial capital investment <i>(new infrastructure investments in existing or planned areas)</i>				
g) Special service district <i>(only provider of key public facilities and services)</i>				
Urban Growth Phasing				
h) Urban reserve district <i>(reserve for future urban-scale development at urban fringe)</i>				
i) Public land management <i>(preserve publicly-owned land from development)</i>				
Rural Growth Management				
j) Agriculture/open space district <i>(exclusive farm, forest and other open space uses)</i>				
k) Urban fringe resource management <i>(overlay of district for rural areas with stringent standards)</i>				
l) Rural growth monitoring <i>(monitor projected demand for rural land)</i>				
Rural/Open Space Protection				
m) Transfer of development rights <i>(transfer development rights of rural area to urban area)</i>				
n) Purchase of development rights <i>(public purchase of rural area development right)</i>				
o) Urban fringe land acquisition <i>(public acquisition of urban fringe lands)</i>				
p) Urban/rural buffer or greenbelt <i>(small-scale greenbelt around urban area)</i>				
q) Small lot zoning <i>(small minimum lot size)</i>				
r) Large lot zoning <i>(large minimum lot size in rural zoning districts)</i>				
s) Open space zoning <i>(development allowed only on one portion of parcel)</i>				

6. How important have each of the following factors been in contributing to the adoption of policies seeking to limit development and/or protect farmland, and/or protect environmentally sensitive areas in your jurisdiction? **Circle one number for each factor** (1 = Not important... 5 = Very important).

FACTORS	ADOPTION OF POLICIES				
	1	2	3	4	5
	Not important			Very important	
Staff commitment to limit development	1	2	3	4	5
Local political action	1	2	3	4	5
Community wealth	1	2	3	4	5
Existing densities	1	2	3	4	5
Seriousness of the sprawl problem	1	2	3	4	5
Plan recommendation	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of land for development	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of funding	1	2	3	4	5
State mandate	1	2	3	4	5

7. Following is a list of goals that are often associated with mechanisms, programs or practices to restrict urban growth and protect farmlands and environmentally sensitive lands programs. To what extent was each of these goals important to the adoption of these mechanisms, programs or practices? **Circle one number for each goal** (1 = Not important... 5 = Very important).

GOALS	IMPORTANCE				
	1	2	3	4	5
	Not important			Very important	
Physically contain urban growth	1	2	3	4	5
Restrain population growth	1	2	3	4	5
Preserve agricultural lands and open spaces	1	2	3	4	5
Protect environmentally sensitive areas	1	2	3	4	5
Accommodate urban development	1	2	3	4	5
Restrict urban development	1	2	3	4	5
Improve quality of life	1	2	3	4	5
Provide economic opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
Provide housing opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
Provide more efficient infrastructures	1	2	3	4	5
Reduce urban sprawl	1	2	3	4	5
Improve neighborhood quality					
Increase vitality of the downtown					
Promote fiscal health					

SECTION III: Effectiveness of Your Jurisdiction's Land-Use Management System

This section is concerned with evaluating the degree to which the land-use management system adopted in your jurisdiction has reached its intended goals and objectives.

1. To the best of your recollection, what is the number of development orders that have been approved over the past twelve months?

2. To the best of your recollection, what percentage of the permitted development required a variance?

3. In the implementation of land development policies, there are requests to allow exceptions or variances. What is your estimate of how often, in the past year, your jurisdiction granted exceptions for each of the following programs? **Circle all that apply. If the program is not in use in your jurisdiction, leave blank** (1 = Never granted... 5 = Always granted when requested).

PROGRAMS	EXCEPTIONS				
	1	2	3	4	5
	Never granted			Always granted when requested	
<i>Urban Services and Facilities</i>					
a) Urban service area	1	2	3	4	5
b) Infrastructure phasing	1	2	3	4	5
c) Municipal boundary	1	2	3	4	5
d) Urban growth boundary	1	2	3	4	5
e) Level of service standards	1	2	3	4	5
f) Spatial capital investment	1	2	3	4	5
g) Special service district	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Urban Growth Phasing</i>					
h) Urban reserve district	1	2	3	4	5
i) Public land management	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Rural Growth Management</i>					
j) Agriculture/open space district	1	2	3	4	5
k) Urban fringe resource management	1	2	3	4	5
l) Rural growth monitoring	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Rural/Open Space Protection</i>					
m) Transfer of development rights	1	2	3	4	5
n) Purchase of development rights	1	2	3	4	5
o) Urban fringe land acquisition	1	2	3	4	5
p) Urban/rural buffer or greenbelt	1	2	3	4	5
q) Small lot zoning	1	2	3	4	5
r) Large lot zoning	1	2	3	4	5
s) Open space zoning	1	2	3	4	5

4. How effective do you think the land management system in place in your jurisdiction is in? **Circle one number for each goal** (1 = Ineffective... 5 = Very Effective).

GOALS	EFFECTIVENESS				
	1	2	3	4	5
	Ineffective			Very effective	
Physically containing urban growth?	1	2	3	4	5
Restraining population growth?	1	2	3	4	5
Preserving agricultural lands and open spaces?	1	2	3	4	5
Protecting environmentally sensitive areas?	1	2	3	4	5
Accommodating urban development?	1	2	3	4	5
Restricting urban development?	1	2	3	4	5
Improving quality of life?	1	2	3	4	5
Providing economic opportunities?	1	2	3	4	5
Providing housing opportunities?	1	2	3	4	5
Providing more efficient infrastructures?	1	2	3	4	5
Reducing urban sprawl?	1	2	3	4	5
Improving neighborhood quality?	1	2	3	4	5
Increasing vitality of the downtown?	1	2	3	4	5
Promoting fiscal health?	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION IV: Coalition Politics and Land-Use Planning

The following section explores some characteristics or traits of your jurisdiction regarding the local approaches to urban growth of various groups or coalitions, and individuals.

1. Local jurisdictions vary in the degree of involvement of individuals and groups in local government issues. How would you describe the general level of involvement in local political issues of the following individuals or groups over the past five years? **Circle the number that represents the level of involvement of each individuals or groups** (1 = Not involved... 5 = Very involved).

INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS	LOCAL POLITICAL ISSUES				
	1	2	3	4	5
	Not involved			Very involved	
Local government department heads	1	2	3	4	5
Local elected officials	1	2	3	4	5
Individual citizens	1	2	3	4	5
University representatives	1	2	3	4	5
Agricultural or forest industry groups	1	2	3	4	5
Business groups (e.g. chambers of commerce)	1	2	3	4	5
Development groups (homebuilder association)	1	2	3	4	5
Land developer trade associations	1	2	3	4	5
Real estate associations	1	2	3	4	5
Other trade associations	1	2	3	4	5
Affordable housing groups	1	2	3	4	5
Environmental groups	1	2	3	4	5
Neighborhood groups	1	2	3	4	5
Professional groups (e. g. architects)	1	2	3	4	5
Property rights groups	1	2	3	4	5
Good government groups	1	2	3	4	5
Sportsmen's groups	1	2	3	4	5
Media groups	1	2	3	4	5

2. Please identify the individuals or groups who, to the best of your knowledge, have supported or opposed the construction of new apartments or housing within your jurisdiction. **Circle the number that represents the level of support of each individuals or groups** (1 = Opposed... 5 = Supported).

INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS	NEW APPARTMENTS OR HOUSING				
	1	2	3	4	5
	Opposed			Supported	
Local government department heads	1	2	3	4	5
Local elected officials	1	2	3	4	5
Individual citizens	1	2	3	4	5
University representatives	1	2	3	4	5
Agricultural or forest industry groups	1	2	3	4	5
Business groups (e.g. chambers of commerce)	1	2	3	4	5
Development groups (homebuilder association)	1	2	3	4	5
Land developer trade associations	1	2	3	4	5
Real estate associations	1	2	3	4	5
Other trade associations	1	2	3	4	5
Affordable housing groups	1	2	3	4	5
Environmental groups	1	2	3	4	5
Neighborhood groups	1	2	3	4	5
Professional groups (e. g. architects)	1	2	3	4	5
Property rights groups	1	2	3	4	5
Good government groups	1	2	3	4	5
Sportsmen's groups	1	2	3	4	5
Media groups	1	2	3	4	5

3. Please identify the individuals or groups who, to the best of your knowledge, have supported or opposed the growth of business and industry within your jurisdiction. **Circle the number that represents the level of support of each individuals or groups** (1 = Opposed... 5 = Supported).

INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS	GROWTH OF BUSINESS & INDUSTRY				
	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
	Opposed			Supported	
Local government department heads	1	2	3	4	5
Local elected officials	1	2	3	4	5
Individual citizens	1	2	3	4	5
University representatives	1	2	3	4	5
Agricultural or forest industry groups	1	2	3	4	5
Business groups (e.g. chambers of commerce)	1	2	3	4	5
Development groups (homebuilder association)	1	2	3	4	5
Land developer trade associations	1	2	3	4	5
Real estate associations	1	2	3	4	5
Other trade associations	1	2	3	4	5
Affordable housing groups	1	2	3	4	5
Environmental groups	1	2	3	4	5
Neighborhood groups	1	2	3	4	5
Professional groups (e. g. architects)	1	2	3	4	5
Property rights groups	1	2	3	4	5
Good government groups	1	2	3	4	5
Sportsmen's groups	1	2	3	4	5
Media groups	1	2	3	4	5

4. Please identify the individuals or groups who, to the best of your knowledge, have supported or opposed growth management efforts, more specifically the containment of urban sprawl, within your jurisdiction. **Circle the number that represents the level of support of each individuals or groups** (1 = Opposed... 5 = Supported).

INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS	GROWTH MANAGEMENT				
	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
	Opposed			Supported	
Local government department heads	1	2	3	4	5
Local elected officials	1	2	3	4	5
Individual citizens	1	2	3	4	5
University representatives	1	2	3	4	5
Agricultural or forest industry groups	1	2	3	4	5
Business groups (e.g. chambers of commerce)	1	2	3	4	5
Development groups (homebuilder association)	1	2	3	4	5
Land developer trade associations	1	2	3	4	5
Real estate associations	1	2	3	4	5
Other trade associations	1	2	3	4	5
Affordable housing groups	1	2	3	4	5
Environmental groups	1	2	3	4	5
Neighborhood groups	1	2	3	4	5
Professional groups (e. g. architects)	1	2	3	4	5
Property rights groups	1	2	3	4	5
Good government groups	1	2	3	4	5
Sportsmen's groups	1	2	3	4	5
Media groups	1	2	3	4	5

5. In your opinion, what is the level of financial and human resources of the following individuals or groups? **Circle the number that represents the level of resources of each individuals or groups** (1 = Low level... 5 = High level).

INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS	RESOURCES				
	1	2	3	4	5
	Low level			High level	
Local government department heads	1	2	3	4	5
Local elected officials	1	2	3	4	5
Individual citizens	1	2	3	4	5
University representatives	1	2	3	4	5
Agricultural or forest industry groups	1	2	3	4	5
Business groups (e.g. chambers of commerce)	1	2	3	4	5
Development groups (homebuilder association)	1	2	3	4	5
Land developer trade associations	1	2	3	4	5
Real estate associations	1	2	3	4	5
Other trade associations	1	2	3	4	5
Affordable housing groups	1	2	3	4	5
Environmental groups	1	2	3	4	5
Neighborhood groups	1	2	3	4	5
Professional groups (e. g. architects)	1	2	3	4	5
Property rights groups	1	2	3	4	5
Good government groups	1	2	3	4	5
Sportsmen's groups	1	2	3	4	5
Media groups	1	2	3	4	5

6. How often would you say neighbors or other groups oppose projects that are technically legal (allowed by plan and zoning)? **Circle letter indicating best answer.**

- a) Never
- b) Less than half the time
- c) Half the time
- d) More than half the time
- e) Almost always

7. What are the avenues for citizen input that are most frequently used in your jurisdiction? **Circle all that apply.**

- a) Appointed advisory group
- b) Public hearings
- c) Workshops or forums
- d) Citizen surveys
- e) Other (specify)

8. How often are the following individuals or groups represented during opportunities given to take part in the decision-making process regarding land use issues? **Circle one number for each individual or group** (1 = Not often represented... 5 = Often represented).

INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS	LAND USE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	Not often represented			Often represented	
Agricultural or forest industry groups	1	2	3	4	5
Business groups (e. g. chambers of commerce)	1	2	3	4	5
Development groups (homebuilder association)	1	2	3	4	5
Land developer trade associations	1	2	3	4	5
Real estate associations	1	2	3	4	5
Other trade associations	1	2	3	4	5
Affordable housing groups	1	2	3	4	5
Environmental groups	1	2	3	4	5
Neighborhood groups	1	2	3	4	5
Professional groups (e. g. architects)	1	2	3	4	5
Property rights groups	1	2	3	4	5
Good government groups	1	2	3	4	5
Sportsmen's groups	1	2	3	4	5
Individual citizens	1	2	3	4	5
Media	1	2	3	4	5
University	1	2	3	4	5

9. How successful are the following individuals or groups in achieving their ends? **Circle one number for each individual or group** (1 = Not successful... 5 = Very successful).

INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS	SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING ENDS				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	Not successful			Very successful	
Agricultural or forest industry groups	1	2	3	4	5
Business groups (e. g. chambers of commerce)	1	2	3	4	5
Development groups (homebuilder association)	1	2	3	4	5
Land developer trade associations	1	2	3	4	5
Real estate associations	1	2	3	4	5
Other trade associations	1	2	3	4	5
Affordable housing groups	1	2	3	4	5
Environmental groups	1	2	3	4	5
Neighborhood groups	1	2	3	4	5
Professional groups (e. g. architects)	1	2	3	4	5
Property rights groups	1	2	3	4	5
Good government groups	1	2	3	4	5
Sportsmen's groups	1	2	3	4	5
Individual citizens	1	2	3	4	5
Media	1	2	3	4	5
University	1	2	3	4	5

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING TIME TO REPLY TO OUR SURVEY. YOUR PARTICIPATION IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT, AND YOUR RESPONSES WILL REMAIN ANONYMOUS.

APPENDIX B:
UNIVARIATE STATISTICS AND BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS

Table 1: Sentiment toward growth Issues

		Growth Business and industry Sentiment	Growth Residential Development Sentiment
N	Valid	237	236
	Missing	5	6
Mean		4.4262	3.7669
Std. Deviation		.87323	1.11505
Minimum		1.00	1.00
Maximum		5.00	5.00

Table 2: Sentiment toward the Growth Business and Industry

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Restriction	3	1.2	1.3	1.3
	Restriction in some cases	8	3.3	3.4	4.6
	Disagreement on the issue	19	7.9	8.0	12.7
	Encouraged in some cases	62	25.6	26.2	38.8
	Encouraged	145	59.9	61.2	100.0
	Total	237	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.1		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 3: Sentiment toward the Growth of Residential Development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Restriction	3	1.2	1.3	1.3
	Restriction in some cases	43	17.8	18.2	19.5
	Disagreement on the issue	33	13.6	14.0	33.5
	Encouraged in some cases	84	34.7	35.6	69.1
	Encouraged	73	30.2	30.9	100.0
	Total	236	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.5		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 4: Priorities in the Jurisdictions

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	N
Traffic Congestion	3.5667	1.15518	1	5	240
Land for Residential Development	2.8410	1.14854	1	5	239
Sewer capacity limits	3.0169	1.18238	1	5	237
Urban Sprawl	3.3191	1.26940	1	5	235
Loss of agriculture to urbanization	2.7093	1.30826	1	5	227
High Housing Costs	3.3808	1.10071	1	5	239
Insufficient low-income Housing	3.2845	1.12020	1	5	239
School crowding	3.4500	1.22286	1	5	240
Wastewater treatment facility capacity	3.0213	1.18915	1	5	235
Limited water supply	3.1172	1.26810	1	5	239
Water pollution	3.1250	1.07511	1	5	240
Destruction of wildlife	3.2605	1.08275	1	5	238
Urban decline	2.9622	1.19891	1	5	238
Lack of government funding	3.8875	1.01033	1	5	240
Government encroachment on private property rights	2.2887	1.03931	1	5	239
Delays in the development permitting process	2.6625	1.18862	1	5	240

Table 5: Traffic Congestion

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1.00	15	6.2	6.3	6.3
2.00	30	12.4	12.5	18.8
3.00	54	22.3	22.5	41.3
4.00	86	35.5	35.8	77.1
5.00	55	22.7	22.9	100.0
Total	240	99.2	100.0	
Missing System	2	.8		
Total	242	100.0		

Table 6: Land for Residential Development

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1.00	32	13.2	13.4	13.4
2.00	63	26.0	26.4	39.7
3.00	75	31.0	31.4	71.1
4.00	49	20.2	20.5	91.6
5.00	20	8.3	8.4	100.0
Total	239	98.8	100.0	
Missing System	3	1.2		
Total	242	100.0		

Table 7: Sewer Capacity Limits

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	34	14.0	14.3	14.3
	2.00	38	15.7	16.0	30.4
	3.00	78	32.2	32.9	63.3
	4.00	64	26.4	27.0	90.3
	5.00	23	9.5	9.7	100.0
	Total	237	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.1		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 8: Urban Sprawl

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	30	12.4	12.8	12.8
	2.00	30	12.4	12.8	25.5
	3.00	53	21.9	22.6	48.1
	4.00	79	32.6	33.6	81.7
	5.00	43	17.8	18.3	100.0
	Total	235	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	7	2.9		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 9: Loss of Agriculture to Urbanization

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	60	24.8	26.4	26.4
	2.00	38	15.7	16.7	43.2
	3.00	55	22.7	24.2	67.4
	4.00	56	23.1	24.7	92.1
	5.00	18	7.4	7.9	100.0
	Total	227	93.8	100.0	
Missing	System	15	6.2		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 10: High Housing Costs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	10	4.1	4.2	4.2
	2.00	45	18.6	18.8	23.0
	3.00	69	28.5	28.9	51.9
	4.00	74	30.6	31.0	82.8
	5.00	41	16.9	17.2	100.0
	Total	239	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.2		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 11: Insufficient Low-Income Housing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	14	5.8	5.9	5.9
	2.00	48	19.8	20.1	25.9
	3.00	68	28.1	28.5	54.4
	4.00	74	30.6	31.0	85.4
	5.00	35	14.5	14.6	100.0
	Total	239	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.2		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 12: School Crowding

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	15	6.2	6.3	6.3
	2.00	44	18.2	18.3	24.6
	3.00	59	24.4	24.6	49.2
	4.00	62	25.6	25.8	75.0
	5.00	60	24.8	25.0	100.0
	Total	240	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 13: Wastewater Treatment Facility Capacity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	28	11.6	11.9	11.9
	2.00	48	19.8	20.4	32.3
	3.00	81	33.5	34.5	66.8
	4.00	47	19.4	20.0	86.8
	5.00	31	12.8	13.2	100.0
	Total	235	97.1	100.0	
Missing	System	7	2.9		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 14: Limited Water Supply

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	32	13.2	13.4	13.4
	2.00	43	17.8	18.0	31.4
	3.00	69	28.5	28.9	60.3
	4.00	55	22.7	23.0	83.3
	5.00	40	16.5	16.7	100.0
	Total	239	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.2		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 15: Water Pollution

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	19	7.9	7.9	7.9
	2.00	46	19.0	19.2	27.1
	3.00	83	34.3	34.6	61.7
	4.00	70	28.9	29.2	90.8
	5.00	22	9.1	9.2	100.0
	Total	240	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 16: Destruction of Wildlife

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	19	7.9	8.0	8.0
	2.00	33	13.6	13.9	21.8
	3.00	79	32.6	33.2	55.0
	4.00	81	33.5	34.0	89.1
	5.00	26	10.7	10.9	100.0
	Total	238	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.7		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 17: Urban Decline

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	30	12.4	12.6	12.6
	2.00	58	24.0	24.4	37.0
	3.00	68	28.1	28.6	65.5
	4.00	55	22.7	23.1	88.7
	5.00	27	11.2	11.3	100.0
	Total	238	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.7		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 18: Lack of Government Funding

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	5	2.1	2.1	2.1
	2.00	18	7.4	7.5	9.6
	3.00	53	21.9	22.1	31.7
	4.00	87	36.0	36.3	67.9
	5.00	77	31.8	32.1	100.0
	Total	240	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 19: Property Rights

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	60	24.8	25.1	25.1
	2.00	87	36.0	36.4	61.5
	3.00	62	25.6	25.9	87.4
	4.00	23	9.5	9.6	97.1
	5.00	7	2.9	2.9	100.0
	Total	239	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.2		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 20: Delays in the Development Permitting Process

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	45	18.6	18.8	18.8
	2.00	67	27.7	27.9	46.7
	3.00	73	30.2	30.4	77.1
	4.00	34	14.0	14.2	91.3
	5.00	21	8.7	8.8	100.0
	Total	240	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 22: Staff Commitment to Limit Development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	32	13.2	13.8	13.8
	2.00	39	16.1	16.8	30.6
	3.00	70	28.9	30.2	60.8
	4.00	54	22.3	23.3	84.1
	5.00	37	15.3	15.9	100.0
	Total	232	95.9	100.0	
Missing System		10	4.1		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 23: Local Political Action

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	19	7.9	8.1	8.1
	2.00	36	14.9	15.3	23.3
	3.00	55	22.7	23.3	46.6
	4.00	82	33.9	34.7	81.4
	5.00	44	18.2	18.6	100.0
	Total	236	97.5	100.0	
Missing System		6	2.5		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 24: Community Wealth

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	47	19.4	20.3	20.3
	2.00	60	24.8	25.9	46.1
	3.00	68	28.1	29.3	75.4
	4.00	46	19.0	19.8	95.3
	5.00	11	4.5	4.7	100.0
	Total	232	95.9	100.0	
Missing System		10	4.1		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 25: Existing Densities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	26	10.7	11.2	11.2
	2.00	41	16.9	17.6	28.8
	3.00	70	28.9	30.0	58.8
	4.00	81	33.5	34.8	93.6
	5.00	15	6.2	6.4	100.0
	Total	233	96.3	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.7		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 26: Sprawl Problem

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	48	19.8	20.6	20.6
	2.00	55	22.7	23.6	44.2
	3.00	68	28.1	29.2	73.4
	4.00	48	19.8	20.6	94.0
	5.00	14	5.8	6.0	100.0
	Total	233	96.3	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.7		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 27: Plan Recommendation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	23	9.5	9.9	9.9
	2.00	23	9.5	9.9	19.7
	3.00	60	24.8	25.8	45.5
	4.00	89	36.8	38.2	83.7
	5.00	38	15.7	16.3	100.0
	Total	233	96.3	100.0	
Missing	System	9	3.7		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 28: Land Available for Development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	29	12.0	12.4	12.4
	2.00	34	14.0	14.5	26.9
	3.00	60	24.8	25.6	52.6
	4.00	72	29.8	30.8	83.3
	5.00	39	16.1	16.7	100.0
	Total	234	96.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	3.3		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 29: Funding Availability

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	36	14.9	15.3	15.3
	2.00	42	17.4	17.8	33.1
	3.00	64	26.4	27.1	60.2
	4.00	50	20.7	21.2	81.4
	5.00	44	18.2	18.6	100.0
	Total	236	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	6	2.5		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 30: State Mandate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	61	25.2	26.1	26.1
	2.00	38	15.7	16.2	42.3
	3.00	51	21.1	21.8	64.1
	4.00	35	14.5	15.0	79.1
	5.00	49	20.2	20.9	100.0
	Total	234	96.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	3.3		
Total		242	100.0		

Goals of the Land Use System

Table 31: Contain Urban Growth

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	49	20.2	21.7	21.7
	2.00	43	17.8	19.0	40.7
	3.00	43	17.8	19.0	59.7
	4.00	37	15.3	16.4	76.1
	5.00	54	22.3	23.9	100.0
	Total	226	93.4	100.0	
Missing	System	16	6.6		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 32: Restrain Population Growth

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	115	47.5	50.4	50.4
	2.00	54	22.3	23.7	74.1
	3.00	40	16.5	17.5	91.7
	4.00	13	5.4	5.7	97.4
	5.00	6	2.5	2.6	100.0
	Total	228	94.2	100.0	
Missing	System	14	5.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 33: Protect Agricultural Land and Open Space

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	29	12.0	12.9	12.9
	2.00	34	14.0	15.1	28.0
	3.00	43	17.8	19.1	47.1
	4.00	62	25.6	27.6	74.7
	5.00	57	23.6	25.3	100.0
	Total	225	93.0	100.0	
Missing	System	17	7.0		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 34: Protect Environmentally Sensitive Areas

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	5	2.1	2.2	2.2
	2.00	20	8.3	8.7	10.9
	3.00	49	20.2	21.3	32.2
	4.00	81	33.5	35.2	67.4
	5.00	75	31.0	32.6	100.0
	Total	230	95.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	5.0		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 35: Accommodate Urban Development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	22	9.1	9.6	9.6
	2.00	22	9.1	9.6	19.2
	3.00	54	22.3	23.6	42.8
	4.00	88	36.4	38.4	81.2
	5.00	43	17.8	18.8	100.0
	Total	229	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	13	5.4		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 36: Restrict Urban Development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	64	26.4	28.1	28.1
	2.00	69	28.5	30.3	58.3
	3.00	51	21.1	22.4	80.7
	4.00	30	12.4	13.2	93.9
	5.00	14	5.8	6.1	100.0
	Total	228	94.2	100.0	
Missing	System	14	5.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 37: Improve Quality Life

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	7	2.9	3.1	3.1
	2.00	14	5.8	6.2	9.3
	3.00	47	19.4	20.7	30.0
	4.00	92	38.0	40.5	70.5
	5.00	67	27.7	29.5	100.0
	Total	227	93.8	100.0	
Missing	System	15	6.2		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 38: Provide Economic Opportunities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	19	7.9	8.2	8.2
	2.00	20	8.3	8.7	16.9
	3.00	52	21.5	22.5	39.4
	4.00	69	28.5	29.9	69.3
	5.00	71	29.3	30.7	100.0
	Total	231	95.5	100.0	
Missing	System	11	4.5		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 39: Provide Housing Opportunities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	19	7.9	8.3	8.3
	2.00	34	14.0	14.8	23.1
	3.00	70	28.9	30.6	53.7
	4.00	73	30.2	31.9	85.6
	5.00	33	13.6	14.4	100.0
	Total	229	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	13	5.4		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 40: Provide Efficient Infrastructures

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	19	7.9	8.3	8.3
	2.00	26	10.7	11.4	19.7
	3.00	52	21.5	22.7	42.4
	4.00	88	36.4	38.4	80.8
	5.00	44	18.2	19.2	100.0
	Total	229	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	13	5.4		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 41: Reduce Urban Sprawl

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	38	15.7	16.7	16.7
	2.00	45	18.6	19.7	36.4
	3.00	56	23.1	24.6	61.0
	4.00	52	21.5	22.8	83.8
	5.00	37	15.3	16.2	100.0
	Total	228	94.2	100.0	
Missing	System	14	5.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 42: Improve Neighborhood Quality

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	16	6.6	7.0	7.0
	2.00	29	12.0	12.7	19.7
	3.00	70	28.9	30.7	50.4
	4.00	73	30.2	32.0	82.5
	5.00	40	16.5	17.5	100.0
	Total	228	94.2	100.0	
Missing	System	14	5.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 43: Increase Downtown Vitality

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	42	17.4	19.3	19.3
	2.00	42	17.4	19.3	38.5
	3.00	33	13.6	15.1	53.7
	4.00	53	21.9	24.3	78.0
	5.00	48	19.8	22.0	100.0
	Total	218	90.1	100.0	
Missing	System	24	9.9		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 44: Promote Fiscal Health

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	22	9.1	9.6	9.6
	2.00	31	12.8	13.6	23.2
	3.00	61	25.2	26.8	50.0
	4.00	59	24.4	25.9	75.9
	5.00	55	22.7	24.1	100.0
	Total	228	94.2	100.0	
Missing	System	14	5.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 45: Policies Adopted in the Jurisdictions

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Urban Service Area	2.6042	1.41036	1	4
Infrastructure Phasing	2.6569	1.35948	1	4
Municipal Boundary	2.8117	1.40307	1	4
Urban Growth Boundary	2.4417	1.39212	1	4
LOS Standards	2.8958	1.33882	1	4
Spatial Capital Investment	2.6569	1.37484	1	4
Special Service District	2.4083	1.41419	1	4
Urban Reserve Dist	1.5542	1.12651	1	4
Public Land Management	2.5983	1.39844	1	4
Agric-Open Space District	2.2427	1.38407	1	4
Urban Fringe Resource Management	1.4370	1.01165	1	4
Rural Growth Monitoring	1.5816	1.11551	1	4
TDR	1.4917	1.03896	1	4
PDR	1.4561	1.01105	1	4
Urban Fringe Land Acquisition	1.5000	1.05100	1	4
Greenbelt	1.5208	1.06267	1	4
Small Lot Zoning	2.6962	1.37182	1	4
Large Lot Zoning	2.6318	1.42840	1	4
Open Space Zoning	2.1561	1.36423	1	4

Table 46: Urban Service Area

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid not in use	100	41.3	41.7	41.7
In use less than 1 year	4	1.7	1.7	43.3
In use 1-5 years	27	11.2	11.3	54.6
in use 5 years +	109	45.0	45.4	100.0
Total	240	99.2	100.0	
Missing System	2	.8		
Total	242	100.0		

Table 47: Infrastructure Phasing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	88	36.4	36.8	36.8
	In use less than 1 year	11	4.5	4.6	41.4
	In use 1-5 years	35	14.5	14.6	56.1
	in use 5 years +	105	43.4	43.9	100.0
	Total	239	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.3		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 48: Municipal Boundary

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	85	35.1	35.6	35.6
	In use less than 1 year	6	2.5	2.5	38.1
	In use 1-5 years	17	7.0	7.1	45.2
	in use 5 years +	131	54.1	54.8	100.0
	Total	239	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.3		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 49: UGB

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	110	45.15	45.8	45.8
	In use less than 1 year	6	2.5	2.5	48.3
	In use 1-5 years	32	13.2	13.3	61.7
	in use 5 years +	92	38.0	38.3	100.0
	Total	240	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 50: LOS Standards

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	72	29.8	30.0	30.0
	In use less than 1 year	12	5.0	5.0	35.0
	In use 1-5 years	25	10.3	10.4	45.4
	in use 5 years +	131	54.1	54.6	100.0
	Total	240	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 51: Spatial Capital Investment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	90	37.2	37.7	37.7
	In use less than 1 year	10	4.1	4.2	41.8
	In use 1-5 years	31	12.8	13.0	54.8
	in use 5 years +	108	44.6	45.2	100.0
	Total	239	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.3		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 52: Special Service District

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	115	47.5	47.9	47.9
	In use less than 1 year	7	2.9	2.9	50.8
	In use 1-5 years	23	9.5	9.6	60.4
	in use 5 years +	95	39.3	39.6	100.0
	Total	240	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 53: Urban Reserve District

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	191	78.9	79.6	79.6
	In use less than 1 year	3	1.2	1.3	80.8
	In use 1-5 years	8	3.3	3.3	84.2
	in use 5 years +	38	15.7	15.8	100.0
	Total	240	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 54: Public Land Management

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	96	39.7	40.2	40.2
	In use less than 1 year	12	5.0	5.0	45.2
	In use 1-5 years	23	9.5	9.6	54.8
	in use 5 years +	108	44.6	45.2	100.0
	Total	239	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.3		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 55: Agriculture-Open Space District

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	126	52.1	52.7	52.7
	In use less than 1 year	9	3.7	3.8	56.5
	In use 1-5 years	24	9.9	10.0	66.5
	in use 5 years +	80	33.1	33.5	100.0
	Total	239	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.3		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 56: Urban Fringe Resource Management

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	199	82.2	83.6	83.3
	In use less than 1 year	1	.4	.4	84.0
	In use 1-5 years	11	4.5	4.6	88.7
	in use 5 years +	27	11.2	11.3	100.0
	Total	238	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.7		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 57: Rural Growth Monitoring

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	185	76.4	77.4	77.4
	In use less than 1 year	3	1.2	1.3	78.7
	In use 1-5 years	17	7.0	7.1	85.8
	in use 5 years +	34	14.0	14.2	100.0
	Total	239	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.2		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 58: TDR

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	192	79.3	80.0	80.0
	In use less than 1 year	7	2.9	2.9	82.9
	In use 1-5 years	12	5.0	5.0	87.9
	in use 5 years +	29	12.0	12.1	100.0
	Total	240	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 59: PDR

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	195	80.6	81.6	81.6
	In use less than 1 year	6	2.5	2.5	84.1
	In use 1-5 years	11	4.5	4.6	88.7
	in use 5 years +	27	11.2	11.3	100.0
	Total	239	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.2		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 60: Urban Fringe Land Acquisition

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	193	79.8	80.4	80.4
	In use less than 1 year	3	1.2	1.3	81.7
	In use 1-5 years	15	6.2	6.3	87.9
	in use 5 years +	29	12.0	12.1	100.0
	Total	240	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 61: Greenbelt

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	189	78.1	78.8	78.8
	In use less than 1 year	7	3.3	3.3	82.1
	In use 1-5 years	12	5.0	5.0	87.1
	in use 5 years +	31	12.8	12.9	100.0
	Total	240	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.8		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 62: Small Lot Zoning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	86	35.5	36.3	36.3
	In use less than 1 year	11	4.5	4.6	40.9
	In use 1-5 years	29	12.0	12.2	53.2
	in use 5 years +	111	45.9	46.8	100.0
	Total	237	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.1		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 63: Large Lot Zoning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	99	40.9	41.4	41.4
	In use less than 1 year	6	2.5	2.5	43.9
	In use 1-5 years	18	7.4	7.5	51.5
	in use 5 years +	116	47.9	48.5	100.0
	Total	239	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.3		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 64: Open Space Zoning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	not in use	130	53.3	54.4	54.9
	In use less than 1 year	11	4.5	4.6	59.5
	In use 1-5 years	24	9.9	10.1	69.6
	in use 5 years +	72	29.8	30.4	100.0
	Total	237	97.9	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.1		
Total		242	100.0		

Table 65: Descriptive Statistics for the Dependent Variables Effectiveness of Urban Containment Goals

Dependent Variables	Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Contain urban growth	1 to 5	3.1696	1.33855	1	5
Restrain population growth	1 to 5	2.1355	1.11134	1	5
Preserve agricultural lands and open Spaces	1 to 5	3.0631	1.31665	1	5
Protect environmentally sensitive Areas	1 to 5	3.5451	1.04588	1	5
Accommodate urban development	1 to 5	3.6695	1.01190	1	5
Restrict urban development	1 to 5	2.5872	1.12950	1	5
Improve quality of life	1 to 5	3.3856	.87010	1	5
Provide eco opportunities	1 to 5	3.4262	1.02502	1	5
Provide housing opportunities	1 to 5	3.2996	1.00787	1	5
Provide more efficient infrastructures	1 to 5	3.1845	1.06079	1	5
Reduce urban sprawl	1 to 5	2.9383	1.24648	1	5
Improve neighborhood quality	1 to 5	3.2661	.96379	1	5
Increase downtown vitality	1 to 5	2.9773	1.26218	1	5
Promote fiscal health	1 to 5	3.1667	1.05737	1	5

Effectiveness	Percent of cases scoring				
	Ineffective	Not so effective	Fair	Effective	Very effective
Contain urban growth	15.2	16.1	25.9	22.3	20.5
Restrain population growth	37.9	25.2	25.7	7.9	3.3
Preserve agricultural lands and open Spaces	16.2	17.6	27	22	17.1
Protect environmentally sensitive Areas	5.2	9	29.6	38.6	17.6
Accommodate urban development	5.2	4.7	27.9	42.5	19.7
Restrict urban development	17.9	33	27.5	15.6	6
Improve quality of life	3.4	8.1	42.8	38.1	7.6
Provide eco opportunities	4.6	13.1	30.4	38.8	13.1
Provide housing opportunities	6.3	12.2	35.4	37.1	8.9
Provide more efficient infrastructures	9.9	12.4	33.5	37.8	6.4
Reduce urban sprawl	15.4	21.6	29.5	20.7	12.8
Improve neighborhood quality	4.3	15	39.1	33	8.6
Increase downtown vitality	16.4	20	24.5	27.7	11.4
Promote fiscal health	8.1	14.5	39.7	27.8	9.8

Table 66: Regime Variable

Scale	Frequency	Valid Percent
Hegemonic anti-growth management	11	5.5
Contested anti-growth management	28	14.1
Split	103	51.8
Contested pro-growth management	37	18.6
Hegemonic pro-growth management	20	10.1
Missing	38	16.0
Total	237	100.0

Table 67: Correlation Matrix -Variables Coding

Containment Policies	
Urban service area	V1
Infrastructure phasing	V2
Municipal boundary	V3
UGB	V4
Level of service standards	V5
Spatial capital investment	V6
Special reserve district	V7
Urban reserve district	V8
Public	V9
Agricultural-open space district	V10
Urban	V11
Rural growth management	V12
PDR	V13
TDR	V14
Urban	V15
Greenbelt	V16
Small lot zoning	V17
Large lot zoning	V18
Open space zoning	V19
Mobilization Context	
Population growth	V20
Income	V21
Institutional Fragmentation	
Level of fragmentation	V22
State Mandate Features	
Goals and objectives	V23
Technical assistance	V24
Local commitment	V25
Stakeholder involvement	V26
Intergovernmental cooperation	V27
Monitoring compliance	V28
Local Coalition	
Regime	V29
Effectiveness of containment goals	
Contain urban growth	V30
Restrain population growth	V31
Preserve agricultural lands and open spaces	V32
Preserve environmentally sensitive areas	V33
Accommodate urban development	V34
Restrict urban development	V35
Improve quality of life	V36
Provide economic opportunities	V37
Provide housing opportunities	V38
Provide more efficient infrastructures	V39
Reduce urban sprawl	V40
Improve neighborhood quality	V41
Increase downtown vitality	V42
Promote fiscal health	V45

Table 69: Bivariate Correlation Matrix with Transformed Policy and Effectiveness Variables

	Population growth	Income	State mandate	Level of fragmentation	Regime	open space protection	Urban containment	Rural growth management	Implementation	Accommodate	Contain	Restrict
Population growth	1											
Income	.335**	1										
State mandate	ns	ns	1									
Level of fragmentation	ns	-.403**	ns	1								
Regime	ns	ns	ns	ns	1							
Open space protection	ns	.153*	ns	ns	ns	1						
Urban containment	ns	.162*	.157*	-.179**	ns	ns	1					
Rural growth management	.188**	ns	.204**	ns	.206**	ns	ns	1				
Implementation	ns	.147*	.190**	-.312**	ns	ns	ns	ns	1			
Accommodate	ns	ns	.180*	-.318**	ns	ns	ns	ns	.30**	1		
Contain	ns	.177*	.342**	ns	.238**	ns	.397**	.409**	ns	ns	1	
Restrict	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	.152*	ns	ns	1

ns = non significant correlation coefficients
 ** = significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed)
 * = significant at the 0.05 level (2 tailed)

APPENDIX C:
HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL



Office of the Vice President For Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742
(850) 644-8673 · FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 7/3/2006

To:
Severine Mayere
MC: 2280

Dept.: **Urban and Regional Planning**

From: **Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair**

Re: **Use of Human Subjects in Research**
Assessing the Influence of Coalition Politics on the Effectiveness of Urban Containment Policies

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Exempt per 45 CFR § 46.(b) 2 and has been approved by an accelerated review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If the project has not been completed by **9/16/2004** you must request renewed approval for continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must promptly report, in writing, any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Bruce Stiftel
HSC No. 2003.497

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agresti, A., and Finlay, B. (1996). Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences. (3rd ed.) New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Asher, H.B. 1976. Causal Modeling. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- American Planning Association. (2002a). 2002 States of the States: Planning for Smart Growth, Colorado. Retrieved June 6, 2003, from the American Planning Association Web site:
<http://www.planning.org/growingsmart/States/Colorado.htm>.
- American Planning Association. (2002b). 2002 State of the States: Planning for Smart Growth, North Carolina. Retrieved June 6, 2003, from the American Planning Association Web site
<http://www.planning.org/growingsmart/States/NorthCarolina.htm>.
- American Planning Association. (2002c). 2002 State of the States: Planning for Smart Growth, Arizona. Retrieved June 6, 2003, from the American Planning Association Web site <http://www.planning.org/growingsmart/States/Arizona.htm>.
- Armstrong, T., H. Jacob. (1996). "Centralized Growth Management Policy and Local Land-Use Decision-Making: Learning From Oregon's Experience." Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 51 (4): 285-287.
- Anderson, J.C., and Gerbing, D.W. (1988). "Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-Step Approach". Psychological Bulletin 103 (3): 411-423.
- Audirac, I., A. Shermyen, M. T. Smith. (1990). "Ideal Urban Form and Visions of the Good Life: Florida's Growth Management Dilemma." Journal of the American Planning Association 56 (4): 470-482.
- Baldassare, M. (1986). "Suburban Support for No-Growth Policies: Implications for the Growth Revolution." Journal of Urban Affairs 12 (2): 197-206.
- Baldassare, M., W. Protash. (1982). "Growth Controls, Population Growth and Community Satisfaction." American Sociological Review 47: 339-346.
- Basalo, V. (2000). "City Spending on Economic Development Versus Affordable Housing: Does Inter-City Competition or Local Politics Drive Decisions?" Journal of Urban Affairs 22 (3): 317-332.

- Bengston, David N., Jennifer O. Fletch, Kristen C. Nelson. (2003). "Public Policies for Managing Urban Growth and Protecting Open Spaces: Policy Instruments and Lessons Learned in the United States." Landscape and Urban Planning 69 (2-3): 271-286.
- Bentler, P. M. (1983). "Some Contributions to Efficient Statistics in Structural Models: Specification and Estimation of Moment Structures". Psychometrika 48 (4): 493-517.
- Bentler, P.M. (1990). "Comparative Fit Indexes in Structural Models". Psychological Bulletin 107 (2): 238-246.
- Bentler, P.M, and C.P. Chou. (1987). "Practical Issues in Structural Equation Modeling". Sociological Methods and Research 16 :78-117.
- Ben-Zadok, E., and D. E. Gale. (2001). Innovation and Reform, Intentional Inaction, and Tactical Breakdown: The Implementation Record of the Florida Concurrency Policy. Urban Affairs Review 36 (6): 836-871.
- Berke P. R., S. P. French. (1994). "The Influence of State Mandates on Local Plan Quality." Journal of Planning Education and Research 13 (4): 237-250.
- Berke, P., D. Godschalk. G. Kaiser. (2006). Urban Land Use Planning. (5th ed). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Bollens, S. A. (1990). "Constituencies for Limitation and Regionalism: Approaches to Growth Management." Urban Affairs Quarterly 26 (1): 46-67.
- Bollens, S. A. (1992). "State Growth Management: Intergovernmental Frameworks and Policy Objectives." Journal of the American Planning Association 58 (4): 454-466.
- Burbank M. J., G. Andranovich (2000). "Antigrowth Politics or Piecemeal Resistance? Citizen Opposition to Olympic-Related Economic Growth." Urban Affairs Review 35 (3): 334-357.
- Burby R., P. May, R. Paterson. (1998). "Improving Compliance with Regulations: Choices and Outcomes for Local Governments." Journal of the American Planning Association 64 (3): 324-334.
- Burby R., R. Paterson. (1993). "Improving Compliance with State Environmental Regulations." Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 12(3-4): 753-772.
- Burby R. J., A. C. Nelson, D. Parker, and J. Handmer (2000). Urban Conference Policy and Disaster: Is There a Connection? Atlanta, GA: 2000 Conference of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning.

- Burby R. J., L. C. Dalton. (1994). "Plans Can Matter: The Role of Land Use Plans and State Planning Mandates in Limiting the Development of Hazardous Areas." Public Administration Review 54 (3): 229-237.
- Burby R J., J. M. Peter, P. R. Berke, L. C. Dalton, S. P. French, and E. J. Kaiser (1997). Making Government Plan: State Experiments in Managing Land Use. Baltimore, MD, John Hopkins University Press.
- Burns, P. (2002). "The Intergovernmental Regime and Public Policy in Hartford, Connecticut." Journal of Urban Affairs 24 (1): 55-73.
- Byrne, B. M. (1994). Structural Equation Modeling with EQS and EQS/Windows. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Calavita, N. (1992). "Growth Machine and Ballot Box Planning: The San Diego Case." Journal of Urban Affairs 14 (1): 1-24
- Carruthers, J. (2002). "The Impacts of State Growth Management Programs: A Comparative Analysis." Urban Studies 39 (11): 1959-1982.
- Carruthers, J. (2002). "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Regulatory Growth Management Programs." Journal of Planning Education and Research 21: 391-405.
- Chapin, T. (2007). Local Governments as Policy Entrepreneurs: Evaluating Florida's "Concurrency Experiment". Urban Affairs Review : 1-28.
- Clark, J. (2001). "Six Urban Regime Types: The Effects of State Law and Citizen Participation on the Development of Alternative Regimes." Public Administration Quarterly 25 (1): 3-48.
- Clark, T., E. Goetz. (1994). "The Antigrowth Machine: Can City Government Control, Limit or Manage Growth?" Urban Innovations: Creative Strategies for Turbulent Times. T. Nichols (ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication. 105-145.
- Clingermayer J, R. Feiock. (1990). "The Adoption of Economic Development Policies by Large Cities: A Test of Economic, Interest Group, and Institutional Explanations." Policy Studies Journal 18 (3): 539-552.
- Cochrane, A. (1998). "Illusions of Power: Interviewing Local Elites." Environment and Planning A 30 (12): 2121-2132.
- Cortina, J.M. (1993). "What is Coefficient Alpha? An Examination of Theory and Applications". Journal of Applied Psychology, 78 (1): 98-104.

- Cox, K. (1995). "Globalisation, Competition and the Politics of Local Economic Development." Urban Studies 32 (2): 213-224.
- Curran, P. J, J. F. Finch, and S.G. West. (1996). "The Robustness of Test Statistics to Nonnormality and Specification Error in Confirmatory Factor Analysis". Psychological Methods, 1 (1): 16-29.
- Dalton, L. C. (1989). "The Limits of Regulation: Evidence from Local Plan Implementation in California." Journal of the American Planning Association 55 (2): 151-168.
- Daniels, T. (1999). When City and Country Collide: Managing Growth in the Metropolitan Fringe. Washington D.C: Island Press.
- Daniels T., A. C. Nelson. (1986). "Is Oregon's Farmland Preservation Program Working?" Journal of the American Planning Association 52 (1): 22-32.
- Daniels, T. (1991). "The Purchase of Development Rights: Preserving Agricultural Land and Open Space." Journal of the American Planning Association 57 (4): 421-431.
- Davies, J. (2002). "Urban Regime Theory: A Normative-Empirical Critique." Journal of Urban Affairs 24 (1): 1-17.
- Dawkins C., A. C. Nelson. (2002). "Urban Containment Policies and Housing Prices: An International Comparison with Implications for Future Research." Land Use Policy 19.
- Deakin, E. (1989). Growth Controls and Growth Management: A Summary and Review of Empirical Research. Understanding Growth Management: Critical Issues and a Research Agenda. D. R. Godschalk, D.J. Brower, and D.R. Porter (eds). Washington, D.C: Urban Land Institute.
- DeCarlo, L.T. (1997). "On the Meaning and Use of Kurtosis". Psychological Methods, 2, (3): 292-307.
- DeGrove, J. M. (1984). Land Growth and Politics. Washington, D.C, APA Planners Press.
- DeGrove, J. M. (1992). Planning and Growth Management in the States. Cambridge, MA, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- DeGrove, J. M. (2005). Land Growth and Politics: Smart Growth and the States. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

- DeGrove, J. M., P. Metzger. (1993). "Growth Management and the Integrated Role of State, Regional and Local Governments". Growth Management: The Planning Challenge of the 1990s. Jay Stein (ed.), Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- DeLeon, R. E. (1992). "The Urban Anti-Regime: Progressive Politics in San Francisco." Urban Affairs Quarterly 27 (4): 555-579.
- Deyle, R., R. Smith. (1998). "Local Government Compliance with State Planning Mandates: The Effects of State Implementation in Florida." Journal of the American Planning Association 64: 457-469.
- DiGaetano, A., J. S. Klemanski. (1999). Power and City Governance: Comparative Perspectives on Urban Development. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- DiGaetano A., P. Lawless. (1999). "Urban Governance and Industrial Decline." Urban Affairs Review 34 (4): 546-577.
- DiGaetano, A. (1993). Urban Governing Alignments and Realignments in Comparative Perspective: Development Policies in Boston, Massachusetts and Bristol, England. Urban Affairs Review 32 (6): 844-870.
- DiGaetano Alan R, John S. Klemanski. (1993). "Urban Regimes in a Comparative Perspective." Urban Affairs Quarterly 29 (1): 54-83.
- Dillman, D. (1978). Mail and Telephone Survey: The Total Design Method. New York: Wiley.
- Donovan, T. (1993). "Community Controversy and the Adoption of Economic Development Policies." Social Science Quarterly 74 (2): 387-402.
- Donovan T., M. Neiman. (1991). "Citizen Mobilization and the Adoption of Local Growth Control." The Western Political Quarterly 45: 651-675.
- Donovan T., M. Neiman. (1995). "Local Growth Control Policy and Changes in Community Characteristics." Social Science Quarterly 76 (4): 780-793.
- Donovan T., M. Neiman., S. Brumbaugh (1994). "The Dimensions of Local Growth Strategies." Research in Community Sociology 4: 153-169.
- Dowall D., J. Landis. (1982). "Land Use Controls and Housing Costs: An Examination of San Francisco Bay Area Communities." Journal of American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association 10 (67-93).
- Dowding, K. (2001). "Explaining Urban Regimes." International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 25.

- Dowding K., P. Dunleavy, D. King, H. Margett, and Y. Rydin (1999). "Regime Politics in London Local Government." Urban Affairs Review 34 (4): 515-545.
- Downs, A. (2001). "What Does Smart Growth Really Mean?" Planning 67 (4).
- Downs, A. (2002). "Have Housing Prices Risen Faster in Portland Than Elsewhere?" Housing Policy Debate 13 (1): 7-31.
- Dunteman, G. H. (1989). Principal Component Analysis. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Edelman, M. (1964). The Symbolic Uses of Politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Elkin, S. L. (1987). City and Regime in the American Republic. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Elkin, S. L. (1987). State and Market in City Politics or the 'Real Dallas'. The Politics of Urban Development. C. Stone and H. T. Sanders (eds). Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Elliot, M. (1981). "The Impacts of Growth Control Regulations on Housing Prices in California." Journal of American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association 9: 115-133.
- Fainstein N., S. Fainstein, eds. (1983). Restructuring the City: The Political Economy of Urban Redevelopment. New York: Longman Press.
- Feagin, J. (1986). "The Corporate Center Strategy: The State in Central Cities." Urban Affairs Quarterly 21: 617-628.
- Feagin, J. (1988). The Free Enterprise City: Houston in Political-Economic Perspective. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Feiock, R. (1994). "Estimating Political, Fiscal, and Economic Impacts of State Environmental Management Mandates on Local Government". Tallahassee, Reubin O'D. Askew School of Public Administration and Policy, Florida State University.
- Feiock, R. (1994). "The Political Economy of Growth Management." American Politics Quarterly 22: 208-220.
- Feiock R., J. West. (1996). "Municipal Recycling: An Assessment of Programmatic and Contextual Factors Affecting Program Success." International Journal of Public Administration 19 (7): 1065-1085.

- Fischel, W. A. (1990). Do Growth Controls Matter? Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Fischel, W. A. (2002). "Comment on Anthony Downs's "Have Housing Prices Risen Faster in Portland Than Elsewhere?"" Housing Policy Debate 13 (1): 43-50.
- Fleischmann A., G. Green., T. M. Kwong. (1992). "What's a city to do? Explaining Differences in Local Economic Development Policies." Western Political Quarterly 45: 677-699.
- Foglesong, R. E. (2002). Married to the Mouse: Walt Disney World and Orlando. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Forester, J. (1999). The Deliberative Practitioner. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fulton W., R. Pendall, M. Nguyen, and A. Harrison (2001). Who Sprawls Most? How Growth Patterns Differ Across the U.S. Washington, D.C: The Brookings Institution.
- Gale, D. E. (1992). "Eight State-Sponsored Growth Management Programs: A Comparative Analysis." Journal of the American Planning Association 58 (4): 425-439.
- Glickfeld M., N. Levine. (1992). Regional Growth...Local Reaction: The Enactment and Effects of Local Growth Control and Management Measures in California. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Goetz, E. (1994). "Expanding Possibilities in Local Development Policy: An Examination of U.S Cities." Political Research Quarterly 47 (2): 85-109.
- Gottdiener, M. (1983). "Some Theoretical Issues in Growth Control Analysis." Urban Affairs Quarterly 18 (4): 565-569.
- Gottdiener, M. (2000). "A Review of the Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later." Journal of Planning Education and Research 20: 116-118.
- Gottdiener M., M. Neiman. (1981). "Characteristics of Support for Local Growth Control." Urban Affairs Quarterly 17 (1): 55-73.
- Hamin, E. (2003). Legislating Growth Management: Power, Politics and Planning. Journal of the American Planning Association, 69 (4): 368-379.
- Hatcher, L. (1994). A Step-by-Step Approach to Using SAS for Factor Analysis and Structural Equation Modeling. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.

- Heimlich R. E., W. D. Anderson. (2001). *Development at the Urban Fringe and Beyond: Impacts on Agriculture and Rural Land*. Washington, D.C: U.S Department of Agriculture.
- Hoch C. J., L. C. Dalton, F. and S. So, eds. (2000). The Practice of Local Government Planning. Washington D.C: American Planning Association and International City/County Management Association.
- Horan, C. (1991). "Beyond Governing Coalitions: Analyzing Urban Regimes in the 1990s." Journal of Urban Affairs 13: 119-135.
- Howard, E. (1902). Garden Cities of To-morrow. London: Faber and Faber, 1965 reprint.
- Hoyle, R.H. (1995). "The Structural Equation Modeling Approach: Basic Concepts and Fundamental Issues". Structural Equation Modeling: Concepts, Issues and Applications. R. H. Hoyle (ed), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 1-13.
- Hu, L.T, and P.M. Bentler. (1995). "Evaluating Model Fit. In Structural Equation Modeling: Concepts, Issues and Applications". Structural Equation Modeling: Concepts, Issues and Applications. R. H. Hoyle (ed), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 76-99.
- Imbroscio, D. (1997). Reconstructing City Politics: Alternative Economic Development and Urban Regimes. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Imbroscio, D. (1998). "Reformulating Urban Regime Theory: The Division of Labor between State and Market Revisited." Journal of Urban Affairs 20: 233-248.
- Innes, J. E. (1992). "Group Process and the Social Construction of Growth Management." Journal of the American Planning Association 58 (4): 440-453.
- Innes, J. E., and D. E. Booher. (1999). "Consensus Building and Complex Adaptive Systems: A Framework for Evaluating Collaborative Planning". Journal of the American Planning Association 65 (4): 412-423.
- Innes, J. E., and D. E. Booher. (2002). Network Power in Collaborative Planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 21 (3), 221-236.
- Jaccard, J., and C. K. Wan. (1996). LISREL approaches to interaction effects in multiple regression. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Johnston, R. A. (1980). "The Politics of Local Growth Control." Policy Studies Journal 9 (3): 427-439.

- Johnston R. A., M. E. Madison. (1997). "From Landmarks To Landscapes: A Review of Current Practices in the Transfer of Development Rights." Journal of the American Planning Association 63 (3): 365-378.
- Kang, In-Sung and Richard C. Feiock. (2006). "Implementation of Growth Management Policy in Florida: Zoning Approval and Regulatory Policy Enforcement". International Review of Public Administration 11 (1): 85-98.
- Kantor P., H. Savitch., S. Haddock (1997). "The Political Economy of Urban Regimes: A Comparative Perspective." Urban Affairs Review 32: 348-377.
- Katz L., K. Rosen. (1987). "The Interjurisdiction Effects of Growth Controls on Housing Prices." Journal of Law and Economics 30: 149-160.
- Kerstein, R. (1993). "Suburban Growth Politics in Hillsborough County: Growth Management and Political Regimes." Social Science Quarterly 74 (3): 614-630.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling. (2nd ed.) New York: The Guilford Press.
- Knaap, G. (1985). "The Price Effects of Urban Growth Boundaries in Metropolitan Portland, Oregon." Land Economics 61 (1): 26-35.
- Knaap, G. (1987). "Self-Interest and Voter Support for Oregon's Land Use Controls." Journal of the American Planning Association 53 (1): 92-97.
- Knaap, G. (1989). "The Political Economy of Growth Management in Oregon: A Historical Review." The Review of Regional Studies 43-49.
- Knaap G., A. C. Nelson. (1992). The Regulated Landscape: Lessons on State Land Use Planning from Oregon. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Krannich R., C. Humphrey. (1983). "Local Mobilization and Community Growth." Rural Sociology 48: 60-81.
- Kunnan, A.J. (1998). "An Introduction to Structural Equation Modeling for Language Assessment Research". Language Testing, 15 (3): 295-332.
- Landis, J. (1986). "Do Growth Controls Matter?" Journal of the American Planning Association 58: 489-508.
- Landis, J. D. (1992). "Do Growth Controls Work? A New Assessment." Journal of the American Planning Association 58 (4): 489-508.
- Lauria, M., ed. (1997). Reconstructing Regime Theory: Regulating Urban Politics in a Global Economy. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Lee, C. M. (1999). "An Intertemporal Efficiency Test of a Greenbelt: Assessing the Economic Impacts of Seoul's Greenbelt." Journal of Planning Education and Research 19: 41-52.
- Leo, C. (1997). Global Change and Local Politics: Economic Decline and the Local Regime in Edmonton. Reconstructing Urban Regime Theory: Regulating Urban Politics in a Global Economy. M. Lauria (ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 77-98.
- Leo, C. (1998). "Regional Growth Management Regime: The Case of Portland, Oregon." Journal of Urban Affairs 20 (4): 363-394.
- Levinson, A. (1997). "Why Oppose TDRS? Transferable Development Rights Can Increase Overall Development." Regional Sciences and Urban Economics 27: 283-296.
- Lewis, P. (2002). "Offering Incentives For New Development: The Role of City Social Status, Politics, and Local Growth Experience." Journal of Urban Affairs 24 (2): 143-157.
- Lewis P., M. Neiman. (2002). Cities Under Pressure: Local Growth Controls and Residential Development Policy. San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Liebert, R. J. (1976). Disintegration and Political Action: The Changing Functions of City Governments in America. New York: Academic Press.
- Liou, K. T., T. J. Dicker (1994). "The Effects of the Growth Management Act on Local Comprehensive Planning Expenditures: The South Florida Experience." Public Administration Review 54 (3): 239-244.
- Logan, J. (1976). "Notes on the Growth Machine: Toward a Comparative Political Economy of Place." American Journal of Sociology 82: 349-352.
- Logan, J. (1978). "Growth, Politics, and the Stratification of Places." American Journal of Sociology 84 (2): 333-348.
- Logan J., K. Crowder. (2002). "Political Regimes and Suburban Growth, 1980-1990." City & Community 1: 113-135.
- Logan J., H. Molotch. (1996). The City as a Growth Machine. Readings in Urban Theory. S. Fainstein and S. Campbell (eds). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell: 291-337.
- Logan J., M. Zhou. (1989). "Do Suburban Growth Controls Control Growth?" American Sociological Review 54: 461-471.

- Logan J., M. Zhou. (1990). "The Adoption of Growth Controls in Suburban Communities." Social Science Quarterly 71 (1): 118-129.
- Logan J., H. Molotch. (1987). Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Logan J., R. Whaley, and K. Crowder (1997). "The Character and Consequences of Growth Regimes: An Assessment of 20 Years of Research." Urban Affairs Review 32 (5): 603-630.
- Lyon L., L. Felice, R. Perryman (1981). "Community Power and Population Increase: An Empirical Test of the Growth Machine Model." American Journal of Sociology 86 (6): 1387-1400.
- Margerum, R. D. (2005). Collaborative Growth Management in Metropolitan Denver: "Fig Leaf or Valiant Effort?". Land Use Policy, 22: 373-386.
- McCallum, R.C. (1995). "Model Specifications: Procedures, Strategies, and Related Issues". Structural Equation Modeling: Concepts, Issues and Applications. R. H. Hoyle (ed). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications. 16-35.
- McFayden, S. (1978). "The Economic Implications of Urban Public Land Banking." Annals of Regional Science 12 (1): 67-81.
- Molotch, H. (1976). "The City as a Growth Machine: Toward a Political Economy of Place." American Journal of Sociology 82: 309-330.
- Molotch, H. (1993). "The Political Economy of Growth Machine." Journal of Urban Affairs 15 (1): 29-53.
- Mossberger K., G. Stoker. (2001). "The Evolution of Regime Theory: The Challenge of Conceptualization." Urban Affairs Review 36: 810-835.
- Neiman, M. (1980). "Zoning Policy, Income Clustering and Suburban Change." Social Science Quarterly 61 (3-4): 666-675.
- Neiman M, F. Kenneth. (2000). "Local Planners and Limits on Local Residential Development." Journal of the American Planning Association 66 (3): 295-305.
- Nelson A.C., D. R. Peterman. (2000). "Does Growth Management Matter? The Effect of Growth Management on Economic Performance." Journal of Planning Education and Research 19: 277-285.
- Nelson A.C, J. B. Duncan. (1995). Growth Management Principles and Practices. American Planning Association, Chicago: Planners Press.

- Nelson A.C., T. Moore. (1996). "Assessing Growth Management Implementation." Land Use Policy 13 (4): 241-259.
- Nelson, A. C. (1986). "Using Land Markets to Evaluate Urban Containment Programs." Journal of the American Planning Association 52 (2): 156-171.
- Nelson, A. C. (1988). "An Empirical Note on How Regional Urban Containment Policy Influences an Interaction Between Greenbelt and Exurban Land Markets." Journal of the American Planning Association 54 (2).
- Nelson, A. C. (1991). "Toward a Definition of Exurbia." Journal of Planning Literature 6 (4): 350-368.
- Nelson, A. C. (1992). "Preserving Prime Farmland in the Face of Urbanization." Journal of the American Planning Association 58: 467-488.
- Nelson, A. C. (1999). "Comparing States With and Without Growth Management: Analysis Based on Indicators with Policy Implications." Land Use Policy 16: 121-127.
- Nelson, A. C. (2000). "Smart Growth or Business as Usual? Which is Best at Improving Quality of Life? ". Bridging the Divide: Making Regions Work. S. M. Watchers and A.C. Nelson (eds). Washington, D.C: U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Nelson, A. C. (2002). "Comments on Anthony Downs's "Have Housing Prices Risen Faster in Portland Than Elsewhere?"" Housing Policy Debate 13 (1): 33-42.
- Nelson, A. C. (2003). What Flavor is Your Containment? National Association of Realtors, The Brookings Institution.
- Nelson A. C., R. Pendall, C. J. Dawkins, G. J. Knaap. (2002). The Link Between Growth Management and Affordable Housing. Washington D.C: The Brookings Institution.
- Nelson, A. C., R. J. Burby, E. Feser, C. J. Dawkins, E. E. Mazilia and R. Quercia. (2004). "Urban Containment and Central City Revitalization". Journal of the American Planning Association, 70 : 411-425.
- Nelson, A. C., T. W. Sanchez and C. J. Dawkins. (2003). "The Effects of Urban Containment and Mandatory Housing Elements on Racial Segregation in the U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1990-2000. Journal of Urban Affairs 26: 339-350.

- Normandeau, S., F. Guay. (1998). "Preschool Behavior and First-Grade School Achievement: The Mediational Role of Cognitive Self-Control". Journal of Educational Psychology, 90 (11): 111-121.
- Ohm, B. W. (2000). "The Purchase of Scenic Easements and Wisconsin's Great River Road: A Progress Report On Perpetuity." Journal of the American Planning Association 66 (2): 177-188.
- Pallant, J. (2001). A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Pedhazur, E. (1982). Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research. (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Peirannunzi, C. A. (1989). The Role of Local Government in Land-Use Politics: Testing and Developing Models of Local Decision-Making on Zoning Issues. Public Administration. Athens, Georgia State University.
- Pendall, R. (1999). "Do Land-Use Control Cause Sprawl?" Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design 26: 555-571.
- Pendall R., J. Martin, W. Fulton (2002). Holding the Line: Urban Containment in the United States. Washington D.C: The Brookings Institution.
- Pennington, M. (2000). "Public Choice Theory and the Politics of Urban Containment: Voter-Centered Versus Special Interest Explanations." Environment and Planning C - Government and Policy 18: 145-162.
- Peterson, P. (1981). City Limits. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Pfeffer M. J., M. B. Lapping. (1994). "Farmland Preservation, Development Rights and the Theory of the Growth Machine." Journal of Rural Studies 10 (3): 233-248.
- Phillips J., E. Goodstein. (2000). "Growth Management and Housing Prices: The Case of Portland, Oregon." Contemporary Economic Policy 18 (3): 334-344.
- Protash W., M. Baldassare. (1983). "Growth Politics and Community Satisfaction: A Test and Modification of Logan's Theory." Urban Affairs Quarterly 18: 397-412.
- Protash W, M. Baldassare. (1984). "Growth Politics and Community Satisfaction." Urban Affairs Quarterly 18: 967-412.
- Ramsay, M. (1996). Community, Culture and Economic Development. Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Reese L.A, R. A. Rosenfeld. (2002). The Civic Culture of Local Economic Development. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rosen, K. T, L. F. Katz (1981). "Growth Management and Land Use Controls: The San Francisco Bay Area Experience." Journal of American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association 9: 321-343.
- Rubin, H. (1986). "Local Economic Development Organizations." Policy Studies Journal 14: 363-388.
- Ryan Robert L., Juliet T. Hansel Walker. (2003). "Protecting and Managing Private Farmland and Public Greenways in the Urban Fringe". Landscape and Urban Planning 68 (2-3): 183-198.
- Sabatier, P. (1975). "Social Movements and Regulatory Agencies: Toward a More Adequate - Less Pessimistic - "Theory of Clientele Capture"." Policy Sciences 6 (3): 301-342.
- Salant Priscilla, Don A. Dillman. (1994). How to Conduct Your Own Survey. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Scholz, J. T., and B. Stiftel (eds.). (2005). Adaptive Governance and Water Conflict: New Institutions for Collaborative Planning. Washington D. C: Resources for the Future.
- Schwartz, S. I., D. E. Hansen, and R. Green (1981). "Suburban Growth Controls and the Price of New Housing." Journal of Environmental Economics and Management 8: 303-320.
- Sites, W. (1997). "The Limits of Urban Regime Theory." Urban Affairs Review 32: 536-557.
- Sorbom, D. (1989). "Model Modification". Psychometrika, 54: 371-384.
- Stiftel, B. (2006).
- Stoker, G. (1995). Regime Theory and Urban Politics. Theories of Urban Politics. D. Judge, G. Stoker and. H. Wolman (eds). London: Sage Publications. 54-72.
- Stone C.N., and H. T. Sanders, eds. (1987). The Politics of Urban Development. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Stone, C. N. (1980). "Systemic Power in Community Decision-Making: A Restatement of Stratification Theory." American Political Science Review 74: 978-990.

- Stone, C. N., ed. (1989). Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Stone, C. N. (1993). "Urban Regimes and the Capacity to Govern: A Political Economy Approach." Journal of Urban Affairs 15(1-28).
- Stone, C. N. (2001). "The Atlanta Experience Re-Examined: The Link Between Agenda and Regime Change." International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 25.
- Strong, A. L. (1979). Land Banking: European Reality, American Prospect. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Stroud, H. B. (1994). "Controlling Growth and Development in Monroe County, Florida." Land Use Policy 11(1): 17-30.
- Suhr, D. (2002). "PROC GLM or PROC CALIS?". Conference Proceedings, SUGI, April 14-17, Orlando.
- Swanstrom, T. (1985). The Crisis of Growth Politics: Cleveland, Kucinich and The Challenges of Urban Populism. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Tabachnick, B.G., and L. S. Fidell. (1996). Using Multivariate Statistics. (3rd ed.). New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.
- Thorson, J. A. (1994). "Zoning Policy Changes and the Urban Fringe Land Market." Journal of the American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association 22(3): 527-532.
- Tiebout, C. (1956). "A Pure Theory of Local Expenditures." Journal of Political Economy 64 (5): 416-424.
- Trounstine T.J., T. Christensen. (1986). Movers and Shakers: The Study of Community Power. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Turner, R. (1990). "Intergovernmental Growth Management: A Partnership Framework for State-Local Relations." Publius: The Journal of Federalism 20 (2): 79-95.
- Turner, R. (1992). "Growth Politics and Downtown Development: The Economic Imperative in Sunbelt Cities." Urban Affairs Quarterly 28: 3-21.
- U.S. Census. (2001). States Ranked by Percent Population Change: 1990 to 2000. Retrieved June 7, 2003 from the U.S Census Bureau Web site: <http://landview.census.gov/population/cen2000/phc-t2/tab03.pdf>.
- U.S. Census. (2000). State and County Quick Facts. Retrieved June 7, 2003 from the U.S Census Bureau Website: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd>.

- Vogel R., B. Swanson. (1989). "The Growth Machine Versus the Antigrowth Coalition: The Battle for Our Communities." Urban Affairs Quarterly 25 (1): 63-85.
- Ward, K. (1997). "Conditions in Urban Regeneration: A Regime Approach." Environment and Planning A 29: 1493-1506.
- Wassmer, R. W. (2005). "The Influence of Local Urban Containment and Statewide Growth Management Policies on the Size of United States Urban Areas". Devoe L. Moore Critical Symposium on State and Local Government Regulations and Economic Development. March 4, Tallahassee, Fl: Florida State University.
- Warner K, H. Molotch. (1995). "Power to Build: How Development Persists Despite Local Controls." Urban Affairs Review 30 (3): 378-406.
- Weaver C. L., R. F. Babcock. (1979). City Zoning: The Once and Future Frontier. Chicago: Planners Press, American Planning Association.
- Weitz, J. (1999). "From Quiet Revolution to Smart Growth: State Growth Management Programs, 1960 to 1999." Journal of Planning Literature 14 (2): 266-337.
- West, S. G., J. F. Finch, and P. J. Curran. (1995). "Structural Equation Models with Nonnormal Variables". Structural Equation Modeling: Concepts, Issues and Applications. R. H. Hoyle (ed), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 56-73.
- Weitz J., T. Moore. (1998). "Development Inside Urban Growth Boundaries: Oregon's Empirical Evidence of Contiguous Urban Form." Journal of the American Planning Association 64 (4).
- Wright, J. B. (1993). "Conservation Easements: An Analysis of Donated Development Rights." Journal of the American Planning Association 59 (4): 487-493.
- Wuensch, K. (2005). Principal Component Analysis-SPSS. Greenville, NC: East Carolina University.
- Wilson, T.P. (1971). "Critique of Ordinal Variables". Causal Models in the Social Sciences. H.M. Blalock (ed). Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Severine Mayere was born and raised in the suburb of Paris, France. She attended the University of Paris-IV Sorbonne where she obtained an undergraduate degree in 1995 and a Master degree in 1997, both in urban planning. In 1998, following an exchange program for one semester at Florida State University, Ms. Mayere enrolled in the Interdisciplinary Master in Social Sciences offered by the College of Social Sciences at Florida State University. Later on, Ms. Mayere joined the PhD program in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at Florida State University where she completed a dissertation on the politics of growth management in six U.S States. She worked as a researcher in the Department of Spatial Planning at the TU Dresden from February 2005 until September 2006.

Ms. Mayere's research interests focus on land use planning and local politics, more specifically the politics of growth management, but also on planning theory, and comparative planning approaches.