

Clean-air supporters, city settle Fresno will devote \$1 million to integrate growth, transportation plans.

By Mark Grossi and Lisa Aleman-Padilla

The Fresno Bee

July 1, 2003

A medical advocacy group and the city of Fresno Monday announced an air quality lawsuit settlement promoting less driving and more clustering of homes, businesses and recreation activities.

The agreement, which settles a lawsuit filed against the city's 2025 General Plan in November, calls for the city to commit more than \$1 million for refinements that bring transportation and land use together.

The Medical Advocates for Healthy Air, which filed the lawsuit, praised city officials, saying the agreement would help get more people out of their vehicles and encourage mass transit.

"The city jumped on this idea, once we started talking about it," said respiratory therapist Kevin Hamilton, a member of the advocacy group. "They saw we didn't have an agenda. They want a nice, clean city, too."

Fresno is among five areas in America with the dirtiest air, along with Los Angeles, Bakersfield, Visalia-Tulare and Houston. Vehicle and other mobile sources of pollution contribute more than half of the smog-forming emissions.

Smog, or ozone, triggers asthma attacks and other respiratory problems.

Though city planning officials were not immediately available to comment, Council Member Jerry Duncan said the settlement should ease public doubt over Fresno's commitment to air quality.

"We're now ready to put it in writing and get it done," Duncan said. "This ensures we do them."

No changes have been made to the existing plan. The city has agreed to use planning "tools" developed in a study that consultants are preparing for the state Department of Transportation.

The tools, expected to be available in a year, would allow planners to bring mass transit and other clean-air modes of travel together with future development.

Though the tools will be new, the approach is not. It is called "smart growth" or "transit-oriented design," said Dave Mitchell, planning manager at the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. He said the air district has been encouraging this type of planning for many years.

But the progressive techniques have not been widely applied in the Valley, Mitchell said. He mentioned two California cities that have employed the methods -- San Jose and Sacramento.

The idea is to place mass transit options close enough for people to walk to them, he said. The activity centers in a community -- subdivisions, businesses or other developments -- are built around the transportation.

"It's a planning improvement that you're starting to see around the country," Mitchell said. "A lot of downtowns are revitalizing and becoming more walkable."

It is the kind of approach that the medical advocates say they did not see in the city's plan last year. The medical advocates, a group of doctors and health professionals, said they will continue to monitor the city's progress and offer support.

Council Member Brad Castillo said he hopes the agreement will give advocates peace of mind.

"I hope that we can begin to build some bridge with this group," he said, "and that with this action they will realize that we are on the same page."

Three bills to clean up Valley air clear hurdle

By Mark Grossi

The Fresno Bee

July 1, 2003

An Assembly committee Monday approved three air quality measures, two addressing farm-waste burning and one expanding the authority of San Joaquin Valley air officials to regulate vehicle pollution.

The measures, SB 704, 705 and 709 by state Sen. Dean Florez, D-Shafter, passed the Assembly Natural Resources Committee. All three, which passed the Senate last month, will move on to other Assembly committees in the next week.

Florez is working on five other air quality measures.

On Monday, the Natural Resources Committee heard testimony on SB 709. The bill would give the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District power to require ride-share programs for businesses and direct public agencies to add low-emission vehicles to their fleets.

It would grant the district power to set up fees for regional trucking centers, housing subdivisions and other developments that would add air pollution from additional vehicle trips.

The measure also gives the Valley air district authority to monitor emissions from diesel-powered irrigation water pumps on farms.

The Fresno County Farm Bureau and five farmers opposed SB 709. Farm officials said additional fees and monitoring would not clean the air. They said farmers are voluntarily upgrading their diesels to newer, cleaner engines.

Florez said he was surprised that farmers would oppose a measure largely focused on vehicles.

SB 704 would provide additional funding and incentives for biomass power plants. Biomass plants burn wood wastes from cities and farms, and the measure would make it more attractive financially to burn the farm waste.

SB 705 would phase out farm waste burning in fields. Florez has amended the bill to extend the phase out from 2007 to 2010 for vineyards and orchards. Other crops would be phased out by 2005

Opinion **The Modesto Bee**

Improve valley's air, avoid EPA sanctions

July 1, 2003

A contentious cleanup plan for the valley's filthy air sailed through the hands of the state air board last week despite sometimes vehement objections from some environmentalists and health experts. The widely expected state approval is only an intermediate step, though, with the final say belonging to the federal Environmental Protection Agency.

If the EPA doesn't approve the valley plan, it could mean costly sanctions against new and expanding businesses and the forfeiture of billions in federal transportation funds.

Critics of this new plan believe avoiding those sanctions is more important to the air district, local governments and business interests than actually cleaning the air. They point to previous plans that failed, but sanctions were kept in abeyance.

They have a point, but we believe the sanctions would have a serious and negative effect on the lives of ordinary valley residents, not just special interests, and thus should be avoided if possible. That needn't compromise our common determination to see the valley's air improved.

The plan describes the steps we will need to take to reduce the presence of tiny particles of dust, soot and chemicals called particulates. Such pollution causes asthma attacks and other ailments, especially in the most vulnerable people -- children, the elderly and those with other respiratory problems. The valley is one of the worst places in the nation for this type of pollution.

Opponents say the plan is illegal and inadequate. Supporters argue just as loudly that it is both legal and flexible. Such views often lead to court, which is where this plan may finally be decided anyway.

It's worth noting that plan proponents call this plan "state-of-the-art." That's hardly reassuring; the state of the art for valley air plans to this point has been failure. We need to do better.

Letters

The Fresno Bee

What about courtesy?

By John McCarthy

Reedley

July 1, 2003

The new law that prohibits smoking in the parks and beach in Reedley confuses me, upsets me and saddens me. All citizens have rights. Common courtesy should prevail and not government edicts.

I understand that courtesy isn't held in as high esteem as it once was. It isn't even taught to most children, as it should be. And, sadly, it is looked upon as a weakness by many. And I agree with a ban on smoking in the bleachers at games and such, but I have also seen people step back to the trees to have a smoke -- common courtesy.

So in Reedley you can no longer smoke next to a barbecue belching out charcoal fumes, or in a park that is groomed with gas-powered mowers, blowers and other gas-powered equipment. I believe that if clean air is the goal here, our City Council members are headed in the wrong direction. We could use a transit system into Fresno for people who work there from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m.

The next thing you know there will be people trying to tell us what we can eat, where we can eat it and how big our portions should be -- oh, wait, that's already going on. What next?

Maggard's legacy in them thar hills

By Dianne Hardisty

The Bakersfield Californian

June 30, 2003

His collar loosened and his shirt sleeves wilted by the heat, Mike Maggard exhibited the bouncy enthusiasm of a preacher and the finesse of a circus ring master.

Facing a roomful of people worried that their neighborhoods and rural lifestyles are being threatened, the Ward 3 councilman fielded anxious homeowners' questions, pointing to one city staff member after another for answers.

Last week's meeting at Rio Bravo Resort was just one in a series of community meetings Maggard is holding to discuss northeast Bakersfield development.

"I'll meet with anybody who asks," he said. "I keep maps in my car. Last Sunday, after church, I met with a group at Taco Bell."

"I want people to catch the vision of how incredible this can be," he said.

Maggard is a man obsessed. He believes his legacy the way Bakersfield today and for generations to come will judge his City Council service depends on how well northeast Bakersfield is developed. He probably is correct.

"It's an awesome responsibility," he said, with a mixture of trepidation and excitement. "I think about it every day. I drive to it, through it and around it. It dominates my thoughts. It dominates my perspective on most city issues.

"We will get only one chance to do this right," he said, confiding that he is demanding more of developers and city staff to make northeast Bakersfield "right."

What is "right" for northeast Bakersfield is very personal for Maggard. For all of his 47 years, he has awakened to the sun rising over his mountains. He has played in the open fields that stretch to the mouth of the canyon. Like a lot of us including this writer he lives in northeast Bakersfield because he loves it.

There's an openness that cannot be found in the flatlands of the southwest and northwest. The serenity and beauty of its rolling hills are community treasures. The Kern River carves a path through its valleys. The history and cultural diversity of its neighborhoods are rich.

With their father, a telephone company employee, and mother, a secretary for the Bakersfield City School District, Maggard and his sister lived first in a home on Chelsea Street, north of Pioneer Park. Later the family moved to a home near the intersection of College Avenue and Sterling Road, where he grew up and attended Foothill High School. Maggard, his wife and their two sons now live in a house on Panorama Drive, near University Avenue.

He jokes that the farthest west he has lived is near the intersection of Monterey and Miller streets in east Bakersfield.

Like most of the rest of us rooted in northeast Bakersfield, Maggard probably would like to see the area stay like it is rural, beautiful and much of it untouched.

But he knows that cannot and will not happen.

"While some of it will have to be sacrificed, it serves the greater good to move development off of the farm land. And just as importantly, if we do it right, the quality of life (in northeast Bakersfield) will be greater than it is anywhere else in Bakersfield. Too much good can result from this change not to give it a try."

Maggard also respects private property rights. It is the right of the area's property owners to develop their land, which for decades has been designated in the city's general plan for residential development. Property owners just have been waiting for the city to extend necessary services such as sewer and water. That has occurred.

But exercising their right to develop may not come easily. Already the Sierra Club has filed a lawsuit demanding the environmental consequences of a development proposal be more thoroughly studied. People living in rural subdivisions, such as Cattle King Estates near the Rio Bravo Resort, are challenging project designs and raising a variety of concerns.

At last week's meeting, Maggard and city staff fielded a litany of questions and concerns from Cattle King Estates residents about Sage Community Group's River's Edge development. Planning commissioners have approved the project, which now could go to the City Council for consideration if appealed.

Lot sizes, drainage plans, police and fire protection, and air quality were among the concerns. But overshadowing all else was traffic a huge concern for everyone who drives Highway 178, between downtown and the canyon.

Ironically, the arrival of Maggard and several others to the meeting was delayed by an after-work traffic accident near the intersection of Fairfax Avenue and Highway 178. The accident common for the narrow stretch of road that will soon have an overpass interchange illustrated the potential nightmare if road improvements are not made to accommodate the area's growth.

Maggard concedes that traffic congestion, pollution and project design are valid concerns. They will test the merits of proposals and change plans likely resulting in tougher rules and hopefully better projects.

"And every time I meet with people I get some great ideas," he said.

He even understands the feelings of those who just plain dread the idea of the area's development.

But he tells them, "You had dreams when you moved here. Others have dreams, too."

And while he concedes development in some areas, such as Rosedale, is aggravating existing traffic congestion, he can only promise to do better in northeast Bakersfield.

"I don't have control over what happened on a watch that preceded me or on Rosedale Highway, but I do have control over what happens here."

Opinion

The Bakersfield Californian

Why give up local control?

June 30, 2003

Expanding the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District board to include appointees with medical specialties and "general public" perspectives could be beneficial. It could take some of the politics and special interest control out of efforts to clean up the valley's polluted air.

But the way state Sen. Michael Machado, D-Linden, proposes to add four appointed members stinks.

In his legislation, SB 999, Machado proposes to have the governor appoint two members of the valley air district board, the state Senate appoint one and the Assembly appoint one.

That would leave a board that oversees local air pollution cleanup programs partially beholden to politicians in Sacramento who are increasingly beholden to cash-carrying special interests.

The state's primary air pollution regulator the California Air Resources Board is comprised of 11 members appointed by the governor, with the consent of the

state Senate. The board adopts statewide rules, particularly regulating emissions from mobile sources, such as cars.

The CARB hasn't been any more successful, innovative or courageous than the several local air boards in adopting strategies to clean up California's air.

And when push comes to shove as it did in years past, when Kern County supervisors were the ones adopting local pollution rules CARB can step in to add teeth to sometimes toothless local rules adopted by reluctant local elected regulators.

So, why turn rulemaking in the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District over to Sacramento?

The present 11-member board, which includes elected officials from the cities and counties in the eight-county valley district, may be beholden to local special interests.

But board members appointed by politicians in Sacramento will be beholden to those who appointed them and to their political contributors. They will not be accountable to the people who live in the valley air district. Their appointments will not be publicly scrutinized.

A more balanced approach would be to expand the board to include non-elected members some with medical specialties serving fixed terms. Candidates should apply for seats on the board and be appointed by the elected members of the valley air district board using a process that will include a hearing and an opportunity for the public to comment.

Power drain: An energy crisis is expected in 2 or 3 years in California

By Tim Moran

The Modesto Bee

June 29, 2003

Triple-digit temperatures have Northern San Joaquin Valley residents reaching for their thermostats.

A few clicks of a switch by a few million people send power demand soaring. Two years ago it often shut things down as the state was rocked by rolling blackouts.

This year the lights will probably stay on all summer in California, barring unexpected circumstances, state regulators and power suppliers say.

Next year looks pretty good, too -- but in 2005 or 2006, there is reason for concern.

"It's the 2005 time frame that we get concerned again," said Gregg Fishman, spokesman for the California Independent System Operator, the agency that runs much of California's electricity grid.

Claudia Chandler, spokeswoman for the California Energy Commission, put the crunch year at 2006, but her concerns are the same.

The problem is a convergence of factors that could see California's energy appetite swell while the available power resources stagnate or shrink.

On the demand side, California's energy use is growing at 1,000 to 1,500 megawatts per year -- or about 2 percent -- according to the California Power Authority. A positive economic turnaround or an unusually severe heat wave through the Western states could dramatically accelerate that use.

At the same time, a large portion of California's generating plants that run on fossil fuels are at or near the end of their useful service.

More than half of the fossil fuel plants in the state, representing 18,100 megawatts of generation, are 30 years old or older, according to the California Power Authority.

They are inefficient, costly to run and cause air pollution. About 2,000 megawatts are expected to be shut down in the next two years for economic or emission problems, according to the power authority.

A megawatt is the amount of electricity needed to power 300 homes in Modesto during the summer, and 1,000 during the winter. California's power use is expected to peak at about 52,000 megawatts this summer.

The third factor in California's energy future is the uncertain financial footing of power plant developers after the collapse of Enron and the resulting turmoil in the industry.

Many of the power plants proposed during California's 2001 energy crisis have been put on hold or withdrawn because developers are either uncertain about the future market or can't find investors to finance the projects.

Those factors don't directly affect the municipal power providers, including the Modesto and Turlock irrigation districts, but if the state returns to a crisis and rolling blackouts, they could.

The MID and the TID are moving forward with plans to build power plants, and both say they have sufficient power for local needs.

"Even back during the energy crisis, we had sufficient power for our customers," said TID spokesman Tony Walker.

The districts participated in the blackouts because of contractual relationships with other power providers, and to prevent the damage to the state's grid that an uncontrolled blackout would cause.

"Not a whole lot has changed," Walker said.

The TID's proposed 250-megawatt Walnut Energy Center would provide the district with enough power to handle its needs through 2020, Walker said.

The MID just completed an 88-megawatt plant on Woodland Avenue in Modesto, and is applying for a permit to build a 95-megawatt plant in Ripon.

Profitability questions

The Modesto district is working toward a power mix of 80 percent long-term sources and 20 percent short-term, said Roger VanHoy, assistant general manager of electric resources.

But it's the area outside the irrigation districts that causes concern.

The uncertainty in California's energy market keeps investors from putting money in new power plants, said Dorothy Rothrock, senior vice president of government relations for the California Manufacturers & Technology Association.

"Can an investor in new generation be treated fairly and profitably in California? It's not yet sure, but it's getting there," said Rothrock.

Rothrock's main concern is the cost of power for industry in California -- but energy shortages will cause higher prices for her members, she noted.

Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and Commonwealth Edison soon will be resuming their duties to provide power to their customers, VanHoy said -- authority they lost as they sunk into insolvency during the energy crisis.

Once the private utilities sign long-term power commitments, the investors will be more willing to step up to finance power plants, VanHoy said.

Fishman, a spokesman for the California Independent System Operator, agreed.

"Getting PG&E and Edison healthy again will be a big factor," he said.

Emergency measures

The California Power Authority also can step in to finance or even take over the construction of power plants deemed critical to the state.

The state's three major power regulators -- the California Energy Commission, the Public Utilities Commission and the California Power Authority -- have developed an energy plan for the future.

"It sets out a good framework of where the state of California and the industry ought to go," Fishman said.

But a lot is still unsettled, he added. The state's market redesign plan needs federal approval, and there are legislative proposals to redraw the energy map in various ways.

The price of natural gas, which directly affects the price of electricity, is another wild card. That price is running about double what it was a year ago, the energy commission's Chandler said.

That's because a severe winter in the Eastern states depleted reserves, and high prices have prevented suppliers from filling storage facilities.

The good news is that everyone seems to agree that there is enough power to get the state through this summer -- unless a major Western heat wave is coupled with the loss of a nuclear plant or fires that disrupt transmission lines.

Knock on wood, and keep an eye on that thermostat.

For more information on California's energy situation, visit the energy commission's Web site at www.energy.ca.gov or the Independent System Operator's site at www.caiso.com.

Readers take up the cause for clean air

The Bakersfield Californian

June 26, 2003

We must build up, not out

Thank heaven someone had the integrity, guts and common sense to do something concrete about Bakersfield's pollution problems. The Sierra Club and the Center for Race, Poverty and Environment are to be commended for forcing the issue of developers taking some responsibility for the pollution they help create.

After reading the excellent and provocative series about how the west side developers have for years avoided paying appropriate and reasonable fees for the sprawl that now blights the valley floor, I must conclude that our elected city

and county officials are in bed with the builders big time. The whole business smells of cronyism.

The only thing more disgusting is the mindless wimpiness of Bakersfield residents who have bought into this mess, literally and figuratively. We get the leaders we deserve, except a lot of us don't deserve what's been going on for the past 20 years. To quote the movie "Network:" "we're mad as hell and we're not going to take it anymore!"

Even my son, at the age of 12, understood that B-town needs to build up, not out.

To all Kern residents, hear this: change your expectations. Get real. We cannot continue to have huge lots and over-sized houses.

Maybe now that real estate prices are shooting up, we'll be forced to face the reality -- like thousands of other communities -- that multi-storied row houses and planned communities with common green areas (instead of huge back yards) are not only very pleasant places to live, but absolutely essential.

Laura Brittain
Bakersfield

Work together to clean air

The Californian has performed a true community service through its publication of Staff Writer Matt Weiser's stimulating series on air pollution in Kern County.

A good newspaper should serve not only as the eyes and ears of a community, but also as its conscience. You have done that -- and one can only hope these articles will serve as a catalyst for change.

What is clear is that Kern County's elected officials are not exerting the leadership necessary to solve our air pollution problem. What is tragic is that they don't even perceive that it is a problem.

Our elected officials, however, are not the only ones to blame. Blame also rests squarely on the shoulders of an uninvolved, apathetic citizenry. How many people even bothered to vote in the last election?

All of us are responsible for the steadily decreasing air quality, and all of us must act together to find a solution.

This is what needs to be done:

The Kern County Board of Supervisors and the Bakersfield City Council must immediately call for public hearings, studies and input from every possible source to find the answers. The answers to cleaner air are out there for those that have the will to examine them.

The citizens must actively participate in these hearings. They must pressure their leaders to follow through with action. And, they must be ready to make the necessary sacrifices to keep that air clean.

We can solve this together if we act now, do our part and insist that we start cleaning up our air today.

Carolyn St. Clare
Bakersfield

'Smart growth' won't work

Let's see if I have this right. You spend several days on articles delving into the pollution problem in Kern County. You even go so far as to show what a "smart growth" development might look like.

Strange thing about your solutions. What I see is more congestion, pollution and the like. Also, what I see from the story is supposedly a "smart growth" development in which there is a corner market.

There is no way that Albertsons, Ralphs, Vons, etc., are able to compete now with the Super Wal-Marts. Some local mom and pop corner market could not compete. So that store/building would be just another empty blight on the community. Do you honestly think people are going to walk to some store where they will be able to pay probably twice the price, especially when it's 100 or more degrees?

The stories and editorial, "Air pollution is not inevitable," stated houses would be shoved closer together. So this would mean more housing in the same confined area, hoping people would walk more. All this will do nothing except result in more congestion, which of course means more smog.

Gil Effertz

Frazier Park

It will only get worse

The recent informative and well-written articles in *The Californian* on smog, sprawl and who's to blame, etc., brought back some Alaskan memories.

Nearly 35 years ago, my former boss, the governor of Alaska, gave me an administrative directive. He told me that before I made any recommendations or decisions on "growth," I needed to ask three questions: Is the project environmentally friendly? Will it pay its own way? And, do the people really want it?

Maybe it's time that our Kern County Supervisors, the Bakersfield City Council, the two planning commissions and, most importantly, the planning staff, also utilize these simple questions. This is important, because what they are doing isn't working. Folks, it's going to get worse -- a lot worse.

Art Hartenberger

Bakersfield

Additional information

Air pollution comes from many sources: industry, farms, trucks and more. But some say rapid urban growth is the new bad boy of smog and one of the last unregulated polluters. *The Bakersfield Californian* examines sprawl's impact on Kern's dirty air in this special report.

Posted: Thursday June 26, 2003, 11:31:00 AM

Last updated: Thursday June 26, 2003, 11:40:52 AM

Check out the following Web sites for more on sprawl and ways you can help clean up our air:

Household air-cleaning appliances

California Air Resources Board air cleaner report

[<http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/indoor/acdsumm.htm>](http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/indoor/acdsumm.htm)

Canadian government air cleaner health warning

[<http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/english/protection/warnings/1999/99_62e.htm>](http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/english/protection/warnings/1999/99_62e.htm)

American Lung Association air cleaner report

[<http://www2.lungusa.org/pub/cleaners/air_clean_toc.html>](http://www2.lungusa.org/pub/cleaners/air_clean_toc.html)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency air cleaner report

[<http://www.epa.gov/iaq/pubs/ozonegen.html>](http://www.epa.gov/iaq/pubs/ozonegen.html)

Consumer products and air pollution

Montana State University indoor air pollution site

[<http://www.montana.edu/wwwcxair/>](http://www.montana.edu/wwwcxair/)

U.S. EPA on polluting consumer products

[<http://www.epa.gov/iaq/voc.html>](http://www.epa.gov/iaq/voc.html)

California rules on consumer products

[<http://www.arb.ca.gov/html/brochure/consprod.htm>](http://www.arb.ca.gov/html/brochure/consprod.htm)

California proposal for additional regulations

[<http://www.arb.ca.gov/emisinv/nscpac_fees/nscpac_fees.htm>](http://www.arb.ca.gov/emisinv/nscpac_fees/nscpac_fees.htm)

50 things you can do for clean air

[<http://www.arb.ca.gov/html/brochure/50things.htm>](http://www.arb.ca.gov/html/brochure/50things.htm)

Yard care and smog

U.S. EPA guide to clean yard care

[<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/19-yard.htm>](http://www.epa.gov/otaq/19-yard.htm)

U.S. EPA rules on landscaping engines

[<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/equip-ld/hhsfrm/f00007.htm>](http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/equip-ld/hhsfrm/f00007.htm)

U.S. EPA rules on lawnmowers

[<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/equip-ld/ph2frm/f99008.htm>](http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/equip-ld/ph2frm/f99008.htm)

Choosing a less-polluting vehicle

U.S. EPA Green Vehicle Guide

[<http://www.epa.gov/greenvehicles/index.htm>](http://www.epa.gov/greenvehicles/index.htm)

Buyers Guide to Cleaner California Cars

[<http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ccbg/ccbg.htm>](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ccbg/ccbg.htm)

Surveys

Public Policy Institute April 2003 Central Valley survey on growth and smog issues

[<http://www.ppic.org/main/publication.asp?i=418>](http://www.ppic.org/main/publication.asp?i=418)

Urban planning and sprawl

Brookings Institution report on sprawl

[<http://www.brook.edu/es/urban/fultonpendall.htm>](http://www.brook.edu/es/urban/fultonpendall.htm)

Texas Transportation Institute reports on sprawl and transportation

[<http://mobility.tamu.edu/ums/>](http://mobility.tamu.edu/ums/)

Local Government Commission community design resources

[<http://www.lgc.org/community_design/index.html>](http://www.lgc.org/community_design/index.html)

U.S. EPA: Linking land use and air quality

[<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/transp/traqsusd.htm>](http://www.epa.gov/otaq/transp/traqsusd.htm)

A Landscape of Choice: Fresno County's effort to reduce sprawl (American Farmland Trust site)

[<http://www.farmlandinfo.org/fic/ft/landcal.html>](http://www.farmlandinfo.org/fic/ft/landcal.html)

Smart Growth Network

[<http://www.smartgrowth.org>](http://www.smartgrowth.org)

Local information

Bakersfield Municipal Code

[<http://bpc.iserver.net/codes/bakersfld/index.htm>](http://bpc.iserver.net/codes/bakersfld/index.htm)

Metro Bakersfield General Plan

[<http://www.ci.bakersfield.ca.us/cityservices/devsrv/planning/genplan.htm>](http://www.ci.bakersfield.ca.us/cityservices/devsrv/planning/genplan.htm)

Kern County development ordinances and planning documents

[<http://www.co.kern.ca.us/planning/plandoc.asp>](http://www.co.kern.ca.us/planning/plandoc.asp)

Greater Bakersfield Vision 2020

[<http://www.bakersfieldvision2020.com/>](http://www.bakersfieldvision2020.com/)

Smart Growth Coalition of Kern County

[<http://www.kernsmartgrowth.org/>](http://www.kernsmartgrowth.org/)

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

[<http://www.valleyair.org/default.htm>](http://www.valleyair.org/default.htm)

Kern Council of Governments: transportation plans and studies

[<http://www.kerncog.org/>](http://www.kerncog.org/)