The Suburbanization of Smart Growth: Metropolitan Change and Comprehensive Legislation in the States

DRAFT REPORT
June 15, 2003

Brookings Institution Census Data Program

Jefferey M. Sellers
Department of Political Science
University of Southern California
Von KleinSmid Center 327, Mailcode 0044
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0044
Phone: 213-740-1684
E-mail: sellers@usc.edu

The author thanks Rebecca Jenkins for indispensable research assistance.

Since the 1960s, measures to manage or regulate patterns of urban and suburban growth at the state and local level have spread across the United States. A growing number of states have adopted legislative schemes reminiscent of the mandatory national systems of planning that characterize a number of northern European countries (Nivola, 1999, Sellers 2002). As late as 2002, however, the distribution of these "smart growth" measures remained highly uneven. Although most states had adopted various types of major and minor legislation addressed to smart growth issues, only 17 of the 50 state legislators had passed statewide regulatory programs.

The rise of state programs to control urban sprawl follows the growth of suburbs into a predominant pattern of land use across large portions of the United States. With this shift, suburban populations have emerged as the deciding constituency in elections and legislatures in many states as well as the federal government. More and more, states with dominant or fast-growing suburban populations have led the way in introducing and developing state programs for growth management. A common argument also points to racial and income segregation as one source of the divergent interests that have often impeded metropolitan or statewide efforts to manage urban sprawl (e.g., Dreier, Mollenkopf and Swanstrom 2001). In fact, however, successful statewide legislation over the 1990s and 2000s a more complex relation that extends to positive associations with certain kinds of metropolitan segregation. The emerging patterns highlight both the potential and the limits of statewide growth management as means to overcome metropolitan divisions and regulate urban growth.

The Introduction of Statewide Growth Management Legislation: A Brief Overview

The analysis here focuses on what Bollens (1992) terms "comprehensive growth legislation," consisting of statewide programs that "insert state prerogatives into local growth management through either direct preemptive regulatory control or through the promulgation of state standards pertaining to local plan making" (p. 454). This must be distinguished from simple mandates to plan (Burby and May 1991, pp. 4-5), from plans applicable to specific areas within states, or from other more narrowly tailored legislation. Other measures that depend on coalitions among urban and suburban jurisdictions, such as Minnesota's initiatives to bring affordable housing to the suburbs (Orfield 1997), do not by themselves fall into this category.

A well-established literature in political science has analyzed the sources of policy adoptions at the state level. As accounts of "diffusion" among the states imply, innovations in policy generally tend to spread as states face parallel problems and information becomes available (Walker, 1969). Studies point to an array of conditions within the states that affect how this process occurs. Income, urbanization and wealth (Walker), general policy liberalism (Klingman and Lammers, 1984), policy entrepreneurs (Mintrom, 1997), federal incentives (Rose, 1973), political culture (Sharansky and Elazar (cite)), social capital (Putnam, 2000), policy networks (Mintrom and Vergasi, 1998), and ethnic or racial diversity (Hero and Tolbert, 1996).

This report focuses on how a particular set of conditions within the states has corresponded to the passage of major smart growth legislation. For this legislation, the social and spatial composition of states and especially of metropolitan areas holds special significance. On the one hand, the social and spatial composition of states can illuminate the reasons for introduction or lack of introduction. Where patterns of urban and exurban growth point to greater, more widespread suburban sprawl, for instance, greater concern to regulate growth should give rise to demands for legislation. On the other hand, configurations of interest and power relations clearly shape the possibilities for metropolitan policy (Weir, 2000). The geography of metropolitan settlement often lies at the core of the interests cities, suburbs and other actors in the political process assert.

Since their introduction in the early 20th century, state legislative frameworks for local planning and land use regulation have become the rule across the United States. Over the 1960s and 1970s, during the first wave of state initiatives that went beyond providing for local regulation, a total of four states—Hawaii, then Vermont, then Florida, then Oregon--succeeded in establishing the legislative groundwork for comprehensive state systems (Table 1). In the late 1980s a second wave brought expansions to state authorities in Florida and Vermont and major new laws in five additional states. A third wave of new laws, mostly in the late 1990s and early 2000s, brought statewide growth management to an additional seven states. During this decade, most other states also either passed more limited legislation associated with growth management or debated moves toward a stronger state role (American Planning Association, 2002).

[Insert Table 1 about here]

These forty years of legislative introductions and development span a period of vast changes in American society. The rise of the service economy, the decline of farms, the rise in immigration, and the steady growth of development outside central cities have transformed the context of state legislation in many states. The approaches to state management in the first states may no longer be applicable for states now considering legislation. The coalitions that have succeeded most recently also differ from those that worked before. For some states, moreover, current conditions may necessitate altogether different approaches.

Early Adopters, 1960-1990

The four states that introduced the first state growth management schemes in the 1960s and 1970s give few consistent indications of the type of context that would most favor passage. By the second wave of legislation in the1980s, however, suburban states in a variety of regions had emerged to lead the trend.

Although it is difficult to find consistent commonalities among Florida, Hawaii, Oregon, and Vermont, three of these four states did share common features. Despite their presence in very different regions, as Table 2(a) shows, these states differed consistently from the national average in rates of population growth. These varied from

just above the national rate to over three times that rate. All but Florida were smaller states. Indeed, the average population of all four in 1970 was only 2.5 million, compared to an average of 4 million for all states. At the same time, although farm employment still furnished an average of 6 percent in all states, cropland if not farm employees ranged lower than the national average in states adopting growth management. Except in Vermont, the rural proportion as well as the suburban portion of the population fell below the national average.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

In this earlier period, only 42 percent of the national population, and 34 percent of the average state population, lived in a metropolitan area outside a central city. Statewide growth management among the earliest adopters was more a small-state practice than a suburban one. Among the four states, only Florida registered a majority living in the suburbs. As 1980 statistics show, all of the four except for Florida had smaller proportions of developed land than average. Incomes and ethnic diversity also differed in no dramatic and consistent way from those of other states (Table 2(b)). Average per capita income did range higher than the average among states, but in Oregon it was only slightly higher and in Vermont it was lower. Although the African-American population ranged much lower than the national state average in all of the states except Florida, Hawaii was perhaps the most ethnically diverse state in the union due to its large Asian and Pacific Islander population.

Patterns of metropolitan segregation, measured in 1980, differed in no consistent way from national trends (Table 2b). Measurements of these employed an indicator for each state derived from the segregation figures for each metropolitan area in the state.[1] To reflect the most typical patterns of segregation that metropolitan residents faced, each statewide indicator weighted the segregation indices for each metropolitan area by the proportion of the state's metropolitan population in that area.[2] Available for these states beginning in 1980, these figures demonstrate wide variations around the average for all states. In Florida, the average dissimilarity index remained significantly lower than the average state between whites and African-Americans, Latinos and Asian Americans. In Hawaii and Vermont, parallel figures for African-Americans and Latinos were higher than in the average state. In Oregon, only Latinos faced dissimilarity indexes that departed more than a point from the state average, in this instance five points higher. Overall Latinos were more segregated in these states than elsewhere (by seven points on

[1] For metropolitan areas that crossed state lines, the indicator used here employed the classifications by state used by the Mumford Center, based on MSA and PMSA figures. These classifications generally assign each metropolitan area to the state in which the largest urban center and the largest proportion of the population were located. The sole departure from the Mumford classifications concerned the Washington, DC metropolitan area, classified here both in Maryland and Virginia.

[2] The current weighted averages, like the segregation figures, derive from the overall metropolitan populations rather than only those located within the relevant state. This approach makes the most sense for the segregation indexes, as patterns of segregation in some instances (New York City, Saint Louis) can only fully be understood through figures that take account of portions in other states. This justification applies less clearly to the weighting, as the weights take account of proportionate metropolitan area populations. Accordingly, alternative weights will be devised based on the populations within the state. Informal tabulations indicate that this procedure will not alter the results significantly.

average). But the average for African-Americans only stood one point higher. As a consequence of the low total in Florida, that for Asian-Americans was five points lower than the national state average.

In the 1980s the pattern of adoptions shifted. Legislation spread to states across the country, in New England (Maine, Rhode Island), the South (Georgia), the Middle Atlantic (New Jersey) and the West (Washington). Although smaller than average states continued to predominate among these new adopters, New Jersey and Georgia ranked ninth and thirteenth in population. Above-average suburbanization emerged as the most characteristic feature of adopting states. Only in Maine did the suburban portion remain less than 5 percentage points above the national state average; in the two Middle Atlantic states and Washington, suburban residents made up the majority of the population. Three of the five states, especially New Jersey and Rhode Island, also claimed higher than average portions of developed land. Cropland and farm populations, declining nationwide, now occupied considerably smaller proportions of land use and employment in the states adopting growth management than the average nationwide. During this decade, the adopting states were also no longer among the fastest growing. Two of the five adopters in 1980s had rates of population growth well below the national state average. Adopters also differed little from other states in average income, minority populations or segregation.

Legislation from 1991-2001: Growth, Metropolitan Change and Rural Land Uses

During the decade from 1991 to 2001, suburbanites grew to a majority of the U.S. population for the first time. Increasingly, the more suburban, larger states with more developed land and lower reliance on farming defined the typical profile of states passing growth management legislation.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Nationwide, as previous Brookings census reports have shown, proportions of the population within urban areas and more specifically within suburban ones continued to rise (Berube 2002; Lucy and Phillips 2002). Higher urbanization and in most instances higher suburbanization set the seven adopters during this decade apart. For the first time, the metropolitan populations outside central cities in the adopting states averaged more than half of the overall population at the beginning of the decade (Table 3). The 54.5 percent average for these states rose to 155 percent of the average suburban proportion in those states that had not yet adopted comprehensive legislation. Even in Arizona and Tennessee, the only two adopters where suburban proportions began the decade below the average for nonadopting states, suburban populations grew at rates 23 percent or more above the national state average. Although the new adopters included the smaller states Delaware and New Hampshire, most were now either mid-sized (Arizona, Maryland, Tennessee, Wisconsin) or even larger states (Pennsylvania).

All but one of the adopters, Arizona, recorded higher proportions of nonfederal developed land than the nonadopters. In all but Arizona and Wisconsin this proportion was growing at rates above the national average of 1.1 percent. Proportions of the population in urban regions reflected this contrast, growing by an average of 5.3 percent of the population over the decade. Already in 1990, no state that would adopt this legislation over the next decade counted less than 51 percent of the population as urban. The average urban proportion of 72.2 percent was 5.6 percent above that for nonadopters. The degree of urban predominance marked a change from states that persisted without major new additions to statewide systems established earlier, which remained less urban than the national average. By 2000 even New Hampshire, the sole borderline urban state at the beginning of the decade among the new adopters, counted 59.2 percent of the population as urban. At the end of the decade, the urban proportion of 79 percent averaged 8.8 percent above that of states that had never adopted legislation.

Overall population change in the adopting states did less to set them apart. Although most had grown at rates above the national state average during the 1980s, only three of the seven enacting new legislation in the 1990s grew at rates above the national state average. Rather than overall population growth itself, it was urban and especially suburban growth that distinguished these states most clearly from others.

At the other end of the spectrum stood the minority of states where smart growth had not even emerged as a subject of debate and legislation at the state level. Closer examination of these states casts further light on what made a difference for legislation in this area. In a total of twelve states, according to a coding of legislative descriptions from the American Planning Association (American Planning Association, 2002), legislative activity addressed to smart growth remained either minimal or confined to placing constraints on local regulatory efforts (Table 4). These consisted exclusively of Southern, Midwestern and Western states. In all but two of them, population had grown at rates below the national state average over the 1980s and continued to do so over the 1990s. Although the urban population in these states also ranged above 50 percent, both suburbanization and land development remained highly limited. The suburban proportion averaged 22. 6 percent, only half the average for all other states. Proportions of developed land also stood in 1990 at less than half the average for other states, and in only one of the twelve states did the growth in this proportion exceed the national average of 1.1 percent. If those states that passed comprehensive legislation numbered among the most suburban ones, those without smart growth on statewide agendas were among the least suburban and least rapidly growing.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

As a result of these differences in metropolitan structures, the populations of states adopting legislation developed modestly different specific everyday interests in growth management. Twenty-nine percent of workers in these states, compared with 24 percent in states not passing legislation and only seventeen percent in states with previous legislation only, worked outside of their county or residence. Three times as many

workers as in states without growth management on agendas, though still only 3.6 percent, used public transit. Average travel time to work rose over the 1990s to 25.7 minutes in adopting states, compared to 22.9 minutes among those without legislation and 21.8 minutes in those without statewide growth management agendas.

Farms and rural land played a more marginal role in most states adopting legislation than it had before. The rural population, farm employment, and cropland all averaged much lower in these states than in those that had not adopted legislation (Table 5). For the first time, no state adopting statewide legislation had begun the decade with a rural majority, and the average farm population of these states shrank to a miniscule 1.6 percent. States without even limited legislation or state-wide debate retained sizeable rural populations of an average of 39 percent and farm populations of 4.5 percent. Even in some of the adopting states, sizeable rural populations in New Hampshire, Tennessee and Wisconsin and above-average proportions of cropland in the northern states of Delaware, Maryland and Wisconsin point to a continued importance for rural and agricultural land uses. In these states, however, above-average losses in proportions of cropland also indicate greater encroachment from development on the agriculture that remained.

[Insert Table 5 about here]

Above all, the demographic and land use correlates show that suburban states and those with above-average growth have become the main sites where smart growth issues have risen to political prominence. Suburban states, and disproportionately those in the areas of the Northeast with well-established suburbs, emerged over the 1980s and 1990s as the most promising venues for passage of statewide land use management schemes. At the same time, the spread of more extensive legislation to Arizona in the West, to Wisconsin in the Midwest and to Tennessee as well as Georgia in the South show that a similar potential may be emerging as suburban sprawl and land development continue in other parts of the country.

Inequality, Segregation and Statewide Growth Management

One of the most frequently discussed political divisions in recent American politics and policy concerns the polarization within metropolitan areas throughout much of the country along class and ethnic lines. Hero and Tolbert (1996) identify racial and ethnic divisions as a prime determinant of state policy in the United States. Studies in a variety of fields have pointed to the divisions among neighborhoods and towns segregated by class and race across metropolitan areas as a problem for policymakers at various levels of government to overcome (Orfield 1997; Weir 2000; Dreier, Mollenkopf and Swanstrom 2001). At the same time, however, the place-based logic that Orfield and others have called for as a basis for coalition-building relies on segregation to delineate the interests of different suburbs as well as central cities. The decline in metropolitan segregation that studies of the 2000 Census have already shown (Glaeser

and Vigdor 2002; Logan 2002) could thus either present new opportunities or undermine the basis of existing coalitions for statewide and metropolitan policy.

Consider first wealth and poverty and segregation along these income lines, as measured at the start of the period (Table 6). Smart growth states proved somewhat more affluent than others. On average, the growing, increasingly suburban states where smart growth was considered seriously or at least partly implemented had per capita incomes $2514 or 15 percent. Those where major legislation was passed were richer those without by $1938 or just under 11 percent. The higher per capita incomes of the Northeastern states that predominated among adopters largely account for these differences.

[Insert Table 6 about here]

Greater wealth in the states that passed major legislation went along with only slightly higher levels of segregation between rich and poor. The dissimilarity index used most frequently to measure segregation demonstrates this contrast (Table 6). Overall, suburbs in the states with major legislation averaged levels of segregation three points higher than others. Suburbs in states without growth management on statewide agendas also averaged four points higher indexes than those in states without. In central cities and metropolitan areas as a whole these differences shrank to one or two points, reflecting considerable spread around the average among adopting states.

In the 2000 census as before, income disparities generally paled alongside ethnic and racial divisions as the determinants of metropolitan segregation. African-Americans have generally suffered the most from these patterns (Massey and Denton1993), and continue to do so (Logan 2002). This same kind of segregation, especially between whites and African-Americans, stood out among the adopting states of the 1990s. Especially in contrast with the 1980s, statewide growth management succeeded more where entrenched segregation has persisted than where new, more integrated patterns of settlement had begun to appear. As Table 7 shows, where growth management legislation was adopted or even seriously discussed bore little correspondence to the overall proportion of minorities, which varied only between 19.9 and 21.8 percent. The main differences among states traced instead to the types of minorities who predominated among this group. As might be expected for a group of mostly southern and eastern states, African-Americans made up four percent more of the average state population than among non-adopting states. Latinos in turn made up a slightly smaller proportion. In the largely southern states where smart growth had drawn little attention, the population averaged 3.1 percent more African-Americans and 2.5 percent fewer Latinos.

[Insert Table 7 about here]

More often than not, for African-Americans, Latinos, and to a lesser extent Asian-Americans, the passage of statewide growth management in the 1990s went along with entrenched segregation. Between whites and African-Americans, the average dissimilarity index of 61 in 1990 for states passing legislation—a level above what

Massey and Denton (1993) consider "hypersegregation"-- stood five points higher than the average for states that never passed legislation. The average of 57 for states debating growth management legislation stood 6 points higher than in states without the issue on statewide agendas. In only three of the eleven states passing legislation did the state average fall below the national state average. Exposure indexes differed less markedly, and averaged highest in the largely southern states without growth management agendas.

Although levels of segregation generally remained well below these levels for Latinos, the parallel contrast was more dramatic. States with legislation averaged a dissimilarity index of 43, eight points higher than the rather modest levels in states without legislation. States without growth management on statewide agendas averaged an index of only 29. Partly due to the larger presence of Latinos in many nonadopting states, the exposure indexes also remained lower in states with legislation. Even between whites and Asian-Americans, dissimilarity in the adopting states ranged four points higher on average than in nonadopters.

All of these trends marked a departure from the patterns in early adopters, especially those that passed no major legislation in the 1990s. In the latter, both the nonAsian minorities and the average segregation indexes for all three minorities ranged lower than among any other groups of states. The changes over the course of the 1990s reinforced most of these contrasts. Although African-American segregation declined in all types of states, the rate of decline in adopting states remained one point less than elsewhere. Latino segregation grew, and Asian-American segregation fell, at similar rates in all these categories.

Although less dramatic than differences from other states in patterns of metropolitan growth and land use, these differences in segregation suffice to put to rest any presumption that growing racial and ethnic as well as economic integration in U.S. metropolitan areas automatically furnished a basis for new coalition building around growth management policies at the state level. There is even some basis to suspect a connection between segregation and legislative success. In states like Georgia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Wisconsin, dissatisfaction with higher levels of segregation could have compelled the embrace of growth management in minority communities. At the same time, vested interests in entrenched segregation could have given the white constituencies who dominated the suburban majorities in these states added reasons to support constraints on new development.

Metropolitan Patterns and the Future of Statewide Growth Management

State policy innovations are always the product of politics as well as social and spatial change. The trends of the last two decades, especially the 1990s, nonetheless point to specific contexts where statewide growth management legislative has succeeded, and others where it has not. Recent trends provide insights into the special obstacles that growth management legislation continues to confront in the biggest states, and evidence

that existing legislation has transformed patterns of urban and suburban development in ways that reinforce the sources of political support for smart growth.

Suburban and Metropolitan Area Growth and Statewide Growth Management.

Several specific characteristics have been associated with the adoption and development of statewide growth measures. Each should also favor adoptions in other states facing similar contexts. As the contexts of metropolitan development and its politics have shifted over the last forty years, however, so have the most promising guides to the possible trajectories of other states.

--*Small, prosperous, moderately growing rural states with recognized environmental assets*. With the exception of Florida, the first adopters fell into this category at the time of their initial legislation. So did Maine in the 1980s and New Hampshire in the 1990s. All had large expanses of forest or other rural land, even where the population remained mostly urban. The forests and mountains in the New England states and Oregon, and the rainforests and volcanoes in Hawaii qualify as assets of this sort.

These types of states clearly differ from the smaller more rural states that did not so much as place growth management on agendas in the 1990s. The latter were generally significantly poorer than other states. With the exception of Alaska and perhaps Wyoming, these states also lacked environmental assets of the sort used to mobilized political support for growth management in northern New England and Oregon.

By the 1990s, as the focus of new legislative activity turned to suburban states, fewer and fewer adoptions in this category became likely.

--*States in which a sizeable metropolitan population centers in a single region.* In these states, a single metropole offers a unitary collective interest in growth management with which the bulk of metropolitan residents can identify. For this type, the Willamette Valley of Oregon offers a paradigmatic example. Not only the Portland metropolitan area but others encompassing the vast bulk of the metropolitan population and even some of the most productive farmland in the state are located there. Over time, the environmentalist, residential, business and agricultural interests in this region coalesced into a powerful coalition that has sustained the most extensive statewide system to regulate land use (Weir 2000; Sellers 2001).

Several other adopting states have benefited from a similar urban geography. The Atlanta metropolitan area in Georgia, the Seattle area in Washington, the Wilmington area in Delaware, the Providence area in Rhode Island share a similar centrality.

--*States with a polycentric, predominantly suburban metropolitan structure.* At the same time, other adopting states display a continuous fabric of urban and surburban settlement predominates. In Maryland, New Jersey, and to a lesser degree Rhode Island, Delaware, Florida and Pennsylvania, an overwhelming suburban majority lives in an

almost contiguous skein of urban regions stretching across the state. Here a common settlement pattern also generates parallel interests. Especially in Maryland and New Jersey, the central cities around which much of the suburban population congregates lie outside the state line. In Tennessee and Wisconsin a largely parallel polycentric structure may have a similar effect without as large a suburban population.

--*States confronting unusually rapid population growth*. It would be difficult to account for the adoption and repeated refinements to statewide growth management in Florida since the 1970s without reference to the pressures associated with the exceptionally rapid growth of that state. Similarly in the 1990s, not only Florida but Arizona, Georgia, Delaware and Tennessee numbered among the fifteen fastest growing states. All of these fifteen states except Alaska and Texas engaged in intensive debates over development and state efforts to control it. In most of these states, however, moves toward growth management generated intense controversy and did not produce statewide, comprehensive programs. Alongside movements for smart growth, rapid population growth has often given rise to powerful development lobbies and other constituencies opposed to state regulation.

Other characteristics have clearly worked against the serious pursuit of smart growth legislation at the state level. Where the overall state population has been growing only slowly, the urban population and developed land remain limited, and both have expanded at modest or even negative rates, few pressures have emerged for statewide legislation (Table 4). So long as these conditions persist, strong pressures for growth management are unlikely to appear in these states.

Big states and statewide growth management.

One of the most important puzzles to be explained in order to assess the prospects for passage of smart growth legislation concerns the continued absence of comprehensive measures in the largest states. All of these states but Texas remain at the center of smart growth debates,[3] and all have passed smaller scale or regional growth control legislation or even considered more extensive measures. Yet as of 2001, Florida remained the only one of the largest five states and, with Pennsylvania, the only two of the largest eight states with comprehensive programs (Table 8). The reluctance in such states as New York and California is all the more surprising in light of their reputation for progressivism and even leadership in the diffusion of policy innovations in numerous fields (Klingman and Lammers 1984).

[Insert Table 8 about here]

As Weir (2000) has shown, big states like California, New York and Illinois have faced major hurdles in building political coalitions for regional and state cooperation

[3] Although the APA classifies Texas on its own map as a state where smart growth reforms are under way at the state level, the specifics description of legislation there describes almost exclusively legislative efforts to restrict the powers of municipalities to pursue growth management.

between their largest central cities and either the suburbs or the remainder of the state. Comparative analysis of the metropolitan structures of these states points out several differences that aggravate and may even generate these political obstacles.

--As the three largest metropolitan regions in the country, New York City, Los Angeles and Chicago each contain significantly larger populations and land area than any metropolitan area in a state adopting statewide growth management. In addition to their greater size and complexity, their distinctive economic status as "global cities" (Abu-Lughod 1999) has probably aggravated the divergence of interests in the cities there from other elements in the suburbs or the state. It may also have enhanced the power of development interests based in these metropolitan areas to fend off efforts at statewide growth management (Sellers 2001).

--California and Texas not only contain a much larger territory than other states, but include more than one of the nation's largest metropolitan regions. The resulting fragmentation and divergences among major urban regions posed greater challenges for statewide planning than in other states. In California, the resulting division between metropolitan areas proved a major impediment to the development of more extensive legislation. From the 1960s, as cities in the Bay Area adopted regional planning and other innovative approaches to land use, development interests based in the Los Angeles area fought persistently against initiatives to enact growth management statewide (Sellers 2001).

--Ethnic and racial polarization within the metropolitan areas of several of the biggest eight states stood at exceptionally high levels. In New York, Illinois, Ohio and Michigan, dissimilarity indexes for African Americans in relation to whites exceeded those of any other larger states adopting legislation by three to eight points. Especially in the large urban regions of these states, greater disparities could be expected to compound the difficulties of coalition building between central cities and suburbs.

--Finally, especially in California and New York, laws and planning initiatives introduced well before the 1960s and 1970s had already put in place part of what statewide growth management aimed to accomplish. Regional planning in and around New York City dated back to the early 20th century (Yaro 2000). Unique among states, California had introduced a planning mandate for municipalities in 1937 during the first national wave of local planning authorizations. Local growth control measures proliferated over the 1980s and 1990s there. These measures have relieved pressures for statewide, comprehensive legislative solutions.

For the largest states, despite declining levels of segregation, statewide growth management legislation is likely to continue to face obstacles. In such circumstances, the more piecemeal and localized or regional approach that has generally characterized state initiatives in these settings poses practical, if limited, alternative to more sweeping measures.

Statewide growth management performance and "virtuous cycles". As the repeated refinements and revisions to statewide growth management regimes in several states indicate, statewide programs often build upon their own legacies. Analysis of why this occurs points in part to the effects that the programs have on patterns of development themselves. According to this argument, limits on sprawl can reinforce the economic and political weight of central cities, limit the power of development lobbies, and, through more socially integrated patterns of settlement, foster stronger collective action. (Weir 2000, Sellers 2001). A range of different measures indicate that states with the most extensive growth management programs have largely succeeded over the 1990s in limiting aspects of urban sprawl to levels below those of other states. Current programs have encountered more mixed success relative to actions in other states in reducing racial, ethnic and income inequalities.

This comparison in Table 9 separates out those states with comprehensive growth management programs by 1992 from all other states, as well as all of those that introduced no similar programs over the 1990s. The classification of programs draws upon Burby and May's (1997) classification of statutory mandates to separate out the programs with the most far-reaching mandates and most extensive mechanisms for implementation (classified here as "strong" programs) from the others. Although Oregon has often been take as the most extensive such program, this classification also highlights the programs in Florida, Maine, and Rhode Island. States with different growth pressures clearly require different metrics to measure the performance of growth management. For this reason, an indicator that controlled for overall population growth over the decade supplemented each simple indicator of metropolitan change. The resulting figures give both the overall rate of change in each indicator and the change per percentage point increase in the state population.

[Insert Table 9 about here]

States with growth management generally succeeded in limiting the loss of nonurban forms of land use, lifestyle and employment (Table 9(a)). Controlling for the stronger rise in population in several such states, even those with more limited programs had held losses in farm employment, cropland, and rural land and population below levels in states without these programs. States with the strong programs usually did even better, with lower rates of loss in farm employment, cropland and rural population. For farm employment, cropland, and rural population, even the uncontrolled figures for losses there fell short of levels in the states without legislation. Even in limiting the growth of suburban populations, states with growth management succeeded more than other states. In Oregon, Florida, and Georgia, where the suburban population grew much more rapidly than average, the large influx of people to the states furnishes part of the cause. The rate of suburban population growth relative to overall population growth in these states remained lower than in states without statewide programs.

Only in stemming the growth of developed land have the states with programs not generally succeeded better than others. Even with the control that takes population

growth into account, the average rate of land development in the growth management states fails to stand out. On closer examination, Florida, Georgia and New Jersey have lost land to development at especially high rates, but several other states have not. Even without controls for population growth, three of the four states that originally introduced state programs—Oregon, Hawaii and Vermont—consumed developed land at rates a third or less than in nonadopting states.

In stemming or reversing metropolitan inequalities, statewide growth management encountered more mixed results. Several states with programs succeeded in alleviating some of the most glaring aspects of metropolitan spatial inequality. But even these states have experienced simultaneous growth in other dimensions of segregation (Table 9(b)). In containing metropolitan and in particular suburban expansion, statewide growth management has often limited the new development that in other states has brought about greater mixing of different races, ethnicities and income groups.

The most striking successes here occurred in the states with the strongest programs, and affected the inner-city concentrations of poverty and African Americans that have occupied much of recent debates over urban policy. Of the four states with strong comprehensive programs, Florida, Oregon and Rhode Island had reduced segregation of African-Americans at rates well beyond the average in states without programs. In Florida, Maine and Oregon, segregation between rich and poor in the central cities as well as between whites and Asians at the metropolitan level also declined at rates beyond those of states without programs. In Oregon, as well as most of the states with more limited programs, segregation of rich and poor residents at the metropolitan scale also dropped at faster rates than in non-adopting states.

At the same time, even in the most successful cases, other kinds of segregation advanced. In the growth management states as elsewhere, segregation of the rapidly growing, largely immigrant Latino population advanced almost as fast as segregation of African Americans declined. In the states with the strongest programs, segregation for Latinos in relation to whites grew more dramatically than in any other category of state. At the same time, states with strong growth management faced a more dramatic version of the rising suburban segregation taking place across the country (cf. Logan 2002). Aside from Oregon itself, only states with weaker statewide programs had brought about reductions in metropolitan income segregation greater than the rates in nonadopting states.

With rates of population growth taken into account, the successes of states with growth management in reducing segregation remained relatively modest by comparison with other states. With this control, only in the central cities did the strong state growth management programs achieve reductions even slightly greater than in nonadopting states The constraints that state programs had placed on rural and suburban development could well have limited the success of efforts to reduce suburban disparities.

It would require closer examination of patterns within individual states to ascertain the consequences that specific programs had on these results. The census results nonetheless help both to confirm significant links in the virtuous cycles of

performance and support for smart growth, and to suggest potential limits to these cycles. In reducing rates of suburban expansion in terms of land and population, existing state growth management legislation helped foster urban forms that could provide bases for continued support. But despite several successes, most notably in the case of Oregon, statewide growth management was ultimately responsible for reductions in segregation that remained limited compared with developments in other states over the 1990s. In some states, comparatively limited or even aggravating effects on segregation may be one price of growth management regimes that restrict suburban growth. In generating political support, virtuous cycles that favor metropolitan growth control can easily turn into vicious circles that discourage metropolitan integration.

Conclusion: The Suburbanization of Smart Growth Legislation

Increasingly, growth management has emerged on the policy agendas of states across the country. Over the 1990s, as the suburbs emerged as a majority of the U.S. population, the profile of states with statewide programs shifted decisively away from the smaller, more rural states that predominated among early adopters. As statewide growth management has spread it has found support in a variety of different types of states. States with mainly suburban populations, with a single dominant metropolitan region, and with rapid growth have predominated among more recent adopters. Rural and farm interests have occupied increasingly less important places in states introducing legislation. Smaller, less urban states with less rapid growth have undertaken far less debate or legislation. At the other end of the spectrum, the recent landmark legislation in Pennsylvania may not presage a shift toward statewide growth management programs in others among the largest states. In California, New York, Texas, Illinois and perhaps other large states, a variety of persistent social and economic divisions within and between the nation's largest urban regions and other areas reinforce political divisions that have long stymied legislation.

The popularity, persistence and continued development of statewide growth legislation in many states owes largely to its apparent effects on patterns of metropolitan development. Census data suggest that states with legislation have often limited suburban expansion and preserved more rural land and farms than they would otherwise. In some but not all instances this data points to successes in effort to alleviate the worst problems of racial and income segregation. With the growing diffusion of statewide growth management to the suburban, largely segregated mainstream of the United States, the dilemmas already evident in the states with programs in place in the 1990s will move increasingly to the fore. In increasingly densely settled contexts, statewide growth management is likely to encounter greater difficulties than up to now in accommodating control over sprawl with efforts to redress place-based inequalities. Coalition building between central cities and suburbs will require constant attention to

Sources

Abu-Lughod, Janet. (1999.) *New York, Los Angeles, Chicago: America's Global Cities.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

American Planning Association. (2002). *Planning for Smart Growth: 2002 State of the States*. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association. Retrieved April 7, 2003 at www.planning.org/growingsmart/states2002.htm

Berry, Frances Stokes and Berry, William D. (1992). Tax Innovation in the States: Capitalizing on Political Opportunity. *American Journal of Political Science* Vol 36 (1992) pp. 715-742.

Berry, Frances Stokes and Berry, William D. (1990). State Lottery Adoptions as Policy Innovations: An Event History Analysis. *American Political Science Review* Vol 84 (1990) pp. 395-415.

Berube, Alan. (2002). Gaining but Losing Ground: Population Change in Large Cities and Their Suburbs. In Katz, Bruce and Lang, Robert (eds.), *Redefining Urban and and Suburban America*, pp. 33-50. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Bollens, Scott. (1992). State Growth Management: Intergovernmental Frameworks and Policy Objectives. *APA Journal* 4: 454-465.

Burby, Raymond and May, Peter. (1997). *Making Governments Plan: State Experiments in Managing Land Use*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cobb, Rodney L. (1997). Toward Modern Local Statutes: A Survey of State Laws on Local Land-Use Planning.

Dreier, Peter, Mollenkopf, John, and Swanstrom, Todd. (2001). *Place Matters*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.

Glaeser, Edward. (2002). Racial Segregation: Promising News. In Katz, Bruce and Lang, Robert (eds.), *Redefining Urban and and Suburban America*, pp. 211-234. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Gray, Virginia. (1973). Innovation in States: A Diffusion Study. *American Political Science Review* Vol 67, pp. 1174-85.

Hero, Rodney E. and Tolbert, Caroline J. (1996). A Racial/Ethnic Diversity Interpretation of Politics and Policy in the States of the U.S. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 40, No. 3., pp. 851-871.

Klingman, David and Lammers, William W. (1984). The "General Policy Liberalism" Factor in American State Politics. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 598-610.

Logan, John . (2002). Ethnic Diversity Grows, Neighborhood Integration Lags. In Katz, Bruce and Lang, Robert (eds.), *Redefining Urban and and Suburban America*, pp. 235-256. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Lucy, William H and Phillips, David L. (2002). Suburbs: Patterns of Growth and Decline. In Katz, Bruce and Lang, Robert (eds.), *Redefining Urban and and Suburban America*, pp. 117-136. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Massey, Douglas and Denton, Nancy. (1993). *American Apatheid*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mintrom, Michael. (1997). Policy Entrepreneurs and the Diffusion of Innovation *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 41, No. 3. (Jul., 1997), pp. 738-770.

Mintrom, Michael, Vergari, Sandra. (1998). Policy Networks and Innovation Diffusion: The Case of State Education Reforms. *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 60, No. 1, pp. 126-148.

Nivola, Pietro. (1999). *Laws of the Landscape*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Orfield, Myron. (1997). *Metropolitics.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Putnam, Robert. (2000). *Bowling Alone*. New York: Harper Collins.

Rose, Douglas D. (1973). National and Local Forces in State Politics: The Implications of Multi-Level Policy Analysis. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 67, No. 4, pp. 1162-1173.

Sellers, Jefferey M. (2002). *Governing From Below: Urban Regions and the Global Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Soss, Joe, Schram, Sanford F., Vartanian, Thomas P., and O'Brien, Erin. (2001). Setting the Terms of Relief: Explaining State Policy Choices in the Devolution Revolution. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 378-395.

Weir, Margaret. (2000). Coalition Building for Regionalism. In Katz, Bruce (ed.), *Reflections on Regionalism*, pp. 127-153. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Yaro, Robert. (2000). Growing and Governing Smart: A Case Study of the New York Region. In Katz, Bruce (ed.), *Reflections on Regionalism*, pp. 43-77. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Zovanyi, Gabor. (2001). *Growth Management for a Sustainable Future: Ecological Sustainability as the New Growth Management Focus for the 21st Century*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Table 1

States Passing Comprehensive Growth Management Legislation, by Decades

Beginning in 1960s or 1970s:			
Florida	1972	Environmental Land and Water Management Act	Fla. Stat. 380 et seq.
	1984-1985	Omnibus Growth Management Act	
	1998-1999	Criteria for land use plans, infill development	
Hawaii	1961	Hawaii Land Use Law	Hawaii Rev. Stats Ch. 205
	1978	Hawaii State Plan	Act 100
Oregon	1973	Land Conservation and Development Act	S.B. 100, Oregon Stats. 197
Vermont	1970	Environmental Control Act	Act 250, 10 Vermont Stats. 151
	1988	Growth Management Act	Act 200, 24 Vermont Stats. Ch. 117
	1990	Amendments to Ch. 117	Act 280
Beginning in 1980s (to 1990):			
Maine	1988	Comprehensive Planning and Land use Regulation Act	30 M.R.S.A. Sec. 4960
Washington	1990	Growth Management Act	Sub. House Bill 2929
	1991	Amendments to 1990 Growth Management Act	ReSHB 1025
New Jersey	1985	State Planning Act	NJSA 52-18A-196 et seq.
	1999	Smart Growth Planning Grants	
	2001	State Development and Redevelopment Plan	
Georgia	1989	Coordinated Planning Legislation	O.C.G.A. 50-8-1 et seq.
	1992	Amendments to Planning law	
Rhode Island	1988	Comprehensive Planning and Land use Regulation Act	Rhode Island General Laws, Ch. 45-22
	2000	Referenda on development rights, opens space	
Beginning in 1990s (to 2001):			
Maryland	1992	Economic Growth, Resource Protection and Planning Act	
	1997	Smart Growth Areas Act	
	2001	Greenprint Program	H.B. 1379
Arizona	1998	Growing Smarter Act, transferable development rights act	S. 1238, Ch.145
	2000	Growing Smarter Plus Act	

New Hampshire	2000	Smart Growth Bill	H.B. 1259
Pennsylvania	2000	Growth Area Legislation, transferable development rights	H.B. 14 (Act 67), S.B. 300 (Act 68)
Tennessee	1998	Growth Policy Law	Public Chapter 1101
Wisconsin	1999	Growth Management Law (budget bill)	A.B. 133
Delaware	2001	Comprehensive Plans and Annexation Law	H.B. 255
		Planning Coordination	S.B. 105
		Graduated Impact Fees	H.B. 235
		Realty Transfer Tax for Conservation Trust Fund	H.B. 192

SOURCES: Bollens, 1992 ; American Planning Association, 2002.

Table 2 - Characteristics of States Adopting Growth Management Legislation in the 1970's and 1980's

(a) Population and land use

	Year	Total Pop	% of Pop Farm Employed	% Land in Cropland**	% of land Non-federal & rural**	% Pop Outside Central City	% of Pop Living in Urban Areas	% of Pop Living in Rural Areas	Change in Total Pop	% Nonfederal Developed Land**	% of Pop Construction Employed***
Florida	1970	6789443	0.031	-	-	0.549	0.805	0.195	0.371	-	0.059
Hawaii	1970	768561	0.033	-	-	0.398	0.831	0.169	0.215	-	0.056
Oregon	1970	2091385	0.056	-	-	0.379	0.671	0.329	0.182	-	0.032
Vermont	1970	444330	0.063	-	-	0.134	0.322	0.677	0.140	-	0.049
Ave. for states that passed growth laws in 1960's or 1970's		2523430	0.046	-	-	0.365	0.657	0.343	0.227	-	0.049
National Average		4049108	0.061	-	-	0.338	0.658	0.342	0.137	-	0.038
Ave. for states that did not pass growth laws in 1960's or 1970's		4181776	0.062	-	-	0.336	0.658	0.342	0.129	-	0.038
Georgia	1980	5463000	0.035	0.174	0.857	0.414	0.624	0.376	0.190	0.063	0.039
Maine	1980	1125000	0.029	0.025	0.908	0.190	0.475	0.525	0.134	0.024	0.035
New Jersey	1980	7365000	0.006	0.155	0.633	0.751	0.890	0.110	0.027	0.243	0.031
Rhode Island	1980	947000	0.004	0.034	0.601	0.589	0.870	0.130	0.000	0.206	0.026
Washington	1980	4132000	0.038	0.177	0.660	0.532	0.735	0.265	0.212	0.035	0.044
Florida	1980	9746000	0.023	0.095	0.735	0.613	0.843	0.157	0.435	0.087	0.056
Hawaii	1980	965000	0.028	0.073	0.874	0.412	0.865	0.135	0.256	0.036	0.040
Oregon	1980	2633000	0.045	0.070	0.471	0.405	0.679	0.321	0.259	0.015	0.034
Vermont	1980	511000	0.054	0.105	0.866	0.149	0.339	0.663	0.150	0.039	0.038
Ave. for states that passed growth laws in 1970's or 1980's		3654111	0.029	0.101	0.734	0.451	0.702	0.298	0.185	0.083	0.038
National Average		4518220	0.043	0.215	0.746	0.360	0.670	0.330	0.164	0.059	0.039
Ave. for states that did not pass growth laws in 1970's or 1980's*		4707902	0.046	0.240	0.748	0.340	0.662	0.338	0.159	0.054	0.040
Ave. for states that passed growth laws in 1980's (through 1990)		3806400	0.022	0.113	0.732	0.495	0.719	0.281	0.113	0.114	0.035

*Also excluding states that passed growths laws in the 1960's or 1970's

**1982 data used for 1980

***For Connecticut construction data was incomplete, 1982 data used for 1980

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, 1972 Statistical Abstract of the United States; U.S. Bureau of Census, 1985 Statistical Abstract of the United States; U.S. Bureau of Census, 1980 Census of Population-Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas and Standard Consolidated Statistical Areas; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, www.bls.gov; US Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service, www.usda.gov/nass; USDA, National Resources Inventory, www.nhq.nrcs.usda.gov

(b) Income and Ethnicity

	Year	PCI ($1990)	% White Pop	% Black Pop	% American Indian Pop	% Asian Pop	% Hispanic Pop	% Minority Pop
Florida	1970	4006.000	0.842	0.153	-	-	-	0.158
Hawaii	1970	5096.000	0.388	0.010	-	-	-	0.612
Oregon	1970	3940.000	0.972	0.013	-	-	-	0.028
Vermont	1970	3634.000	0.996	0.002	-	-	-	0.004
Ave. for states that passed growth laws in 1960's or 1970's		4169.000	0.799	0.044	-	-	-	0.201
National Average		3873.920	0.884	0.088	-	-	-	0.116
Ave. for states that did not pass growth laws in 1960's or 1970's		3848.261	0.891	0.092	-	-	-	0.109
Georgia	1980	8474.000	0.722	0.268	0.001	0.004	-	0.278
Maine	1980	8408.000	0.987	0.003	0.004	0.003	-	0.013
New Jersey	1980	11778.000	0.832	0.126	0.001	0.014	-	0.168
Rhode Island	1980	9742.000	0.947	0.030	0.003	0.005	-	0.053
Washington	1980	10913.000	0.915	0.026	0.015	0.023	-	0.085
Florida	1980	10049.000	0.840	0.138	0.002	0.005	-	0.160
Hawaii	1980	11512.000	0.331	0.018	0.003	0.469	-	0.669
Oregon	1980	10196.000	0.946	0.014	0.010	0.012	-	0.054
Vermont	1980	8702.000	0.992	0.002	0.002	0.001	-	0.008
Ave. for states that passed growth laws in 1970's or 1980's		9974.889	0.835	0.069	0.005	0.060	-	0.165
National Average		9790.840	0.855	0.091	0.014	0.017	-	0.145
Ave. for states that did not pass growth laws in 1970's or 1980's*		9750.439	0.859	0.096	0.016	0.008	-	0.141
Ave. for states that passed growth laws in 1980's (through 1990)		9863.000	0.881	0.090	0.005	0.010	-	0.119

	Year	White/Black Metro Area Dissimilarity	White/Hisp Metro Area Dissimilarity	White/Asian Metro Area Dissimilarity	White/Black Metro Area Exposure	White/Hisp Metro Area Exposure	White/Asian Metro Area Exposure
Georgia	1980	66	32	43	13	1	1
Maine	1980	39	22	19	0	0	0
New Jersey	1980	58	52	27	5	5	2
Rhode Island	1980	67	29	45	1	2	0
Washington	1980	66	46	41	2	3	3
Florida	1980	42	30	20	6	7	1
Hawaii	1980	68	59	33	3	7	45
Oregon	1980	59	40	35	1	2	2
Vermont	1980	77	38	32	0	1	1
Ave. for states that passed growth laws in 1970's or 1980's		60	39	33	4	3	6
National Average		60	35	35	5	4	2
Ave. for states that did not pass growth laws in 1970's or 1980's*		60	35	35	5	4	1
Ave. for states that passed growth laws in 1980's (through 1990)		59	36	35	4	2	1

*Also excluding states that passed growths laws in the 1960's or 1970's
Sources: Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research, Census data, Metropolitan Racial and Ethnic Change Initiative, http://www.albany.edu/mumford/

Table 3 – Population and Land Use in States With Major Legislation in the 1990s

State	% Change in state population 1980-1990	%Change in state population 1990-2000	% Urban Pop 1990	% Rural Pop 1990	Change in % of Urban Pop	% of Land that is Nonfederal & Developed 1990*	Gain/loss in Nonfederal Developed Land 1990-1997*	% Pop in Metro Area Outside Central City 1990	Change in % pop in MA outside CC 1990-2000
States with previous laws that enacted major 1990s legislation:									
Georgia	18.6	26.4	63.2	36.8	8.4	7.7	2.8	49.1	5.4
New Jersey	5.2	8.6	89.2	10.6	4.9	29.4	4.7	87.7	0.7
Rhode Island	6.0	4.5	86.0	14.0	4.9	23.0	1.6	57.4	0.9
Florida	32.8	23.5	84.8	15.2	4.5	10.9	3.0	68.3	2.5
States that enacted first major legislation:									
Arizona	34.9	40.0	87.5	12.5	0.7	1.8	0.2	30.8	4.9
Delaware	12.1	17.6	73.1	27.0	7.0	12.7	2.0	63.9	-1.0
Maryland	13.4	10.8	81.3	18.7	4.7	13.1	2.6	74.6	3.0
New Hampshire	20.4	11.4	51.0	49.0	8.2	8.5	1.4	38.5	1.7
Pennsylvania	0.2	3.4	68.9	31.1	8.1	11.3	2.5	61.2	1.6
Tennessee	6.2	16.7	60.9	39.1	2.7	6.9	1.9	32.0	2.4
Wisconsin	4.0	9.6	65.7	34.3	2.7	6.1	0.7	35.4	2.1
Average for states that passed laws during or after 1990	14.0	15.7	73.8	26.2	5.2	11.9	2.1	54.5	2.2
Average for states that passed laws up to 1990 but not after	12.0	12.6	62.5	37.5	3.6	3.5	0.5	35.9	1.5
Average for all other states that did not pass laws during or after 1990	8.1	13.3	66.6	33.4	3.0	5.5	0.8	35.2	1.8
Average for states that never passed laws	7.6	13.4	67.2	32.8	3.0	5.8	0.9	35.1	1.9
National Average	9.4	13.8	68.2	31.8	3.5	6.9	1.1	39.4	1.9

*1990 data obtained from weighted averages for 1987 and 1992, =.6(1992 total)+ .4(1987 total)
Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, www.census.gov; U.S. Bureau of Census, 1992 Statistical Abstract of the United States; USDA, National Resources Inventory, www.nhq.nrcs.usda.gov; U.S. Bureau of Census, http://eire.census.gov/popest/archives/metro/ma99-06.txt; U.S. Bureau of Census, 2000 Census

Table 4 – States With Little Statewide Smart Growth Activity, 1990s

	% Change in State Population 1980-1990	% Change in State Population 1990-2000	% of Population that is Urban 1990	% of Population that is Rural 1990	Change in % of Urban Population	% Nonfederal Developed Land 1990*	Gain/loss in nonfederal developed land 1990-1997*	% Pop in Metro Area Outside Central City 1990	Change in % pf Pop in Metro Area outside Central City 1990-2000
States without statewide legislation or debate:									
Alabama	3.8	10.1	60.4	39.6	-4.9	5.6	1.1	40.4	3.5
Alaska	36.8	14.0	67.4	32.5	-1.7	-	-	0.0	0.0
Arkansas	2.8	13.7	53.5	46.5	-1.1	3.6	0.6	20.6	2.5
Kansas	4.8	8.5	69.9	30.9	2.3	3.4	0.3	23.6	2.5
Louisiana	0.4	5.9	68.0	31.9	4.6	4.6	0.6	43.9	2.2
Mississippi	2.2	10.5	47.0	52.9	1.7	4.1	0.8	19.2	3.5
Nebraska	0.5	8.4	66.1	33.8	3.5	2.3	0.1	15.0	1.6
Oklahoma	4.0	9.7	67.7	32.3	-2.4	3.8	0.5	26.2	0.9
South Dakota	0.7	8.5	50.0	50.0	1.9	1.8	0.2	9.2	1.1
Texas	19.4	22.8	80.3	19.7	2.2	4.3	0.7	34.9	4.1
West Virginia	-8.0	0.8	36.1	63.8	9.9	4.3	1.3	30.3	1.6
Wyoming	-3.5	8.9	65.0	35.1	0.3	1.0	0.1	8.2	1.0
Average for states that debate growth laws during or after 1990s	10.7	15.0	70.5	29.5	4.2	7.9	1.3	44.7	1.9
Average for states that did not debate growth laws during or after 1990s	5.3	10.1	61.0	39.1	1.4	3.5	0.6	22.6	2.0
National Average	9.4	13.8	68.2	31.8	3.5	6.9	1.1	39.4	1.9

*1990 data obtained from weighted averages for 1987 and 1992, =.6(1992 total)+ .4(1987 total)
Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, www.census.gov; U.S. Bureau of Census, 1992 Statistical Abstract of the United States; USDA, National Resources Inventory, www.nhq.nrcs.usda.gov; U.S. Bureau of Census, http://eire.census.gov/popest/archives/metro/ma99-06.txt; U.S. Bureau of Census, 2000 Census

Table 5 – Rural Population and Land Use in States with Major Legislation in 1990s

State	% Rural Population 1990	Decline in % of Population Rural 1990-2000	% of Pop that is Farm Employed 1990	Change in % of Pop that is Farm Employed 1990-2000	% of Land Used as Cropland 1990	Gain/loss in cropland 1990-1997	% Nonfederal rural forest land 1997 (1000 acres)*
States with previous laws that enacted major 1990s legislation:							
Georgia	36.8	-8.4	2.0	-0.6	14.5	-1.9	57.1
New Jersey	10.6	-5.2	0.4	0.0	12.8	-1.5	32.6
Rhode Island	14.0	-4.9	0.3	0.0	3.1	-0.5	47.6
Florida	15.2	-4.5	1.4	-.3	8.2	-0.9	33.4
States that enacted first major legislation in 1990s:							
Arizona	12.5	-0.7	1.0	-0.3	1.7	0.0	5.8
Delaware	27.0	-6.9	1.1	-0.2	32.8	-1.2	22.9
Maryland	18.7	-4.7	0.8	-0.2	21.6	-1.1	30.2
New Hampshire	49.0	-8.2	0.7	0.0	2.4	-0.2	66.2
Pennsylvania	31.1	-8.1	1.3	-0.1	19.5	-0.6	53.4
Tennessee	39.1	-2.7	3.9	-0.8	18.8	-1.6	44.6
Wisconsin	34.3	-2.7	4.0	-1.1	30.7	-1.1	40.2
Average for states that passed laws during or after 1990	26.2	-5.2	1.5	-0.3	15.1	-0.9	39.5
Average for states that passed laws up to 1990 but not after	37.5	-3.6	2.6	-0.5	8.3	-0.5	48.1
Average for all other states that did not pass laws after 1990	33.4	-3.0	3.6	-0.8	22.1	-0.8	29.0
Average for states that never passed laws	32.8	-2.9	3.7	-0.8	24.2	-0.8	26.2
Average for states that debated growth management laws during or after 1990	29.5	-4.2	2.7	-0.6	19.9	-0.8	32.5
Average for states that did not debate growth management laws during or after 1990s	39.1	-1.3	4.5	-1.0	22.6	-1.1	27.4
National average	31.8	-3.5	3.1	-0.7	20.5	-0.8	31.4

*1990 data obtained from weighted averages for 1987 and 1992, =.6(1992 total)+ .4(1987 total)
Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, www.census.gov; U.S. Bureau of Census, 1992 Statistical Abstract of the United States; USDA, National Resources Inventory, www.nhq.nrcs.usda.gov; U.S. Bureau of Census, 2000 Census

Table 6 – Wealth and Income Segregation in States with Major Legislation in 1990s

State	Per Capita Income, 1990	Change in Per Capita Income 1990-2000*	Rich/Poor Metro Area Dissimilarity 1990	Rich/Poor Central City Dissimilarity 1990	Rich/Poor Suburban Dissimilarity 1990	Change in Rich poor Metro Area Dissimilarity
States with previous laws that enacted major 1990s legislation						
Georgia	17722	3374	41	48	37	-2.1
New Jersey	24748	3425	37	(NA)	34	-.2
Rhode Island	20167	1930	34	34	25	2.3
Florida	19832	1241	36	37	33	.8
States that enacted first major legislation in 1990s:						
Arizona	17187	1779	44	42	44	-1
Delaware	21620	1918	32	35	28	1
Maryland	23012	2401	43	38	38	-1
New Hampshire	20703	4472	31	29	26	0
Pennsylvania	19810	2584	37	33	31	-2
Tennessee	16808	2885	39	43	37	-4
Wisconsin	18152	3176	38	37	27	-1
Average for states that passed laws during or after 1990	19978	2653	37	38	33	0
Average for states that passed laws up to 1990 but not after	19231	1865	36	38	30	-1
Average for all other states that did not pass laws during or after 1990	18193	2644	37	39	30	-1
Average for states that never passed laws	18040	2758	37	39	30	0
Average for states that debated growth management laws during or after 1990s	19189	2743	38	39	32	-1
Average for states that did not debate growth management laws during or after 1990s	16675	2339	36	39	28	1
National average	18586	2646	37	39	31	0

* Consumer Price Index used to convert to $1990.
Note: Central city averages do not include those for New Jersey, New York, North Dakota and Texas. No suburban figures for Alaska.
Sources: Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Accounts Data, Annual State Personal Income, SA1-3- Per Capita Personal Income 2/ (dollars), www.bea.gov; Bureau of Labor Statistics, all urban, US city average, all item, 1982-84=100, www.bls.gov; Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research, http://www.albany.edu/mumford/, Census data, Metropolitan Racial and Ethnic Change Initiative

Table 7 – Race and Ethnicity in States With Major Legislation in the 1990s

	2000 Ethnic Composition: White only %	Black or African American only %	Native or American Indian only %	Asian only %	Hispanic or Latino, any race %	Wh/Black Metro Area Dissimilarity 1990	Change 1990-2000 in Wh/Bl Metro Area Dissimilarity	Wh/Bl Metro Area Exposure 1990	Change 1990-2000 in Wh/Bl Metro Area Exposure
States with previous laws that enacted major 1990s legislation									
Georgia	65.1	28.7	0.3	2.2	5.3	64	-2	14	2
New Jersey	72.6	13.6	0.2	5.7	13.3	72	-4	5	1
Rhode Island	85.0	4.5	0.5	2.4	8.7	65	-6	2	1
Florida	78.0	14.6	0.3	1.8	16.8	67	-6	7	2
States that enacted first major legislation in 1990s:									
Arizona	75.5	3.1	5.0	1.9	25.3	48	-6	2	1
Delaware	74.6	19.2	0.3	2.1	4.8	52	-1	10	3
Maryland	64.0	27.9	0.3	4.0	4.3	68	-3	11	2
New Hampshire	96.0	0.7	0.2	1.3	1.7	37	-3	1	0
Pennsylvania	85.4	10.0	0.1	1.8	3.2	72	-5	4	1
Tennessee	80.2	16.4	0.3	1.0	2.2	63	-3	10	1
Wisconsin	88.9	5.7	0.9	1.7	3.6	67	-5	3	1
Average for states that passed laws during or after 1990	78.7	13.1	0.8	2.4	8.1	61	-4	6	1
Average for states that passed laws up to 1990 but not after	77.3	1.5	0.8	12.3	4.9	43	-5	2	1
Average for all other states that did not pass laws during or after 1990	79.7	9.0	1.9	3.4	7.7	54	-5	5	1
Average for states that never passed laws	80.1	10.1	2.1	2.1	8.1	56	-5	5	1
Average for states that debated growth management laws during or after 1990s	79.7	9.2	1.2	3.8	8.4	57	-5	5	1
Average for states that did not debate growth management laws during or after 1990s	78.7	12.3	3.2	1.4	5.9	51	-4	7	1
National average	79.5	9.9	1.7	3.2	7.8	56	-5	5	1

State	Wh/Hispanic Metro Area Dissimilarity 1990	Change 1990-2000 in Wh/Hi Metrro Area Dissimilarity	Wh/Hi Metro Area Exposure 1990	Change 1990-2000 in Wh/Hi Metro Area Exposure	Wh/Asian Metro Area Dissimilarity 1990	Change 1990-2000 in Wh/Asian Metro Area Dissimilarity	Wh/Asian Metro Area Exposure 1990	Change 1990-2000 in Wh/Asian Metro Area Exposure
States with previous laws that enacted major 1990s legislation								
Georgia	36	12	2	3	41	1	2	2
New Jersey	54	0	7	3	36	3	4	3
Rhode Island	61	6	3	2	50	-7	1	1
Florida	37	2	10	5	30	0	1	1
States that enacted first major legislation in 1990s:								
Arizona	49	3	14	4	28	0	2	1
Delaware	40	3	2	2	35	-1	1	1
Maryland	38	5	3	2	37	2	4	2
New Hampshire	30	4	1	1	30	1	1	1
Pennsylvania	51	0	2	1	44	-2	1	1
Tennessee	29	10	1	1	42	-2	1	1
Wisconsin	44	3	2	1	46	-6	1	1
Average for states that passed laws during or after 1990	43	4	4	2	38	-1	2	1
Average for states that passed laws up to 1990 but not after	26	2	3	1	34	-1	12	2
Average for all other states that did not pass laws during or after 1990	34	4	5	2	36	-1	3	1
Average for states that never passed laws	35	4	5	2	36	-2	2	1
Average for states that debated growth management laws during or after 1990s	38	4	5	2	37	-1	3	1
Average for states that did not debate growth management laws during or after 1990s	29	4	4	1	36	-2	1	1
National average	36	4	4	2	36	-1	3	1

Sources: Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research, http://www.albany.edu/mumford/, Census data, Metropolitan Racial and Ethnic Change Initiative

Table 8 - The Fifteen Largest States and the Ten Largest Metropolitan Areas, 2000

Area	State Population 2000	State Land Area, 1990 (1000 acres	White – Black Metro Area Dissimilarity 1990 (change 1990-200)		White – Hispanic Metro Area Dissimilarity 1990 (change 1990-200)		Major Metropolitan Areas in State (among 20 largest in United States), population in millions (proportion in state)					Number of Metro Areas over 200,000
California	33,871,648.00	101510.2	58	-4	48	3	*Los Angeles*	*16.4 (all)*	San Franciso	7.0 (all)	San Diego 2.8 (all)	14
Texas	20,851,820.00	171051.9	59	-2	46	3	Dallas	5.2 (all)	Houston	4.7 (all)		13
New York	18,976,457.00	31360.8	**77**	-1	56	2	*New York*	*21.2 (most)*				7
Florida*	15,982,378.00	37533.7	67	-6	37	2	Miami	3.9 (all)				16
Illinois	12,419,293.00	36058.7	**81**	-4	58	0	*Chicago*	*9.2 (most)*	St. Louis	2.6 (part)		5
Pennsylvania*	12,281,054.00	28995.2	72	-5	51	0	Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City	6.2 (part)				9
Ohio	11,353,140.00	26444.8	**75**	-5	37	1	Cleveland	2.9 (all)				7
Michigan	9,938,444.00	37349.2	**80**	-4	40	4	Detroit	5.5 (all)				4
New Jersey*	8,414,350.00	5215.6	72	-4	54	0	New York	19.5 (part)	Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City	6.2 (part)		2
Georgia*	8,186,453.00	37740.5	64	-2	36	12	Atlanta	4.1 (all)				5
North Carolina	8,049,313.00	33709.3	53	-2	30	14						5
Virginia	7,078,515.00	27087.1	60	-3	37	5						3
Massachusetts	6,349,097.00	5339	62	-2	56	2	Boston	5.8 (most)				2
Indiana	6,080,485.00	23158.4	72	-5	34	8	Chicago	9.2 (part)				5
Washington*	5,894,121.00	44035.3	51	-6	25	6	Seattle	3.5 (all)				2

*Passed comprehensive statewide growth management by 2001.

Table 9 – Trends in Suburban Growth, Land Use and Segregation in States With Major Legislation by 1992 (Change overall and for every percentage point rise in state population)

(a) Land use and Population

	%Change in state population 1990-2000	Change in % Farm Employment 1990-2000		Gain/loss in cropland 1990-1997		Gain/loss in nonfederal rural land 1990-1997		Change in % of population rural		Change in % pop in MA outside CC 1990-2000		Gain/loss in nonfederal developed land 1990-1997	
			per % pop. Increase		per % pop. Increase		per % pop. Increase		per % pop. Increase		per % pop. Increase		per % pop. Increase
States with strong, comprehensive growth management:													
Florida	23.5	-0.3	-0.01	-0.85	-0.04	-3.12	-0.13	-4.55	-0.19	2.50	0.11	2.96	0.13
Maine	3.8	-0.3	-0.09	-0.28	-0.07	-0.66	-0.17	4.42	1.16	1.53	0.40	0.61	0.16
Oregon	20.4	-0.8	-0.04	-0.15	-0.01	-0.38	-0.02	-8.23	-0.40	2.32	0.11	0.22	0.01
Rhode Island	4.5	0.0	-0.01	-0.45	-0.10	-1.26	-0.28	-4.93	-1.10	0.90	0.20	1.64	0.37
Other states with comprehensive growth management:													
Georgia	26.4	-0.65	-0.02	-1.88	-0.07	-2.87	-0.11	-8.42	-0.32	5.37	0.20	2.76	0.10
Hawaii	9.3	-0.32	-0.03	-0.87	-0.09	0.32	0.03	-2.58	-0.28	0.20	0.02	0.35	0.04
New Jersey	8.6	0.03	0.00	-1.47	-0.17	-4.85	-0.56	-5.16	-0.60	0.73	0.08	4.67	0.54
Vermont	8.2	-0.44	-0.05	-0.51	-0.06	-0.81	-0.10	-6.03	-0.74	1.49	0.18	0.36	0.04
Washington	21.1	-0.60	-0.03	-0.70	-0.03	-0.74	-0.04	-5.59	-0.26	1.88	0.09	0.74	0.03
Average of all states with growth management:	14.0	-0.39	-0.03	-0.80	-0.07	-1.60	-0.15	-4.56	-0.30	1.88	0.16	1.59	0.16
States with strong, comprehensive control	13.0	-0.38	-0.04	-0.43	-0.05	-1.36	-0.15	-3.32	-0.14	1.81	0.20	1.36	0.17
Other states with comprehensive controls	14.7	-0.39	-0.03	-1.09	-0.09	-1.79	-0.15	-5.56	-0.44	1.93	0.12	1.78	0.15
All other states	13.8	-0.76	-0.21	-0.84	-0.17	-1.08	-0.18	-3.27	-0.76	1.93	0.25	1.01	0.17
All other states without 1990s legislation	13.4	-0.83	-0.25	-0.87	-0.18	-1.12	-0.18	-3.78	-0.79	1.90	0.27	1.05	0.16
National state average	16.1	-0.44	-0.03	-0.68	-0.08	-0.82	-0.17	-1.90	-0.56	2.01	0.17	0.71	0.17

(b) Metropolitan inequality

	%Change in state population 1990-2000	Change in Metro White - Black Dissimilarity 1990-200	per % pop. Increase	Change in Metro White - Hispanic Dissimilarity 1990-2000	per % pop. Increase	Change in Metro White-Asian Dissimilarity 1990-2000	per % pop. Increase	Change in affluent-poor dissimilarity 1990-2000: metro	per % pop. Increase	central city	per % pop. Increase	suburbs	per % pop. Increase
States with strong, comprehensive growth management:													
Florida	23.5	-5.57	-0.24	1.60	0.07	0.09	0.00	0.85	0.04	-1.73	-0.07	2.04	0.09
Maine	3.8	0.71	0.19	2.80	0.73	-2.25	-0.59	0.12	0.03	-5.16	-1.35	3.62	0.94
Oregon	20.4	-12.36	-0.61	7.99	0.39	-1.37	-0.07	-2.17	-0.11	-5.53	-0.27	1.08	0.05
Rhode Island	4.5	-6.15	-1.38	6.15	1.37	-6.94	-1.55	2.32	0.52	0.90	0.20	3.83	0.86
Other states with comprehensive growth management:													
Georgia	26.4	-1.73	-0.07	11.82	0.45	0.59	0.02	-2.13	-0.08	-3.39	-0.13	-0.78	-0.03
Hawaii	9.3	-8.04	-0.86	0.25	0.03	0.86	0.09	-1.35	-0.14	-0.48	-0.05	-5.43	-0.58
New Jersey	8.6	-3.58	-0.42	0.03	0.00	3.03	0.35	-0.16	-0.02			-0.24	-0.03
Vermont	8.2	2.79	0.34	-4.97	-0.61	2.64	0.32	-2.82	-0.34	-1.02	-0.12	-2.78	-0.34
Washington	21.1	-6.01	-0.28	6.04	0.29	-2.65	-0.13	-1.15	-0.05	-0.27	-0.01	-0.10	0.00
Average of all states with growth management:	14.0	-4.44	-0.37	3.53	0.30	-0.67	-0.17	-0.72	-0.02	-2.08	-0.23	0.14	0.11
States with strong, comprehensive control	13.0	-5.84	-0.51	4.63	0.64	-2.62	-0.55	0.28	0.12	-2.88	-0.37	2.64	0.49
Other states with comprehensive controls	14.7	-3.31	-0.26	2.64	0.03	0.89	0.13	-1.52	-0.13	-1.29	-0.08	-1.86	-0.20
All other states	13.8	-4.56	-0.99	3.99	-0.03	-1.49	-0.63	-0.35	-0.11	-1.54	-0.30	-0.36	-0.03
All other states without 1990s legislation	13.4	-4.92	-1.11	3.82	-0.09	-1.72	-0.73	-0.24	-0.13	-1.48	-0.33	-0.32	-0.03
National state average	16.1	-2.53	-0.43	3.85	0.27	-0.31	-0.10	-1.08	-0.06	-1.85	-0.13	-1.22	-0.04

Note: Central city averages do not include those for New Jersey, New York, North Dakota and Texas. No suburban figures for Alaska.
Sources: see Tables 2, 6, 7