

Dutton Contract. FIBS MS

Re Sutton, Fiscal Impact

Ideas

1. Pro growth arguments

a. Base mult.

b. Size & synergy - and magnetism. Common inputs. bulk purchase or xptn. El Dorado effect. (Relatively neglected, in recent yrs. on defensive)

c. Density & synergy

Confused w. (b), & badly neglected

d. Renewal & synergy

Discredited by Fed. abuse

i) Replanning & rationalizing

ii) Upgrading

e. Variety & synergy

Jane Jacobs

Ag rets. in local sector. Diversity & stability. Freedom from one big base & employer. Regional El Dorado effect.

f. Transit layout and synergy

g. Property rights

h. Custom. base & mult.

i. Scale of govt. ees.

j. Anti-obsolescence -- growth needed for progress.

k. Social justice. House the poor. Radical Econ. beat vs.

l. Public choice?

stone wall.

m. Increase voting strength

n. A matching grants. Attract P.O., govt. offices, ~~the~~ xptn. stops, roads.

o. Attract routes -- Rivalry, regional dominance. v. (q.)

p. Growth compn.
vs. other nations

- p. Open the frontier around city.
 q. ~~v. rise above~~ colonial status. become metropolis, dominate rivals, stifle rivals.
 Escape
 (x.) Escape exploitation -- make the profits here, esply. to break mugsy. elsewhere.
 s. ~~by~~ Δ value of land, transient effect.

2. Anti-growth arguments

- a. Fiscal impact
- b. Stability
- c. Established character
- d. Pollution, ~~environment~~, Greenbelts, containment (neg.), parks
- e. Social downgrading
- f. Ethnic change
- g. Too much compen. See i, m
- h. Growth is subsidized
- i. Hang onto tax-dead land
- j. User charges: admission fees, permits etc.
- k. Wait for Feds. to finance.
- l. Give no unearned Δ s
- m. Hold down wage rates
- n. Reserve land for higher later use.
- o. Hold down prices, rents, for old timers
- p. Reserve common amenities for same

3. Policy-oriented lit. in urban econ. is scarce!

— User charge lit. is abundant. Water, effluent, peak loads — all a natural outgrowth of econ. schooled in price theory.

— Price. control. lit. was large, ~~in~~ '40s — hang onto tax-reverted land. Cite Blumberg, Galtick.

Then dispose of it. This established growth orientation of 1946 - 60. Fill up hangover of land from 20s.

- tax lit. large, but not oriented to problems ^{as} perceived by city council. See Groves, Due, etc.
- plug. lit -- see Fiscal Approach to land use plug.
- many planners unaware, thought of just arranging pieces on board as they would.

4. Only a few treated land & xptn. jointly.
 JLPUE did, but changed to LE, lost connections.
 Mitchell & Raptin
 Moses.
 Wingo

5. Pro-growth divides into ^{what} kinds of growth to be pro.
- a. Tax inducements, pro & con.
 Large lit., pro & con.
 Special v. general inducements.
 - b. Big popn.
 - c. Capl.
 - d. Land

e. Pro lg, anti franchise plants
Anti-colonial

f. Pro-colonial.
Nail that big plant

g. Stabilizing
Balance. Intervene to encourage balance

h. Avoid tax-exempts.

6. Social Justice divides in two

a. Redistrib. wealth.

Housing for poor

Rent control (has Fiscal Impact)

b. Open frontiers. Break ring of containment.
This is more popular variation, locally.

7. Tax exemptions

The Base & F.I. ideas meet head-on when a tax-exempt payroll is involved.

Developers of new land court them. They want the base, the nucleus, the Δ l.v.

5-

Older cities seek to tax them, but rarely to expel them. They fight to keep shipyards, bases, contractors.

8. "Area dev't."

- a. Fed. subsidy. Appal. & Ozarks.
Reclam; harbors, rivers, water, bases, NASA,
- b. Local subsidy
Northfield & the EL
Modesto etc.
19th cent. bonding for r.r.s.

9. Onerous & beneficial tax.)

10. Challenge & response

A delicate qu. locally. An effic. govt. may attract indy. by hi taxes & superior service.

An ineffic. govt. v.v.

It also depends on the indy. - and for whom the service is designed

Govt. will aim to attract most profitable ones.

But govt. usually reps. only a few

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92717

April 25, 1978

Dr. Mason Gaffney
Graduate School of Administration
University of California
Riverside, CA 92502

Dear Dr. Gaffney:

I received your letter of April 15, 1978 and I am writing to let you know that we are processing the appropriate forms for payment of four days consulting for your work on our Fiscal Impact Budgeting Systems proposal. At your consulting rate of \$200.00 per day, total payment will be \$800.00.

I too enjoyed working with you on this proposal. Martha Hollis, Ken Kraemer and I appreciate the work you did and we are confident that the proposal benefited substantially from your involvement.

We will keep you informed on the progress the proposal is making at NSF.

Best regards,

Bill

William H. Dutton
Co-Principal Investigator

WHD/gw

cc: Kenneth Kraemer
David Schetter
Shirley Hoberman