

hell freezes over, and then we will fight on the ice.”
The success of California College Republicans is

creating a new generation of trained, articulate, loyal, and energized American leaders.

CPR

THOSE IN POWER OVER US

Redevelopment's Heavy Hand

People who have lived or done business in the same location — perhaps for a generation — are forced out by a little known local government body.

M . D A V I D S T I R L I N G

IN LATE 2002, Elaine Evans, together with business and residential owners of 22,883 other parcels in over twenty separate neighborhoods of San Jose, were notified by the local redevelopment agency (RDA) that their properties were “blighted.” Neither the 120 property owners who opposed the designation at the agency’s public hearing, nor the 1,422 who protested in writing, nor the several thousand whose properties were not — except perhaps in a most technical sense — blighted, nor Elaine Evans’ court challenge, have so far succeeded in derailing this attempted massive government take-over of their properties. Ms. Evans’ appeal is pending.

It’s happened regularly in California for several decades: homeowners and small business owners in older sections of a community are informed that their property has been found to be “blighted;” that the local RDA is prepared to acquire their property through eminent domain, if necessary; and that an appraiser will be recommending a price the RDA will offer them for their property, should they prefer to take the money and leave. Whichever route they choose, the RDA’s ultimate success is rarely in doubt.

The harsh reality is that people who have lived and/or conducted business in the same location — perhaps for a generation or more — are forced from their homes and businesses by a little known local government body with a better use in mind for their property. Invariably, that better use is calculated to generate substantially greater revenues for the RDA than the

existing property owners are.

Variations on this scenario have played out thousands of times in California since the state’s redevelopment law was enacted more than a half-century ago. While the original purpose of this expanded use of eminent domain was to provide an expedient remedy to city neighborhoods plagued by boarded-up warehouses, abandoned gas stations, flop-houses, alcoholics, and prostitutes, redevelopment planners quickly discovered they also could utilize eminent domain on residents and small businesses in older, modest, yet still viable neighborhoods of the community.

With the vast financial incentives redevelopment provides — power to condemn private property and give it to other private parties; power to give developers public money to develop projects; sole use of all property tax increases generated over the life of the project (often 30 years); and authority to sell bonds to raise revenue to fund the project, all without a vote of affected property owners or local residents — RDAs almost overnight became the state’s most powerful and least accountable political subdivisions. Today, 400 of California’s 478 incorporated cities have active redevelopment agencies. (Nearly all states have adopted redevelopment laws modeled largely after California’s.)

Few can reasonably deny local government the tools necessary to “redevelop” the decrepit, crime-infested, and virtually hopeless areas so familiar to many large cities. Even moderate-sized communities have effectively utilized RDAs to create clean, productive, people-friendly neighborhoods where once urban wastelands lay. But as often as not over the past half-century, redevelopment law in California and in other parts of the country has been misused, some would say abused.

Attorney M. David Stirling (mds@pacificlegal.org) is vice president of Pacific Legal Foundation (www.pacificlegal.org), a public interest legal organization that defends private property rights. This article reflects his views and not necessarily those of the foundation.

Of redevelopment's several controversial elements, two in particular stand out as the most vulnerable to misuse. The first is the lack of clear definition — and RDAs' selective application — of redevelopment's triggering mechanism, the designation of "blight." The second is the grossly expanded interpretation of the term "public use," as contained in the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution. ("... nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.")

THE ORIGINAL definition of "blight" in California law was taken from the federal government's urban renewal statute of 1949. In that law, Congress did not define blight in clear, unambiguous language. Instead, the statute provided federal funds for a "slum area or a blighted, deteriorated, or deteriorating area." By granting the urban renewal administrator unfettered discretion to decide what property-characteristics fit within the statute's purpose, Congress effectively set the future course for blight designation. As a result, the U.S. Supreme Court's controlling precedent (in *Berman v. Parker*, 1954) essentially defined blight to be in the eye of the beholder.

Following Congress's lead, mid-century California legislators created a definition of blight as amorphous as is the federal statute. *Sacramento Bee* columnist Dan Walters wrote recently (the *Bee*, June 15, 2004) that over the years "local officials stretched the definition to ludicrous lengths. One city even declared unoccupied, undeveloped marshland to be 'blighted' because it was subject to periodic flooding." Walters observed that blight was misused to make way for "shopping centers, auto malls, big-box retailers, and other projects," primarily for the purpose of generating additional sales tax revenues to make up for property tax revenues lost to redevelopment projects. Although 1993 amendments to the redevelopment statute purported to (and did to a degree) make blight designations more difficult to impose, in practice, with relatively few exceptions, any city lured by redevelopment's economic incentives can still declare blight without fear its designation will be challenged, much less set aside.

When property owners in modest neighborhoods are told that their properties have been designated as blighted, virtually none realize the impact that designation has on their property. No one unfamiliar with redevelopment law (about 99.9 percent of the population) understands how the initial blight determination is made. In practice, the city (or county) contracts with and pays a consultant with past experience in making blight determinations. In the earlier-mentioned San Jose Redevelopment Project case, Elaine Evans' court brief showed the consultant's blight-bias by revealing that the agency contracted to pay the consultant \$338,080.00, in return for which it would "produce a blight analysis to be used by the agency . . . to demonstrate that all or part of the Survey Area is blighted . . . in order to justify the inclusion of that geographic area within a proposed redevelopment project area." When the process is understood, what property owners are up against becomes all too clear. For those in the blight assessment business, *not* finding blight is not in their interest.

The term "public use," contained in the Fifth Amendment, was intended to limit government's ability to seize private property through eminent domain, the process used by RDAs to acquire "the project area." What historically was considered a "public use" — and what most people still today readily accept as a public use, *i.e.*, building a highway, constructing a school, a jail, a post office, and the like — only raises the question of how much money the government will pay the owner for his property. Over the past several decades, however, as modern, more ambitious planners came to regard the traditional notion of public use as too confining, the term was mutated into

Family Owned
**SCREEN
PROCESS**
Colby
Since 1946
**LETTER-
PRESS**

POSTER PRINTING CO.

POLITICAL SIGN SPECIALISTS!

11"x14" to 4'x8' And Larger!

ALL WEATHER Coroplast & Polycoat Stock

Street / Yard Signs ★ Demonstration Signs

Bus Signs ★ Billboards ★ Banners

52" Inkjet Printer QUICK TURN AROUND

(800) 956-7707

Tel: 213-747-5108
Fax: 213-747-3209
1332 W. 12th Place, Los Angeles, CA 90015 www.colbyposter.com

the almost limitless standard of “public benefit.” This resulted in what is now routine practice: if the RDA makes a plausible showing that its seizure of the property will benefit the public sooner or later, reviewing courts generally uphold the taking.

Invariably, the public benefit standard — as compared with the public use limitation — promotes the RDA practice of taking one private party’s property to give to another private party. In Chula Vista, for example, the RDA utilized eminent domain to take a privately-owned 3.2 acre parcel with an old building and give it to a major corporation at a below-market-value price, in order to build a parking lot. In exchange, the corporation agreed that within six years it would develop the adjacent property it already owned. The RDA justified taking the previous owner’s land arguing that the increased business activity and employment at the corporation’s new facility would generate greater city tax revenues, benefitting the public.

In Cypress, the Cottonwood Christian Center applied for a permit to build a \$50 million worship center on the 15-acre parcel it had owned for several years. The city council, however, preferring Costco’s proposal to build a big retail store on the property,

went so far as to assert that Cottonwood’s proposed religious center would itself constitute “blight” and a “public nuisance.” Again, the justification for using eminent domain was the public benefit Costco’s big retail store would provide by way of increased business activity, local employment, and sales tax revenues, compared with a religious center. Countless government take-overs of private property for public benefit have occurred throughout California, and around the nation, and they continue.

ONE OTHER redevelopment concern that deserves mention is the revenue-generating incentive called “tax increment financing” (TIF). Most often, TIF explains why so many communities establish and promote active RDAs. Once a redevelopment project is established, property values within the project area appreciate, in turn generating increased property tax revenues. 100 percent of those revenues remain with the RDA to spend at will and without citizen oversight; and not just for a limited time, but for the life of the project: often 30 years or more. None of the RDA’s increased property tax revenues flow to overlapping local government agencies — such as the local school district — to pay for increased services those entities must provide the project area. This is but one of several bizarre characteristics of redevelopment law.

Thomas Jefferson observed, “The natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground.” One of the surest ways for a citizenry to lose its liberties is to sit by idly while ever-more overreaching government planners — those in power over us — devise complicated programs to extinguish our fundamental right to own and use private property. The onerous burden of eminent domain in the redevelopment context falls almost entirely on modest neighborhoods, where homes and businesses are peopled not by the financially, legally, or politically connected, but by those with few resources to resist.

With California’s median-priced home values making home ownership affordable to fewer households daily, and small businesses struggling ever harder to compete, it is critical that local government’s vast power of eminent domain be used with care. While redevelopment has its legitimate uses, it also uproots and disperses families and destroys mom-and-pop businesses. Instead of growing government intrusiveness, it would be much more constructive to grow the notion of community pride and individual responsibility, whereby all small property and business owners can strive for a piece of the American dream.

CPR

**“ONE OF THE BEST,
IF NOT THE BEST”**

AND CLOSE TO THE CAPITOL



400 L Street

(Across from Macy’s)

Steaks, Chops, Fish, Pastas

Full Service Bar

Catering - Private Room

(916) 448-2847

THE FRONT LINE

Fall line-up by Ray Haynes

The fall lineup is relatively thin for conservatives. The legislative caucuses are still solidly conservative with Senator Dick Ackerman as senate leader and the overwhelming majority of GOP assemblymen firmly committed to conservative principles. Conservatives are likely to continue to control the policy direction of the legislative caucuses after November.

The governor's office is more problematic. His legislative operation, headed by Richard Costigan, and his finance operation, headed by Donna Arduin, have a decided conservative tilt. But his agencies and departments have trouble seeing that the governor's interest is not served by pursuing the Gray Davis policies that brought him his recall. Some agency heads — Fred Aguiar, for instance — are long-time conservative heroes. Others, like Kim Belshe and Marybel Batjer, operate under the long-held conviction that belief in smaller government is an historical anachronism. They push the governor to increase spending in their agencies, and, in some ways, have pressed him into decisions that undermined his position in the budget

*Ray Haynes represents
California's 66th Assembly District.*

negotiations. The governor would best serve himself by listening to Arduin on fiscal issues and leaving his agency heads to operate within the restrictions she places on them.

As for the legislative elections, November offers conservatives slim pickings. Tricia Hunter and Steve Kuykendahl, not known for their commitment to the principles of family, freedom, and free enter-



prise, are bidding to return to the Legislature from San Diego and Long Beach respectively.

Hunter, in her previous political life, made her name as The Republican Most Likely to Attack Her Fellow Republicans (if they are pro-life, the Party's most loyal activists). Kuykendahl is similarly challenged about recognizing his political friends. Make no mistake, their Democrat opponents (Lori Saldana against Hunter and Betty Karnette against Kuykendahl) are left-wing nutballs committed to

destroying California's future. But Hunter and Kuykendahl, should they return and resume their past political habits, should be expected to stir up more trouble than cooperation among their fellow Republicans.

Others, like Bob Pohl in Santa Barbara, Steve Poizner in Palo Alto, and Alan Wapner in Ontario are not known for their conservative political activism. And little is so far known about Paul Betancourt in Fresno.

On the brighter side, a solid conservative, Dean Gardner, is running for assembly in the Fresno-Bakersfield area and another, Gary Podesto, is running for senate in Stockton. Gardner would have won two years ago had he not been abandoned by assembly GOP leadership, and Podesto has been the popular mayor of Stockton for years now. (See *CPR's* in-depth look at Dean Gardner's race, this issue, page 23.)

Each election offers a new opportunity to prove once again that a solid conservative can take out an incumbent Democrat. So it is time for conservatives to work. If these two seats move from "D" to "R," they should — but won't — end the eternal liberal chanting that conservatives can't win in California. More importantly, they will add critical pro-family, pro-freedom reinforcements to GOP ranks in Sacramento.

CPR