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empirical research. Simply repeating these recommendations in a journal article, along with an appropriate reference, does not necessarily make them true. The type of research-practice linkage that is needed would be a compromise between Golant's overly pessimistic approach and Hunt's overly confident one.

Housing Preference Research

Several of the articles deal with a familiar problem for planners: how to use survey research (possibly in tandem with other sources) in order to formulate a needs estimate or to design a building or program. While the articles do not break new ground they do at least alert the reader to some of the pitfalls involved.

Citing a study by Prosper (1987), Monk and Kaye estimate that there are currently "3 million elderly functionally eligible for congregate housing" (p. 13). They do not indicate, however, how this estimate was derived.

Granger and Kaye's chapter, "Assessing Consumer Need and Demand for Service-Assisted Housing in Pennsylvania," aims to improve such estimates by showing how they used the results of a mailed questionnaire survey. (Service assisted housing [SAH] refers to an apartment complex for the independent elderly which is linked to adaptable levels of supportive services, minimal health care, and personal care which are provided only as needed and on a fee-for-service basis.) The survey used for the chapter revealed that 23% of the elderly would be interested in SAH. Applying this percentage to the number of Pennsylvania elderly provides a needs estimate of about 550,000.

Unfortunately, their approach is overly simplistic. As Pollak et al. (1985) indicate, the expression of interest does not necessarily indicate who will actually move in once a senior citizen housing project is built. Consequently, Granger and Kaye's estimate is probably unrealistically high.

Social surveys have also frequently been used to design particular aspects of buildings or to develop packages of social services. Lawton offers some wise advice on the "state-of-the-art" of such surveys. On the one hand, there have been so many preference studies completed that care must be taken to avoid repeating previous investigations. On the other hand, there is a need for more sophisticated preference research. For example, when surveyed many elderly downplay medical services because it implies institutional care. However, there are good reasons to have a resident nurse and a doctor with regular office hours. Research with adequately sized samples is therefore needed "to inform us about which are most security-inducing and which are unimportant or even actively disliked by the residents" (p. 175).

In conclusion, it should be obvious that the two books are quite different. Keigher focuses on the coping strategies of inner-city elderly residents. Kaye and Monk concentrate on implementation issues related to congregate housing.

The two volumes do, however, share a common theme: that a housing policy for the elderly should stress prevention of decline and maintenance of independence as well as meeting the needs of those in greatest need. Such a housing policy, if implemented, would lead to an expansion of medical outreach and housing repair services and an increase in the number of congregate housing projects containing a mixture of healthy and frail residents. I hope that these two books are scrutinized by members of the new Clinton Administration as they develop housing policy for the elderly.

David P. Varady
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The last few years have seen the publication of several books on growth management including the two reviewed here. (Brower et al. 1989; Schiffman 1989; Mantell et al. 1990; DeGrove 1991; Caves 1992; Knapp and Nelson 1992; Stein 1992; deHaven Smith 1992; Glickfield and Levine 1992; DeGrove 1992; Kelly 1993). They follow a recent surge in urban growth management policies adopted across the United States.

According to Professor Stein, the purpose of his collection is to "further knowledge about current U.S. experience with growth management planning and the struggle to define the collective future of our built environment" (p. viii).
Most of the articles focus on state policies, which constitute a smaller but still important part of the recent story. The book is organized into four parts and contains material using both comparative and case study methods. The first part examines the role of government in growth management, the second discusses specific state programs, the third targets key issues and the fourth presents Stein's conclusion calling for broadening growth management to include economic development planning. The essays in the first part offer different interpretations of the effectiveness of increasing government involvement at all levels in growth management. Stein considers this growth paradoxical, as it occurred during politically conservative times. In the opening chapter John DeGrove and Patricia M. Metzger describe how local, regional, and state government have distinct but integral roles in growth management which must be coordinated to ensure success. They argue that success requires society to maintain a broad based consensus of support for growth management. Judith Innes echoes these arguments when in the following chapter she describes state growth management systems as mixed systems of shared power and joint deliberation. She believes that statewide growth management programs are coordinating strategies whose success requires face-to-face discussions, negotiations, and other processes between the relevant actors. Part one closes with Marc Smith's chapter offering a possible explanation for why coordination and consensus building have become so important. He suggests that newer growth management efforts have increased the potential for conflict by adding new objectives concerning quality of life and sprawl to traditionally local zoning concerns about preserving neighborhood property values and maintaining local fiscal strength. He elaborates on the sources of these conflicts and calls for a larger state and regional role to help resolve them. All these authors see coordination as the major element of increasing government involvement in managing growth. If this is true, then it may resolve Stein's paradox. Legislators may be embracing greater coordination as a vehicle to achieve the so-called conservative goals of a smaller and more efficient government.

The second part of the book describes growth management in Oregon, Florida, Georgia, New Jersey, and California. Here again the value of coordination emerges as an important lesson. Deborah Howe writes that coordination is a key to success in Oregon, Earl Starnes describes top-down and bottom-up approaches to coordination in Florida and Georgia, John Epling presents a middle-path to coordination in New Jersey called cross-acceptance, and William Fulton decries the lack of coordination in California and calls for greater state and regional intervention to help local growth management transcend the arbitrary planning boundaries currently being used.

Specific issues addressed in part three include the environment, economic development, housing, traffic, and infrastructure finance. Elizabeth Burns and Dudley Onderdonk tell the history of the sensitive lands ordinance in Scottsdale, Arizona, and conclude that sustained political support is important for success. Scott Bollens writes that a greater state role in local planning is justified when positive or negative spillovers across jurisdictional boundaries result from local decisions and discusses alternative strategies that have been attempted to assert the state's interest in these situations. Genevieve Giuliano and Martin Wachs review evidence about the effectiveness of transportation demand management (TDM) and conclude that powerful incentives are required to change work trip travel behavior and TDM may involve significant costs. Charles Connelly and Nancy Muller review housing elements in local plans adopted under Florida's 1985 growth management law and find them to be inadequate. They believe this is the result of both will and ignorance and suggest an even stronger state role in requiring and assisting in the preparation of strong housing elements. James Nicholas explains the need for creativity and innovation in local infrastructure finance and discusses exactions, impact fees, special assessments, and conditions of development approval as means of providing public facilities. These chapters add to the impression that piecemeal local planning will not achieve the goals of growth management and that a more coordinated statewide effort is needed.

Many of the authors seemed convinced that coordination offers not only the most common, but most effective feature of new state growth management programs. I believe, however, that a highly coordinated growth machine (Molotch 1976) would be even less capable than an uncoordinated one of achieving many of the adopted goals of growth management plans, such as housing for all and a clean environment. A more important aspect of the new state growth programs is their requirement that growth machinations be constrained by certain fundamental requirements such as the provision of sufficient land for housing and the protection of critical environmental lands and natural resources. Stein's conclusion criticizes how the issues addressed in growth management have been framed too narrowly. He argues that changes in the world economy have generated weak U.S. economic performance, uneven spatial growth, economic dislocation and hardship, and intensified competition. These circumstances require us to make economic development planning part of growth management. He sees this occurring in at least four areas, including the coordination of infrastructure planning with economic development, streamlining permitting, improving government coordination, and investing in human capital.

Professor Caves' book, Land Use Planning: The Ballot Box Revolution, focuses on local growth management and explicitly recognizes the political struggles that lie therein. What happens when citizens don't like the development policies of local officials and cannot obtain growth control through conventional means? They take another course of action: they
use initiatives and referenda. Using evidence from his case studies Caves concludes that citizens mount direct democracy campaigns because they want to reduce the negative externalities of growth and that efforts to do so by conventional means are too easily opposed by well-financed groups whose wealth and power is tied to the urban growth machine. These local citizen movements are, I believe, composed of many of the same groups that support strong state growth management laws. Local initiatives and referenda are different but politically related ways of limiting the power of the local growth machine.

I found Caves’ book an especially welcome contribution because it fills a significant gap in the literature on the relationship between direct democracy and growth management. It is the only book that I know of on the subject.

The opening chapters present useful background information. The first chapter explores political theory about direct and representative democracy. This sets up the fundamental debate which surrounds the use of ballot box planning between those who see it as antiplanning versus those that see it as a valid tool. It also describes the evolution of direct democracy in the U.S., tracing it to New England town meetings and the efforts of populists and progressives to reduce government corruption. The second chapter examines the growth of ballot box planning and why citizens turn to it. Citizen activists, it seems, do not trust local officials, but believe that policy makers ignore the negative effects of growth. The third chapter considers the legal issues of direct democracy and how states vary in their willingness to allow citizens to use the ballot box for planning.

Except for the conclusion, the remainder of the book contains four case studies of initiative and referenda fights in Cape Code, Portland (Maine), San Diego, and Seattle. Each case, based on interviews and secondary sources, examines what events prompted the movement, who was for and against the measures, how the campaigns were financed, what happened after the measures were adopted, and other questions. As someone who was involved in the Seattle case, I can say that Cave’s account matches my own. Systematic attention to the same research questions helps readers compare the cases which, unfortunately, they must do for themselves. Cave’s disappointing concluding chapter summarizes when it should compare the cases and offer the reader a review of the legal and theoretical literature in light of the case findings. Perhaps Professor Caves will do that for us in a future work.

Gary Pivo
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Quantitative analysis in planning has grown increasingly sophisticated in recent decades. The infusion of social science has made statistical significance seem to be the essential criterion for judging what is important in academic planning. How well has this quantitative revolution served the graduates of academic planning programs? Only half-well most will agree. While electronic spreadsheets provide an invaluable tool for many practitioners, most statistical methods and theory have found little use in planning practice. It may be that we simply haven’t trained our students well enough. Or maybe the training was fine but the students simply weren’t bright enough to benefit. Or maybe the training was fine and the students were bright, but the nature of planning practice is all wrong. For whatever reason there has been a serious misfit.

Page and Patton offer us an unusually attractive book in its cover and design. Unfortunately, although the book does