

**AGENDA**  
**Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee (MVPAC)**

**Wednesday, April 24, 2013**  
**9:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.**  
**1290 Broadway**  
**Independence Pass Board Room**

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. March 20, 2013 Meeting Summary  
(Attachment A)

**ACTION ITEMS**

4. **Recommendations regarding call for projects for FY14 and FY15 Station Area Master Plan or Urban Centers studies; specifically related to “pooling” funds, project eligibility, and project evaluation.** (35 minutes)  
(Attachment B)  
Brad Calvert

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

5. Crafting Regional Scenarios – Metro Vision 2040 (25 minutes)  
(Attachment C)  
Brad Calvert
6. Local Government Survey – First Draft (10 minutes)  
(Attachment D)  
Brad Calvert

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

7. Announcements (10 minutes)
  - MVPAC Small Group Meetings
  - April 2013 – DRCOG Board Items
  - Metro Vision 2040 Project Management worksheet
8. Next Meeting – May 15, 2013 (Potential Agenda Items Below)
  - Transportation – Regional Vision Network
  - Regional Equity Atlas
9. Other Matters by Members
10. Adjournment

*Disabled attendees are asked to notify DRCOG at least 48 hours in advance of the need for auxiliary aids or services*

*We make life better!*



## ATTACHMENT A

### MEETING SUMMARY Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee (MVPAC) Wednesday, March 20, 2013

---

#### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Christopher Auxier	Adams Cty. Housing Authority
Kim Burnett	Mile High Connects
Erin Fosdick	City of Longmont
Steve Glueck	City of Golden
Steve Gordon	City and County of Denver
Randy Harrison	RW Harrison & Associates
Steve Hebert	City of Lone Tree
Andy Hill	CO Dept. of Local Affairs
Glenda Lainis	City of Thornton
Kyle Legleiter	The Colorado Health Foundation
Bryce Merrill	Western States Arts Federation
Lynn Merwin	City and County of Broomfield
Ann Norton	Ann Norton Law Offices
Katherine (Kati) Rider	Douglas County
Frederick Rollenhagen	Clear Creek County
Jerome Tinianow	City and County of Denver
Will Toor	Southwest Energy Efficiency Project
Glen Van Nimwegen	City of Littleton
Robert Watkins	City of Aurora
Brad Weinig	Enterprise Community Partners

DRCOG staff: Teri Whitmore, Brad Calvert, Nicole Klepadlo, Casey Collins

#### Call to Order

Steve Glueck, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

#### Public Comment

There was no public comment given.

#### Summary of February 20, 2013 Meeting

The meeting summary was accepted.

### **INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS**

#### **Metro Vision 2040 Local Government Survey**

Brad Calvert continued last month's discussion on developing a local government survey to identify local government priorities, and their policy practices and challenges. The goal is to have survey design completed in May, with results available in Summer, 2013. A preliminary draft of survey questions will be provided to the committee at next month's meeting (April 24).

Brad briefed on potential survey questions he received from members since last meeting, including:

- How well are innovative land use policies working, given current market forces. Is the market commanding concepts such as mixed-use, etc.
- What is the importance of cross-regional transportation connections (suburb to suburb commute)
- How is public responding to change in household trends (more singles, less families, empty-nesters, multi-generational).
- Describe the efforts to become more self-sufficient (tax base, programs).
- What strategies are in place to provide a range of housing choices.

- What are strategies to connect all residents to job opportunities (regional and local)
- Summarize economic growth strategies.

Member comments:

- A local government survey should give an indication of how local governments perceive the intersection/overlap between housing, transportation, land use, school, health outcomes, and job opportunities/job training. The member related that San Francisco (Bay Area) does overlay mapping of the transportation system and job training opportunities, based on their primary industry clusters.
- Is this was a one-time survey? Brad said yes, but could be used again in the future.
- The lessons learned will be critical, such as several areas - 1) resistance to densification and 2) economic uplift.
- Asked that the survey get into detail, but not overwhelm. Concerned about how long it would take to fill the form out.
- Asked for a more specific laundry list, and noted an arts and culture sector was not listed. Brad said sector-specific analysis will be done more in-depth further along the line.
- Concerned that the survey respondent be appropriate. The person who fills out form can make answers variable.
- Is the survey is being used to validate the Listening Tour? The survey, while being qualitative, should also have quantitative data (open-ended) as well, so this committee can evaluate.
- Brad said input from the recent Board workshop will also be incorporated in the survey.
- Brad said the survey will be getting a “more constrained” vision from local governments than the “unconstrained” vision used in the Listening Tour.
- Is important to employ a marketing effort to motivate respondents to participate in this survey, as it is a detailed survey.
- This survey could be an excellent tool for DRCOG to use as an opportunity to provide regional training on topics such as regional best practices. Survey would entice more people to respond to the survey, if there would be a benefit.
- Recommended a marketing effort to communities, such as in introductory email notifying them of the importance of the survey.

**Economic Development Scope of Work**

Brad Calvert presented a “big picture” overview on the development of a regional economic development scope within the Metro Vision. DRCOG staff is further developing the scope over the next few weeks, with key input from this committee, the Metro Denver Economic Development Corporation (MDEDC), and SCI Consortium members.

An RFQ for consultant services for more in-depth development will be issued in April 2013. Brad said the consultant will be reporting regularly on work progress to the committee. Brad briefed the committee on meetings with the MDEDC (March 19) and the SCI Consortium (March 22).

MDEDC and SCI discussion highlights included:

- “A well-planned region is critically important to economic development” (planning matters)
- Transportation as an economic asset may be at a “tipping point” (from asset to liability)
- Lack of housing options to attract young families (“what they want – we don’t have”)
- Communities should focus on attracting and growing primary jobs (“our current tax policy is killing us”)
- Businesses focus on business costs in making location decisions – but some are looking for places that reflect their corporate identity
- There is a need for multi-jurisdictional cooperation around transit stations

- Not just about transportation, water and workforce anymore – also access to high speed internet
- DIA is an incredible asset/connector
- Generation Y has very different consumption patterns than previous generations (e.g., are more likely to buy technology vs. cars)

Key findings (of MDEDC group polling):

*Urban Centers*

- MDEDC participants (approximately 50) were unfamiliar with DRCOG's urban centers concept.
- 44% were not aware that the region has designated urban centers as priority areas for growth.
- 61% felt it was important to *prioritize growth areas* around the region.
- Less than 10% were aware of the "50/75" goal (50% of new housing and 75% of new employment) within a designated urban center area. The MDEDC group felt the 75% goal was unrealistic.

Member comments:

- Is there is any data to validate the MDEDC group's perspective that 75% is unrealistic?
- A member said the MDEDC felt job sectors (aerospace, energy, technology, and financial centers) were not compatible with urban centers.
- Colorado is a small business state, where some businesses are predisposed to urban centers, some not. The member recommended a nuanced analysis and breaking out industry clusters.

---

*Housing Choice*

- A lack of housing options for young families is hurting recruitment efforts
- Need more options that are close to quality schools, to transit, to employment, and affordable.
- MDEDC was split as to whether housing for families was impacting their efforts.

---

*Last Mile Challenge*

- The difficulty of getting from rail-transit stations to employment and vice versa is minimizing the value of rail-transit to employers.
- 82% felt the last mile challenge is a problem and over 70% indicated it is impacting their work.

Member comments:

- Is the last mile discussion focused on the transportation, or land-use. Brad said the MDEDC didn't get to that level, but recognizes it as an issue.

---

*Airports*

- Near unanimity in group that DIA needs more international flights and regional airports are underappreciated asset.

---

*Tax Policy and self sufficiency*

- 75% of the group indicated that current tax policy is a primary barrier. "Our tax policies are killing us". Current tax policies are not generating enough revenue and the future is bleaker.
- Communities should focus on attracting and growing primary jobs.

Member comments:

- The current economic development view is retail-focused to bring in the sales tax, but should focus more on bringing in primary jobs that in turn, bring in retail.
- Economic spending changes (including less spending on durable goods, etc.) are making revenue generation unsustainable.

- Entrepreneurial/micro business communities were not included in the conversation. 'Universities of innovation' concept should be captured as well.
- Need to discuss anti-poaching issues.

---

Brad said the MDECD group prioritized last mile challenges and tax policy as primary areas the economic development community and DRCOG can most work together to address.

Other topics discussed at the March 19 MDEDC meeting:

- *Road infrastructure* (interstates and more). Need to include a broader geography, entire Front Range.
- *Connectivity* is critical. Roads are important, but so is high speed internet access, noting Colorado is middle of the road in fiber infrastructure/internet access and losing ground.
- *Workforce development*. "Can't find enough qualified workers"

The MDEDC group noted:

- Primary jobs aren't always going to end up in urban centers, but urban centers are critical to attraction and retention. A vital downtown is important, but having smaller centers with urban amenities in surrounding communities is critical too.
- Attracting employers is not so much about site selection, but rather site elimination (sound planning keeps you in the competition longer).

Member comments:

- Could be helpful to make a check list to compare the economic development priorities for site selection with what an urban center can offer – so that we can understand how to create critical mass at urban centers.
- Member agreed the 75% new employment rate may be excessive, but the need for larger areas of space for urban center is intriguing.
- Commended the discussion with the MDECD, especially to know more branding of the urban centers concept is needed. Encouraged regular discussions with MDEDC.
- May be a gap in the MDEDC group's concept of the importance of urban centers.
- How can the MDEDC and this committee further work together? Brad noted MDEDC was agreeable to ongoing conversation.
- Is within DRCOG's reach to address last-mile and urban centers issues, but questioned if the DRCOG Board had the willingness to take on tax policy issues.
- Is a good opportunity to align the Denver regional economic branding messaging/ communication with both the MDECD and Metro Vision.

### **Metro Vision 2040 Housing Scope of Work**

Nicole Klepadlo continued the discussion on the regional housing scope of work. A scope of work is expected to be developed by end of April/early May 2013.

She reviewed that as part of HUD's SCI grant, the development of a Regional Fair Housing and Equity Assessment (FHEA) is required. A further step to develop a Regional Analysis of Impediments (RAI) is encouraged, but HUD guidance on RAI requirements is not yet available. Nicole said DRCOG is proceeding with the FHEA, but is continuing back-burner discussions with key stakeholders (entitlement communities) on possible RAI development.

Nicole said peer SCI grantees (in Seattle, Boston, and Houston) were compared to see how they are proceeding with their scopes of work.

- Seattle will proceed with a FHEA, and will set up a platform for a future RAI. (She noted a Seattle representative will be presenting on Seattle's practices at the DRCOG Denver Regional SCI Full Consortium meeting on March 22.)

- Boston, with the largest scope of work, will proceed with a FHEA, and will not be completing a RAI. Boston will be doing a regional housing plan and needs assessment.
- Houston is doing the FHEA only, focusing on best practices, and will not expand their scope to do a RAI.

Nicole said the FHEA process challenges grantees to explore additional local data categories. The stakeholder process identified additional categories such as aging populations, food access, health indicators, and crime. Nicole related that stakeholders felt DRCOG could educate on fair housing with a regional focus.

Other scope of work ideas included looking at regional realtor lending practices, planning and zoning policies, exploring a housing trust fund/a regional inclusionary housing ordinance, and generating a comparison of FHEA-required data and what entitlement communities are required to enter into their various HUD-required plans.

#### Member comments on other scope ideas:

- Regional data-sharing of (non-controversial) data is important and this is chance to leverage an opportunity with this grant. The member noted that with a commitment to create an RAI, there is also a commitment to address gaps found. Asked about the possibility of differences in what a local government feels is important as opposed to a regionally-identified need.
- Member asked if there is an emphasis on Fair Housing and was it because of the SCI grant. Nicole said stakeholders' and MVPAC discussions can be expanded to other housing topics as well. Member would like to see moving towards affordable housing topics, such as a regional affordable housing needs assessment, maybe affordable housing committees, etc.
- Affordable workforce/transportation gaps were a key topic. Also, integration of livability and housing goals. Brad said some topics will overlap and staff will craft a scope from general topics.
- Internet access and linkage to housing was important.
- Showing linkages is critical (affordability – housing- jobs-transportation)
- Member agreed that a regional housing needs assessment is important. Looking at different levels of affordability, and housing needs and show linkages.
- Show linkages between housing/jobs/transportation. Asked for a mapping component.
- The 50/75 goal is more practical if stated as “to be located where it is reasonable to access without an automobile. Member noted the DRCOG formulation is to focus on SOV usage, not blaming the automobile.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

- Brad noted two MVPAC Small Group Meetings were scheduled:
  - Incorporating Equity Measures – April 10 @ 3:00 p.m.
  - Quantifying Fiscal Impacts – April 16 @ 9:00 a.m.The Modeling 101 small group meeting date is to be determined.
- The March 25 DRCOG Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) will be discussing Scenario Analysis. Brad will email the TAC memo to the committee for information.
- The March 20 DRCOG Board will discuss the recently formed 25 member Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and the UGB/A Allocation – Request for Delay. Brad will report on the Board's urban growth boundary discussion at the next MVPAC meeting on April 24.

- Several topics on urban centers (data centers, and a \$1.985 million allocation for urban centers around transit centers in the FY14-15 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) will be discussed at the next MVPAC meeting on April 24.
  - Steve Hebert asked that urban centers discussion include how much of the vacant land in urban centers is redevelopable (zoning).
  - Brad said he will also include capacity based on the regulatory environment.
  - Steve Glueck recommended the book, Triumph of the City, by Edward Glaeser, on why zoning is a problem.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:07 a.m. The next scheduled meeting is April 24, 2013.

## ATTACHMENT B

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee

From: Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, Regional Planning and Operations  
303 480-6839 or bcalvert@drcog.org

Subject: **FY14-15 Station Area/Urban Centers Studies**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 24, 2013	Action	4

### REQUESTED ACTION

Recommendations regarding call for projects for FY14 and FY15 Station Area Master Plan or Urban Centers studies; specifically related to “pooling” funds, project eligibility, and project evaluation.

### SUMMARY

- The primary goal of the Station Area/Urban Centers Studies program is to support a shared local and regional strategy promoting growth in urban centers and transit-oriented communities – resulting in detailed local visions and action strategies that contribute to the achievement of regional goals.

#### Available Funds and Proposal to “Pool” Funds\*

- A total of \$3,500,000 federal CMAQ funds were available during the initial call for projects associated with original FY12-17 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) in fall 2010. At that time funds were programmed into FY12-15.
- \$1.435M was awarded to studies in the fall of 2010. \$1.985M remains as a reserve in the FY14-15 (TIP ID: 2007-089).
- In order to allocate the reserve funds to individual projects DRCOG staff recommends that Station Area/Urban Center Studies be designated as a “pool” in the FY12-17 TIP. If a pool is created DRCOG staff will make minor changes to the *Policy on TIP Preparation* administratively (e.g., update table that lists pools in the TIP).
- Other pools currently in the TIP are the Regional Traffic Signal System Improvement Program (TSSIP) and the Regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program.
  - Projects in pools are evaluated and identified in the TIP at times other than the broad TIP call for funding requests (i.e., the original call for projects in 2010).
  - Unique eligibility rules and evaluation criteria may be proposed for pools when the pool’s selection process is developed.

#### Proposed Study Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria

- The attached documents detail proposed Project Eligibility Rules and Evaluation Criteria. These criteria would serve as the “new” criteria for the proposed pool and “replace” the existing criteria in the *Policy on TIP Preparation* (existing criteria attached – Table 15). A brief summary of the proposed Project Eligibility Rules and Evaluation Criteria follows.
  - Four types of studies are eligible (corridor-wide studies, urban center and station area plans, next steps studies, and area implementation activities).
  - DRCOG staff will determine eligibility based on the Project Eligibility Rules.
  - If requested federal funds are less than or equal to federal funds available (\$1.985M) all eligible projects will be programmed into either FY14 or FY15.
  - If requested federal funds exceed federal funds available the Evaluation Criteria will be applied to the proposed projects. Two evaluation methods will be used.
    - The Evaluation Criteria details regional priorities within each project type (e.g., corridor-wide studies and next steps studies).
    - A second evaluation will include DRCOG staff and an external committee reviewing individual proposals and scoring the proposal based on the criteria outlined.

- All funding recommendations will be forwarded to the DRCOG Board for approval.

Other Station Area/Urban Centers Studies Eligibility Items

- Sponsors are limited to two studies per fiscal year.
- No more than \$200,000 in federal funds in aggregate can be awarded for transportation-related planning activities at an individual station and/or urban center (total of funds awarded for preparation of a plan/study and any “next step” plans/studies over ALL TIP cycles for which planning funds have been/are awarded). Prior to the call for projects DRCOG will make available a current accounting of planning funds previously awarded to urban centers and station areas.

Eligibility Requirements and Commitments for All TIP Projects

- Minimum federal funding request for studies is \$75K, with a minimum required local match of 20%.
- Eligible applicants include county and municipal governments; regional agencies (i.e., RTD, RAQC and DRCOG), and the state.

Today’s Discussion

- Does MVPAC support “pooling” the Station Area/Urban Center Study funds?
  - The call for projects can move forward without pooling, but will be governed by the original eligibility and evaluation criteria outlined in the *Policy on TIP Preparation* – appropriate excerpt attached.
- If MVPAC supports creating a pool, what eligibility and evaluation criteria should be recommended to the DRCOG Board?

Next Steps

- If applicable, forward MVPAC recommendations to the Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC), followed by DRCOG Board.
- Develop application for call for projects.
- Solicit applications (early summer).
- Evaluate and recommend funding awards to MVIC (late summer).

**PRIOR BOARD ACTION**

- *Policy on TIP Preparation* – July 2010

**FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

N/A

**ALTERNATIVES**

- Recommend establishing a Station Area/Urban Centers Studies pool in the TIP to the DRCOG Board
- Do not recommend establishing a Station Area/Urban Centers Studies pool in the TIP to the DRCOG Board
- If a pool is recommended, further recommend proposed study eligibility and evaluation criteria

**PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Staff recommends establishing a Station Area/Urban Centers Studies pool and adjust the *Policy on TIP Preparation* accordingly.
- Staff further recommends the attached:
  - FY 14-15 Station Area/Urban Centers Studies – Project Eligibility Rules
  - FY 14-15 Station Area/Urban Centers Studies - Evaluation Criteria

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- Attachments:
  - B-1. Draft FY 14-15 Station Area/Urban Centers Studies – Project Eligibility Criteria

B-2. Draft FY 14-15 Station Area/Urban Centers Studies - Evaluation Criteria

B-3. Policy on TIP Preparation – Excerpt (Table 15. Station Area/Urban Center Studies)

## **FY 14-15 Station Area/Urban Centers Studies – Project Eligibility Rules**

Station Area Master Plans or Urban Center Studies should encourage further implementation of the fiscally constrained regional transit network at existing or future rapid transit station locations OR enhance the implementation of urban centers identified in the Metro Vision 2035 plan. Such studies include the four types of planning studies described below. Sponsors are limited to two studies per fiscal year (i.e. each sponsor could have as many as two studies in FY14 and two studies in FY15).

### **1.) Corridor-wide studies focusing on:**

- Maximizing multi-modal connectivity within transit corridors and at individual station areas/urban centers along the corridor
- Identifying barriers to station area development and increased transit use along the corridor – barriers could include current land use, zoning and development standards; parking availability and cost; inadequate supportive infrastructure, etc.
- Creating corridor-wide implementation strategies and/or an action plan identifying such things as needed plan updates, code revisions, and financial or regulatory incentive

*Corridor-wide studies must involve all the local jurisdictions and other major stakeholders along the corridor.*

### **2.) Creation and adoption of an “original” or updated station area master plan or urban center study. The scope for such a plan/study must include:**

#### Stakeholder Engagement

- Outreach and engagement process that promotes the involvement of stakeholders in the study area, with efforts and accommodations made to include low to moderate income, minority, and elderly or disabled citizens.
- Involvement by DRCOG, any relevant transit agency, and the public in the development of the plan.

#### Placemaking

- Identification (map) of type and density of future land uses, including public spaces.
- Internal circulation plan(s) (maps or graphics) for motor vehicles, transit, bicycle and pedestrian and strategies to increase multi-modal connections with the larger region.
- Identifying barriers (e.g. parking, zoning, infrastructure, etc.) to station area and/or urban center development.
- Detailed development strategies that allow people of all ages, incomes and abilities to access a range of housing, employment, and service opportunities.
- A market or fiscal feasibility analysis that assesses plan recommendations and ensures the proposed plan is realistic, including financing recommendations where applicable.

#### Action Plan and Implementation Strategies

- A clear and realistic action plan to address key findings, including identification of necessary policy or regulatory changes (e.g. comprehensive plan, zoning, etc.); infrastructure improvements, business attraction and retention; and housing strategies.
- An implementation strategy that describes the organizational structure and process that will be used to ensure the action plan is implemented.

Assessment and Impacts

- Indicators or metrics related to key strategies (e.g. housing affordability, multi-modal connectivity, leveraging private investment, environmental quality, etc.)
- Identification of the transportation impacts and air quality benefits of the proposed plan
- Current and future population, housing units, and employment estimates to the year 2040 (in five-year increments), including distribution of planned housing units by type and square feet of future non-residential development

**3.) Additional “Next Step” plans/studies to further the development of the area if a station area master plan or urban center study was previously developed and adopted. Such plans/studies are only eligible if they:**

- Are for planning activities that are clearly and unambiguously related to transportation infrastructure for use by the general public, AND
- Are for planning/design activities that do not conflict with any relevant transit agency’s planning/design activities as demonstrated by a letter of concurrence from the agency.

Next Step studies should be identified in an existing plan for the area and must further the existing plan – potential Next Step projects could include:

- Parking management studies
- Access management plans
- Corridor redevelopment plans
- Design studies and concepts for multi-modal infrastructure projects
- Street design standards/manuals
- Regional multi-use trail feasibility study
- Multi-use Trail/Bike Facilities plan
- Urban design and development guidelines
- Targeting housing strategies (e.g. to facilitate jobs-housing balance, affordable housing, etc.)
- Comprehensive wayfinding plans and strategies
- Traffic circulation studies (including traffic simulation model development)
- First/Last-mile mobility implementation and financing studies
- Transit circulator feasibility
- Transportation demand management studies and implementation activities

**4.) Area Implementation Activities**

Area Implementation Activities will promote innovative planning activities that can be replicated throughout the Denver region. Eligible projects will include multiple jurisdictions, station areas and urban centers aiming to study a common issue while focusing on local context and implementation strategies – the projects could include:

- Electric or natural gas-fueled vehicles facility planning
- Parking management planning and strategies
- Development and TOD financing strategies
- Workforce and affordable housing tools
- First/last-mile mobility implementation and financing studies

## **FY 14-15 Station Area/Urban Centers Studies - Evaluation Criteria**

*Metro Vision* establishes the importance of urban centers in transit station areas in the region's efforts to reach regional goals and describes a desired future that includes healthy, livable communities connected by a robust multi-modal transportation network. These communities will have high levels of internal connectivity and be well-connected to the region at large. Additionally, they will support housing suitable for a wide range ages, incomes and abilities; and use innovative planning, zoning and urban design strategies to promote higher density, mixed-use development, and transportation options.

Given *Metro Vision* support for planning and implementation of mixed use, multimodal communities with a variety of housing options in urban centers and station areas, all eligible studies in these areas are considered regional priorities and will be recommended by staff for approval if funding is available. DRCOG staff will determine eligibility based on the Project Eligibility Rules. If staff determines a proposed project is not eligible, there will be a consultation meeting with the sponsor to address eligibility issues.

### **Project Evaluation – Regional Priorities**

If requests for federal funds exceed the federal funding available (\$1.985 million total for FY14-15) DRCOG staff will conduct an initial evaluation to identify priority projects in each eligible study category (i.e. corridor-wide, original studies, next steps, and area implementation activities). A second evaluation (Project Impact) will also be conducted as described later in this document. Regional priorities for studies are as follows:

1. **Corridor-wide studies:** Priority will be given to existing transit corridors and corridors on the fiscally constrained regional transit network that are not receiving corridor planning funds through the region's Sustainable Communities Initiative (SCI). Transit corridors included in the FC-2035-RTP Regional Transit Network that are not receiving SCI corridor planning funds include:
  - I-225 LRT Corridor: Parker Road to East Corridor
  - North Metro Rail Line (Denver Union Station to Stock Show Station & Stock Show Station to 72<sup>nd</sup> Ave Station)
  - Southeast Rail Extension: Lincoln Ave. to Ridgeway Pkwy
  - West Corridor LRT: Denver Union Station to Jefferson County Gov't Center
  - Downtown Denver Circulator
2. **"Original" or major updates to Station Area/Urban Center Plans:**
  - Proposed study areas that include a rapid transit station and include an urban center designated in *Metro Vision* will be given priority.
  - Stations that are currently open to the public or on corridors expected to be open for service within 5 years according to the current FC-2035-RTP Regional Transit Network will be given priority.

- Urban centers designated as “existing” or “emerging” will be prioritized over “planned” urban centers.

3. Next Steps Studies

- Stations that are currently open to the public or on corridors expected to be open for service within 5 years according to the current FC-2035-RTP Regional Transit Network will be given priority.

4. Area Implementation Activities

- Studies, plans, tools plans or programs that directly advance Metro Vision, including RTP, policies (e.g. Urban Centers and Transportation policies) through regional/multi-jurisdictional planning and implementation will be given priority.

Project Evaluation – Project Impact

In addition to the Regional Priorities Evaluation a second evaluation criteria will be applied to proposed, eligible projects if requests for federal funds exceed federal funding available. Proposals will be evaluated by a project recommendation committee comprised of DRCOG staff, selected regional stakeholders with a variety of interests and expertise (e.g. transportation, design, environment, housing, etc.), RTD and local governments that have previously received funds, but are not seeking funds in FY14 or FY15. The committee will submit recommendations to the appropriate DRCOG committees and Board of Directors. Recommendations will reflect the regional priority evaluation described above and the project impact criteria described below.\*

**Study Need (20% - proposed)** - *Application will include an issue statement that clearly identifies the local /regional need of the study along with the desired outcomes.*

**Potential of Study Area to Contribute to the vision, goals and policies embodied in Metro Vision (60% - proposed),** including:

- Be active, pedestrian-, bicycle-, and transit-friendly places that are more dense and mixed in use than surrounding areas
- Promote regional sustainability by reducing per capita VMT, air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions
- Provide reliable mobility choices to all users: residents and visitors of all ages, incomes and abilities, as well as businesses that provide services and produce or sell goods.

**Local Commitment and Ability to Implement (10% - proposed)** – *Urban Center/Station Area studies are the first step in a larger commitment to implement the plan and create positive changes at the local level that contribute to regional goals. Applicants will describe prior activities in support of the overall goals in the study area as well as the sponsor’s ability to successfully complete the project in a timely fashion while involving project area stakeholders. Sponsor overmatch will also be considered.*

**Innovation and Feasibility (10% - proposed)** – *Proposed studies will be evaluated on project applicability, feasibility and innovation. Project evaluation will focus on:*

- *Innovation in project scope*
- *Practicality/feasibility of scope of work and budget*
- *Potential economic development impact, including increasing access to opportunity for people of all ages, incomes, and abilities*
- *Coordination with other local governments, organizations, and non-profits*
- *Applicability and transferability of project outcomes locally and regionally*

*\* At such time that Project Impact evaluation criteria have been finalized DRCOG staff will develop an application that provides guidance to sponsors on information needed to evaluate project proposals.*

DRAFT

Table 15. Station Area/Urban Center Studies

### Eligibility Criteria

**Station Area Master Plan or Urban Center Studies** further implementation of the fiscally constrained rapid transit system (Figure 32 of the 2035 Metro Vision RTP document) at existing or future rapid transit station locations OR further implementation of urban centers identified in the Metro Vision 2035 plan (<http://www.drcog.org/documents/UrbanCenters.pdf>). Such studies include the three types of planning studies described below.

1. Corridor-wide station area master plans and/or urban center studies focusing on:
    - Maximizing both multi-modal connectivity and successful station area/urban center development along the corridor
    - Involving all the local jurisdictions and other major stakeholders along the corridor
    - Completing an action plan identifying, on a corridor basis, such things as needed plan updates, code revisions, and financial or regulatory incentives
  2. Creation and adoption of a station area master plan or urban center study. The scope for such a plan/study **must include**:
 

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identification of the plan horizon year</li> <li>○ Definition of area activity focus (character, nature, typology)</li> <li>○ Identification (map) of type and density of future land uses, including quantifiable goals for mix of uses (e.g., a target jobs/housing balance) and increased housing and employment density</li> <li>○ Circulation plan(s) (maps) for motor vehicles, transit, bicycle and pedestrian modes, including quantifiable goals for multi-modal connectivity (e.g., street network density, sidewalk coverage, route directness) both within the area and to the region</li> <li>○ Housing strategy, including quantifiable goals for housing diversity, as well as age and income diversity (e.g., percent of housing units that are affordable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Parking strategy (e.g., parking maximums, shared parking, pricing strategies, etc.)</li> <li>○ Public spaces plan (map), including identification of pedestrian areas and characteristics</li> <li>○ Identification of the transportation impacts and air quality benefits of the proposed plan (CMAQ benefits reporting requirement)</li> <li>○ A clear and realistic implementation strategy to accomplish the master plan, including identification of necessary zoning changes and infrastructure improvements</li> <li>○ Active involvement by DRCOG, any relevant transit agency, and the public in the development of the plan</li> </ul>
---	---
  3. Additional "Next Step" plans/studies to further the development of the area if a station area master plan or urban center study has already been adopted. Such plans/studies are only eligible if they:
    - Are for planning activities that are clearly and unambiguously related to transportation infrastructure for use by the general public, AND
    - Are for planning/design activities that do not conflict with any relevant transit agency's planning/design activities as demonstrated by a letter of concurrence from the agency, AND
    - Total no more than \$200,000 federal funds awarded for transportation-related planning activities at an individual station and/or urban center, aggregate (total of funds awarded for preparation of a plan/study and any "next step" plans/studies over ALL TIP cycles for which planning funds are awarded).
- No more than three stations or urban centers can be included in any single funding request for a plan/study. Funding requests for corridor-wide plans have no limit on number of stations or urban centers. When multiple stations or urban centers are included, all evaluation criteria refer to the average conditions for those locations.

**Table 15. Station Area/Urban Center Studies**

Evaluation Criteria	Points	Scoring Instructions
Current VMT per capita	0-10	Based on the 2005 VMT per capita (jobs plus population) of the station area/urban center; 10 points will be awarded if the 2005 VMT per capita is 25 or more; 0 points if the 2005 VMT per capita is 20 or less; with straight line interpolation between. <i>Source: DRCOG's 2005 model.</i>
Multimodal potential	0-20	Based on the reduction potential in SOV percentage (2005 to 2035) in the station area/urban center; 20 points will be awarded if the decrease in the percentage of trips made by SOV is 5 percentage points or more; 0 points if the decrease is 0 percentage points (or is an increase); with straight line interpolation between. <i>Source: DRCOG models.</i>
Development potential	0-10	Based on the "attractiveness" score of the station area/urban center; 10 points will be awarded if the station area/urban center has an "attractiveness" score of 2,100 or more; 0 points if the station area/urban center has an "attractiveness" score of 1,100 or less; with straight line interpolation between. <i>Source: DRCOG's land use model, combined residential, retail and commercial attractiveness.</i>
Existing study area land use, ownership, income, environmental justice characteristics	0-22	<p>A maximum of 3 points will be awarded based on the percentage of the study area that is brownfields: 3 points will be awarded if the study area is 30% or more brownfields; 0 points will be awarded if the study area is 0% brownfields; with straight line interpolation between.</p> <p><b>AND</b> a maximum of 6 points will be awarded based on the number of different property owners within 1/4 mile of the study area: 6 points will be awarded if there are 50 or more owners; 0 points will be awarded if there are 2 or fewer owners; with straight line interpolation between.</p> <p><b>AND</b> a maximum of 7 points will be awarded based on the percentage of the study area that would be infill/redevelopment area as opposed to currently-undeveloped land: 7 points will be awarded if the study area is 80% or more infill/redevelopment; 0 points will be awarded if the study area is 10% or less infill/redevelopment (i.e., almost entirely currently undeveloped); with straight line interpolation between.</p> <p><b>AND</b> a maximum of 6 points will be awarded based on the percentage of the study area in low income or minority areas (reference 2035 Metro Vision RTP Figure 34): 6 points will be awarded if the study area is 75% or more low income or minority area; 0 points will be awarded if the study area is 15% or less low income or minority area; with straight line interpolation between.</p>
Environmental justice	0-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points will be awarded if 75% or more of the study area is located within a RTP-defined environmental justice area (Figure 34 of the 2035 Metro Vision RTP). The sponsor must identify anticipated benefits and/or disadvantages of the study to the environmental justice community in the submittal.</li> <li>• 0 points will be awarded if less than 75% of the project length is located within a RTP-defined environmental justice area or if the benefits documentation is not provided.</li> </ul>
Overmatch	0-9	Based on providing <i>above</i> the minimum 20 percent local funding match: 9 points will be awarded to projects with local match of 47 percent or more; 0 points to projects with the minimum 20 percent local match; with straight line interpolation between.
Project-related Metro Vision implementation and strategic corridor	0-18	Up to 18 points will be awarded as described in Appendix F.

**Table 15. Station Area/Urban Center Studies**

Evaluation Criteria	Points	Scoring Instructions
focus		
Sponsor-related Metro Vision implementation	0-8	Up to 8 points will be awarded for sponsor actions implementing Metro Vision. Appendix G explains the specific criteria.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	

## ATTACHMENT C

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee

From: Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, Regional Planning and Operations  
303 480-6839 or bcalvert@drcog.org

Subject: **Crafting Regional Scenarios – Metro Vision 2040**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 24, 2013	Information	5

### REQUESTED ACTION

No action required. This item is for information and discussion.

### SUMMARY

#### Previous Guidance on Metro Vision 2040 Scenario Analysis - Outcomes

- In January staff provided MVPAC with a list of “outcome topic areas” and “refined measures” that were previously rated by the Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC) and reviewed by the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC).
- MVPAC assistance was requested to assist staff in identifying additional refined measures for each topic area. Following the meeting in January DRCOG staff provided MVPAC members with the working list of measures for scenario analysis and also asked for feedback on other measures to track and monitor during the plan update.
- In February DRCOG staff provided MVPAC with an expanded list of refined measures that incorporated initial MVPAC feedback.
- Throughout the scenario analysis process the outcome measures suggested by MVPAC and TAC will be evaluated by staff to determine their applicability for use in comparing results of scenario option model runs.

#### Scenario Packages - Factors

- Each future scenario DRCOG models will include a “package” of input factors (e.g., land use characteristics, transportation facilities, fuel costs, etc.), or “what-ifs” that represent a change from our base assumptions (aka the 2040 Base Scenario).
- Each scenario will be modeled and produce outcome measures – many of which will be recommended outcomes suggested by MVPAC and/or TAC.
- When the scenario evaluation process is completed later this year, it is not expected that the DRCOG Board will choose “the best scenario.” Rather, it is expected the Board will look at specific outcomes in relation to factors that changed between scenarios. The Board can then consider outcomes that got “better” or “worse” within different scenarios when they discuss policy actions for the 2040 Plans.
- The attached table (Table 1) lists several example factors that can impact future scenarios, including the 2040 Base Scenario. There are 4 categories of factors:
  - Socioeconomic & Demographic
  - Transportation System
  - Growth and Development Patterns
  - Other External Factors
- Some factors can be directly adjusted in the model (miles of rapid transit), but others may blur the line between factor and outcome – this is particularly true of items in the Growth and Development Pattern category (e.g. share/amount of growth in urban centers).
- Table 1 provides, for discussion purposes:
  - Factors to consider adjusting from the base scenario
  - Example factor values for the 2040 Base Scenario
  - Example scenarios A-E

# Crafting Regional Scenarios – Metro Vision 2040

April 24, 2013

Page 2

## “Building” Scenarios – Process and Evaluation

- The number of possible scenarios and combinations of factors is limitless. Modeling and resource constraints will limit the number of scenarios to between 4 and 6 (each individual model run requires a minimum of 1–2 weeks).
- DRCOG staff will package factors into scenarios for modeling. Crafting the regional scenarios will take some thought - especially related to assembling factors into logical, single scenarios.
- When reviewing factors, consider:
  - If the factor increases or decreases, would it likely affect a modeled outcome measure?
  - Is the factor understandable to the general public?
- When crafting scenarios, consider:
  - Should the scenario reflect several factor changes, or just one change?
  - How realistic should the level of factor change be? Is it desired to depict extreme scenario variations?

## Table 1 – A “Starting Point” for Today’s Conversation

- As depicted in Table 1, the example Scenario B reflects changes to several factors. Example scenarios A, C, and D change a few factors, but largely rely on the same assumptions in the 2040 Scenario Base.
- Scenario E will be crafted later in the scenario analysis process. Rather than first establishing factors and then modeling to evaluate outcomes, example Scenario E will “work backwards” from identified outcome targets established in current regional goals (e.g. goals for VMT and GHG reductions).
  - “Internal” factors will be adjusted until goals are reached.
  - Internal factors are those which DRCOG and planning partners have more influence over (e.g. the region may have little influence over the cost of gasoline, but can influence the amount of land designated for urban development in the future).

## Today’s Discussion

- What unique factors/scenarios should be modeled as part of the Metro Vision 2040 scenario analysis?

## Next Steps

- DRCOG staff will finalize 2040 base scenario.
- DRCOG staff will compile recommendations into distinct 2040 scenario packages.
- On May 15<sup>th</sup>, the DRCOG Board will discuss and recommend scenarios for staff to begin modeling work on.

## **PRIOR BOARD ACTION**

- May 2011 – Approval of Metro Vision 2040 Framework
- May 2012 – Approval of 2012-2013 Strategic Plan, including Metro Vision 2040 activities
- August 2012 – Approval of approach to using scenario analysis to inform the Metro Vision 2040 plan update process
- December 2012 – Feedback on proposed scenario outcome measures (MVIC)

## **FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

N/A

## **ALTERNATIVES**

N/A

# Crafting Regional Scenarios – Metro Vision 2040

April 24, 2013

Page 3

## PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Table 1: Draft 2040 Factors to Consider in Scenarios - Example Scenarios for Discussion

Table 1  
**Draft 2040 Factors to Consider in Scenarios - Example Scenarios for Discussion**  
 April 15, 2013

Factors	2040 BASE Scenario	Scenario A Roadway & Managed Lanes Focus	Scenario B Transit, Bicycle, Pedestrian Focus	Scenario C Really High Pop Growth w/ base transp	Scenario D Really Low Growth w/ base transp	Scenario E Do What's needed to meet MV goals **
<b>SOCIOECONOMIC/DEMOGRAPHIC</b>		<b>Change From Base 2040 Scenario</b>				
Population Growth (2010 to 2040)	1,350,000	same as base	same as base	2,000,000	500,000	same as base
Employment Growth (2010 to 2040)	765,000	same	same	1,300,000	250,000	same
Household Growth (2010 to 2040)	611,000	same	same	841,805	210,451	same
<b>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM</b>						
Rapid Transit System-Rail miles (2035 FasTracks)	110	same	All FasTracks (+50)	same	same	adjust as needed
Rapid Transit System - Bus/HOV CL miles	47	+100 miles managed lanes	+ 50 miles managed lanes	same	same	adjust as needed
Bus Service Levels (annual hours)	2,970,000		20% increase	same	same	adjust as needed
Bus Service Levels (annual miles)	35,600,000		20% increase	same	same	adjust as needed
Cost (fares) for Transit	Inflation		1/2 Base cost	same	same	adjust as needed
Additional Roadway Lane Miles:						
- new Regional System (non-toll) LM	1,000	+ 200 ln. miles	same	same	same	
Toll Costs / Managed Lane CL miles	committed system	+ 100 miles	+ 50 miles	same	same	
Other Fees, etc.						
Cost of Gasoline (e.g. \$3.80 @ 2%/yr inflation)	~\$6.75/gal		~\$13.50/gal	same	same	adjust as needed
Additional "Cost of Driving"	Inflation		double	same	same	adjust as needed
Miles of Bicycle Facilities	2,000		3,000	same	same	adjust as needed
Acceptance (Utility Factor) of Walk/Bicycling			"double"	same	same	adjust as needed
Share of Pop. "Driving" / Auto availability	1.74 autos/HH		reduce # autos/HH	same	same	
Location/Amount of Free or Pay Parking			Add costs in additional areas?			
<b>GROWTH &amp; DEVELOPMENT</b>						
UGB/UGA Additional Area (sq. miles)	260	?	?	350	?	adjust as needed
Share / Amount of Growth in Urban Centers						
- Housing Units	17%					
- Employment	48%					
Share Infill vs. Greenfield New Development						
Share of Types of Housing Units						
Level of "Mix" of Land Uses						
Retail Square Footage per capita						
Employment Sector Make-up						
Labor Force participation rates						
<b>OTHER</b>						
Average Household Size	2.376					
Level of Teleworking (work at home)	6.3%					
Age Cohort Distribution (e.g. % > age 65)	25%					

Goals: \*\*10% less VMT/capita  
 \*\*10% less GHG/capita  
 \*\* 50% of HH, 75% employment growth in urban centers

## ATTACHMENT D

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee

From: Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, Regional Planning and Operations  
303 480-6839 or bcalvert@drcog.org

Subject: **Metro Vision 2040 Local Government Survey**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 24, 2013	Information	6

### REQUESTED ACTION

No action required. This item is for information and discussion.

### SUMMARY

- At the February 20, 2013 MVPAC meeting, DRCOG staff asked the committee to provide initial feedback on a proposed survey of member governments. The purpose of the proposed survey is to obtain a better understanding of local growth and development challenges and opportunities. The primary goals of the survey are to:
  1. Capture successful policy development, implementation efforts, challenges or innovative planning throughout the region.
  2. Familiarize committee members with what is happening in communities around the region they may be less familiar with.
  3. Identify local priorities that would potentially benefit from further exploration during the Metro Vision 2040 planning process.
- MVPAC members were supportive of moving forward with the survey and provided DRCOG staff with initial feedback on the types of information that would be helpful to the committee.
- MVPAC members provided additional feedback after the February meeting and were provided another opportunity to collectively comment on the survey in March. Additional comments and suggestions included:
  - The survey must strike a balance between providing a volume of needed information and not being onerous for the respondent.
  - The survey should also be a good mix of quantitative and qualitative questions – able to be evaluated quickly by MVPAC.
  - It is important to “market” the survey so that people are motivated to take the survey and provide useful information.
- The attached draft survey framework is provided to MVPAC for review and comment.
- DRCOG staff recommends limiting discussion of the framework during the meeting, but would rather invite a few MVPAC members to volunteer to “test” the survey in their communities and report back to staff on the usability of the survey.
  - Other members are encouraged to review the survey on their own and provide feedback to staff.

### Next Steps

- DRCOG intends have survey design complete in May and results in summer 2013.
- Staff will provide updates to MVPAC over the coming months.

### PRIOR BOARD ACTION

N/A

### FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

### ALTERNATIVES

N/A

### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

# **Metro Vision 2040 Local Government Survey**

April 24, 2013

Page 2

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- Draft 2013 Local Government Survey

**Attachment D**  
**DRAFT 2013 Local Government Survey**

**Demographic Shift**

Changing demographics throughout the region are presenting challenges and opportunities. Several of which are identified below. Please identify those changes that are the most relevant in your community and the policies and strategies your community is using now, or implementing to address the most significant changes.

**1. Please tell us which of the following demographic challenges or opportunities are occurring in your community? (Click on all that apply.)**

- Increase in older adult population
- Increase in 5-17 year old school-age children
- Increase in low-moderate income households
- Increase in high school graduation rates
- Increase in college educational attainment
  
- Decrease in older adult population
- Decrease in 5-17 year old school-age children
- Decrease in low-moderate income households
- Decrease in high school graduation rates
- Decrease in college educational attainment
  
- Other demographic opportunities
- Other demographic challenges

**2. What strategies are being implemented in your community to address these? (Detail those that apply)**

Increase in older adult population	[_____]
Increase in 5-17 year old school-age children	[_____]
Increase in low-moderate income households	[_____]
Increase in high school graduation rates	[_____]
Increase in college educational attainment	[_____]
Decrease in older adult population	[_____]
Decrease in 5-17 year old school-age children	[_____]
Decrease in low-moderate income households	[_____]
Decrease in high school graduation rates	[_____]
Decrease in college educational attainment	[_____]
Other demographic opportunities	[_____]
Other demographic challenges	[_____]

**Attachment D**  
**DRAFT 2013 Local Government Survey**

**3. Of the challenges and opportunities listed above, which one is your community's number one priority?**

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**4. Please elaborate on the strategies your community is using to address your community's number one priority?**

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**5. Are there other practices or strategies addressing demographic shifts you would you like to know more about?**

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]  
[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**Housing Trends**

Please tell us about the housing in your community, what your priorities are, and how you are filling some of the gaps in your housing needs.

**6. Are you seeing fewer, more, or no change, in the following household types in your community?**

	Fewer	More	Same (no change)
Single households	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Older adults living alone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Empty-nest households	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Retiree households	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Households with children	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multi-generational households	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**7. Is your community's housing supply able to meet your community's changing housing needs?**

- Yes, housing supply is able to meet ALL of community's housing needs.
- Yes, housing supply is able to meet MOST of community's housing needs.
- No, housing supply is only able to meet SOME of community's housing needs.
- Definitely No, housing supply is NOT ABLE TO MEET ANY of community's housing needs.

**Attachment D**  
**DRAFT 2013 Local Government Survey**

**8. Where does your community have gaps in any of the following housing types? (Click all that apply)**

- Single family detached, for rent
- Single family detached, to own
- Condominium, Townhouse
- Family housing
- Multi-family, for rent
- Multi-family, to own
- Low-rise apartment
- Mid- to High-rise apartment
- Small apartment
- Assisted living
- Senior housing
- Housing for persons with disabilities
- Transitional housing
- Public housing
- Affordable housing, market rate
- Affordable housing, supported or subsidized
- Duplex, Triplex
- Side-attached rowhouse
- Stacked rowhouse
- Mobile home
- Manufactured/Modular homes
- Other [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]
- Other [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**9. What is your community doing to fill gaps in housing stock?**

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]  
[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**10. In your community's most recent housing needs assessment or other planning activities, what have been identified as your top three (3) housing priorities?**

1. [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]
2. [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]
3. [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**Transportation**

**11. Which of the following transportation issues are affecting your community? (Click on all that apply)**

- First / last mile connections
- Older adult transportation options
- Bike and pedestrian infrastructure

Transportation connections:

- From suburb to suburb
- From suburb to central business district (Denver CBD)
- Inside/within suburban communities
- Inside/within suburban activity centers (hubs of higher density service, employment, mixed use)

- Other [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]
- Other [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**12. What strategies or policies are being implemented in your community to promote walkability?**

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**13. What barriers are preventing your community from becoming more walkable?**

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**Growth & Development**

The past decade has seen dramatic changes in development of all types. Changes in the market, economic stresses, changes in customer preferences, and innovative planning policy and practice have influenced the way development is occurring in local communities. How have development needs, desires, and practices changed from what may be termed as “business as usual” prior to the economic downturn?

**14. In the past year has your community seen an increase in overall development activity?**

- Yes, a large increase in development activity
- Yes, a small increase in development activity
- No change in development activity
- No, development activity declined

**Attachment D**  
**DRAFT 2013 Local Government Survey**

**15. What areas are seeing increased activity in your community? (click on all that apply)**

- New development (greenfield)**
- Redevelopment**
- Master-planned development**
- Previously approved but unbuilt projects**
- Big-box / large format retail**
- Large lot development**
- Commercial strip centers**
- Mixed use development**
- Infill development**
- NA / no new development**
- Other [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]**
- Other [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]**

**16. Describe any regulatory practices (ordinances, zoning, codes, permitting, etc.) in your community that are barriers to current development (new/greenfield development, redevelopment, mixed use, etc)? Please include some detail.**

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**17. Describe any regulatory practices (ordinances, zoning, codes, permitting, etc.) in your community that support current development (new development, redevelopment, mixed use, etc)? Please include some detail.**

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**18. Please describe your community's economic growth strategies (e.g. enhancements to commercial districts, designated redevelopment areas, support for small business and entrepreneurial ventures, etc.).**

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**19. What key industries are you targeting in your community?**

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**20. Is your community addressing access to broadband, fiber optic networks, and high-speed internet access for both employers and residents in any of its planning strategies or policies?**

**Attachment D**  
**DRAFT 2013 Local Government Survey**

- Yes
- No

**21. If yes, what are those strategies and have they been successful?**

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**22. Is your community's current Urban Growth Boundary / Area allocation adequate to accommodate future growth?**

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

**Emerging Issues**

Local communities and the region are experiencing both existing and new challenges on a variety of fronts; some may be well-known, while others are only recently coming to the forefront. Developing forward-thinking policies, both locally and regionally, relies on the identification of emerging issues and future constraints. Please identify the emerging issues and future constraints your community is facing.

**23. What emerging issues is your community experiencing? (Click on all that apply)**

- Wildfires
- K-12 education (impact on development)
- Public health
- Homelessness
- Loss of affordable housing
- Production of new affordable housing
- Aging population
- Oil and gas extraction
- Preservation of open space
- Climate change and adaptation
- Resistance to redevelopment (particularly density)
- Declining demand for "brick and mortar" retail
- Preservation of agricultural land
- Locally grown food / urban agriculture
- Other [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]
- Other [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**24. Please share some of the practices your community is using to address emerging issues:**

**Attachment D**  
**DRAFT 2013 Local Government Survey**

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]  
[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**25. What future constraints has your community identified that are addressed in current plans? (Click on all that apply)**

- Fuel prices
- Tax revenue
- Developable land
- Infrastructure funding
- Local planning obstacles/issues
- Water (availability, quality, flow, etc.)
- Other [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]
- Other [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**Other Topics**

**26. When was your most recent major comprehensive plan update completed?**

- 2013 / In-progress
- 2012
- 2011
- 2010
- 2009
- 2008
- 2007
- Other [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**27. Did the most recent plan include mapping future land use?**

- Yes
- No

**28. How best can we work with you to ensure that Metro Vision recognizes and supports your local priorities?**

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]  
[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**29. Any other key challenges, opportunities that you would like to mention?**

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]