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Background

§ Metropolitan Challenges
  – Urban sprawl
  – Air quality
  – Governance

§ Need for smarter growth patterns
  – Supports alternative modes
  – Offers local services

§ Regional sale governance need
Research Goal and Focus

§ Goal: assess regional efforts to coordinate transportation & land use

§ Specifically
  – Regional governance
  – Urban center grants
  – Transportation incentives
Cases

§ All cases have:
  – A regional plan
  – Designated centers
  – Incentives for centers

§ Differences
  – Regional land use powers
  – Sales tax funding
  – Varied funding control
  – Varied transportation funding arrangements
Methods

§ Case studies
§ Interviews
  – 10 per site
  – Group interviews
§ Survey
  – 450 surveyed
  – 199 responses (44% rate)
§ Research forum
## On-Line Survey

### Transportation and Land Use Committees

### Total sample size:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PSRC</th>
<th>DRCOG</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Rate</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caveats

§ Based on only 4 cases
§ Reliance on expert views
§ Limited sample sizes
§ Relatively new programs
§ Difficulty of comparing data across cases
### Regional Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>PSRC</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
<th>DRCOG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPO Population</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA 2009 Population</td>
<td>2,240,000</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
<td>3,050,000</td>
<td>2,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-2000 Pop change</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Area (mi²)</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>6,290</td>
<td>4,526</td>
<td>5,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA 2000 Area (mi²)</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Evaluation

- Regional growth centers
  - Definition and approach
  - Influence on local plans
- Supporting policies
  - Grant programs
  - Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) incentives
## Definitions of Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>PSRC</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
<th>DRCOG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus for redevelopment, multi-modal transportation and concentrations of households and employment patterns.</td>
<td>Compact, pedestrian-oriented development, with a mix of different office, commercial, civic, entertainment, and residential uses.</td>
<td>Accommodate … higher residential and employment densities… pedestrian-friendly… connected to other by transit or could be in the future.</td>
<td>Active, pedestrian-friendly places, with employment, housing and services in close proximity to each other…served by transit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Regional Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term used</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>PSRC</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
<th>DRCOG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term used</td>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>Smart growth opportunity areas</td>
<td>Urban Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numb er</td>
<td>37 (27 Regional; 8 Industrial)</td>
<td>35 (27 Regional; 8 Industrial)</td>
<td>196 (85 exist/planned 111 potential)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types</td>
<td>✓ Town ✓ Regional</td>
<td>✓ Regional Growth ✓ Manufacturing/Industrial</td>
<td>✓ Metropolitan ✓ Urban ✓ Town ✓ Community ✓ Transit Corridor ✓ Special Use ✓ Rural Community</td>
<td>✓ Mixed-use ✓ Activity ✓ Regional corridors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transportation Funding Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>PSRC</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
<th>DRCOG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🆓25% of Metro TIP criteria for alternative modes</td>
<td>🆓70% of Surface Trans. Fund and Cong. Mgmt and Air Qual. for projects with benefits to centers</td>
<td>🆓5% of Highway Corridor criteria for centers and 15% for livability and accessibility goals</td>
<td>🆓6% of Regional TIP criteria for urban centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🆓40% of Metro TIP criteria for regional land use goals</td>
<td>🆓50% of Cong. Mit and Air Quality for projects with benefits to centers</td>
<td>🆓20% of HOV criteria for projects serving transit corridors</td>
<td>🆓4% of Regional TIP criteria for projects near centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🆓70% of FTA fund criteria for projects with benefits to centers</td>
<td>🆓70% of FTA fund criteria for projects with benefits to centers</td>
<td>🆓15% of FTA for projects that serve regional centers</td>
<td>🆓3% of Regional TIP criteria for projects located within urban growth boundary/area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Growth Center Grant Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
<th>DRCOG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction excise tax: $7-10 million over 4 years</td>
<td>TransNet Sales Tax: $280 million over 40 years</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program: $3.5 million over 4 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Yearly Est. | ≈$1.8 to 2.5 per year | ≈$7 million per year | ≈$.87 million per year |

| Uses | Redevelopment projects, land acquisition, planning | Planning studies, land acquisition or infrastructure to support centers | Station area master plans and/or urban center studies |

Note: PSRC does not have a grant program
## Regional Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>PSRC</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
<th>DRCOG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supports what local jurisdictions were doing already</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenced local jurisdictions to focus more development within centers</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are significant incentives for local jurisdictions to promote growth within centers</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The geographic distribution of centers has been equitable</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Centers policy] has significantly</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Themes

- Role of Regional Planning
- "Follow the Money"
- Governance findings

San Diego Light Rail
Role of Regional Planning

Puget Sound

San Diego
Follow the Money

§ Smart Growth Incentives
   – Grants
   – Funding priority

§ Regional Sales Tax
   – Denver: Highway and Transit
   – San Diego: Highway, Transit and Open Space
July 2011 News

SANDAG moves $800M from I-5 into transit-oriented projects
# Governance Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>PSRC</th>
<th>SANDAG</th>
<th>DRCOG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cities and Counties</td>
<td>25 cities 3 counties</td>
<td>82 cities 4 counties</td>
<td>18 cities 1 county</td>
<td>47 cities 9 counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive committee (members)</td>
<td>Elected council (7)</td>
<td>Board (32)</td>
<td>Board (24)</td>
<td>Board (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use authority</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation planning authority</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit planning powers</td>
<td>No TriMet</td>
<td>No Six agencies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No RTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other related powers</td>
<td>Trans. Consistency</td>
<td>Trans. Consistency</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional governance challenge

UGB vs. Travelshed
(Source: Metro)
Governance Practices

- SANDAG: Sitting Fees
- PSRC: Cross-board representation
- Metro: Regional transportation collaboration
- Denver: Mile High Compact
- All: Suburban leadership

San Diego Trolley
Conclusion

§ Regional Centers
  – Important as part of a regional plan
  – Incentive based policies important but limited

§ Important challenges
  – Regional livability vs. transportation mobility
  – Opposition to density
  – Regional governance
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