

State-of-the-Practice Alternative Land Use and Transportation Scenario Development

A National Case Study Review

presented to

HB 2186 MPO Greenhouse Gas Emissions Task Force

presented by

Cambridge Systematics, Inc.

October 15, 2009

Transportation leadership you can trust.

CAMBRIDGE
SYSTEMATICS

Presentation Agenda

1. Purpose of the Case Study Review
2. Synthesis of the Case Studies
3. Summary of Key Elements
4. Questions and Answers

1. Purpose of the Case Study Review

- **Provide insight from national examples on how land use and transportation scenario development and analysis is conducted**
 - **Summarize how these activities relate to regional transportation planning and programming conducted by metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs)**
 - **Understand how elements of the national examples could apply to Oregon MPOs in addressing HB 2186 planning requirements**

1. Purpose of the Case Study Review

- **Case studies focus on –**
 - **Small to medium size MPOs to be consistent with Oregon MPOs**
 - **Planning programs with readily available data and information**
 - **Planning processes that include multiple scenarios and visioning exercises**
 - **Land use planning that feeds into a regional transportation plan process conducted by MPOs**

1. Purpose of the Case Study Review

Case studies include -

- Sacramento (CA) Regional Blueprint (pop. 1.9 million)
- San Joaquin Valley (CA) Blueprint (pop. 563,000)
- Puget Sound (WA) Vision 2040 (pop. 3.2 million)
- Gainesville (FL) 2020 LRTP Update (pop. 159,508)
- Albany (NY) New Visions and Linkages Program (pop. 794,293)
- Charlottesville (VA) Eastern Planning Initiative (pop. 81,449)
- Envision Missoula (MT) (pop. 57,053)
- PlanCheyenne (WY) (pop. 68,202)

2. Synthesis of the Case Studies

- **Synthesis focuses on –**
 - **The long-range transportation planning (LRTP) process**
 - **Public involvement process**
 - **Decision-making framework**
 - **Scenario evaluation tools**
 - **Timeframe, schedule and cost**
 - **Legal authority / control**

2. Synthesis of the Case Studies

- **The LRTP process**

- **Connection between transportation and land use required since 1990**
- **Requirement addressed at various level of detail**
 - Integration of transportation and land use models
 - Policy based assessment by “expert” panels
- **LRTP process elements**
 - 20 year planning horizon
 - Constant updates (every 5 years) to ensure transportation plans and programs remain valid
 - Formal adoption process by MPOs

2. Synthesis of the Case Studies

- **The LRTP process (continued)**
 - **Case studies focus on a process to develop a land use and development “*vision*” that creates the starting point for the regional transportation planning process**
 - Environment, livability and control of sprawl are the controlling factors in the case studies
 - Sacramento, San Joaquin, Puget Sound, Gainesville and Charlottesville driven by livability and environmental issues
 - Albany, Missoula and Cheyenne driven by a desire for comprehensive planning – land use, transportation, open space, parks, conservation
 - Many have a longer time horizon (e.g. 50 years) than the LRTP
 - **All case studies influence transportation planning process**

2. Synthesis of the Case Studies

- **Public involvement process**
 - All spend a significant amount of time engaging various stakeholder groups on detailed “visioning” exercises
 - Consume financial resources and time
 - Processes are at least 2 years in duration
 - Cost range from \$250,000 to over \$3.0 million
 - Most are a “bottom-up” process involving hundreds of participants
 - Include public workshops, open houses, public opinion research, radio and television, and dedicated web sights

2. Synthesis of the Case Studies

- **Public involvement process (continued)**
 - **Albany and Missoula use small stakeholder groups to complete major elements of the process**
 - Albany employs small stakeholder task force throughout the process
 - Missoula base scenario (BAU) developed by a small group of stakeholders

2. Synthesis of the Case Studies

- **Decision making framework**
 - **All set regional or sub-regional goals to support the vision**
 - **All develop multiple scenarios to evaluate**
 - **Scenario development ranges from 2 (Charlottesville, Missoula) to 5 (Gainesville)**
 - **All include a base case or “business as usual” scenario**
 - **Scenario development conducted as part of a public forums/ workshops to ensure local buy-in**
 - **Vision tools employed to support the public forums**
 - **Public polling used to frame scenario elements**

2. Synthesis of the Case Studies

- **Decision making framework (continued)**
 - **Most create a structured but qualitative evaluation framework**
 - **Charlottesville creates a framework to evaluate the desirability of 17 “Community Elements” that form the alternative regional growth scenarios**
 - **Envision Missoula evaluated tradeoffs of 13 “Place Types” that roll up into alternative land use and transportation scenario**
 - ◆ **Each “Place Type” is associated with a level of density and an illustration of what land use types (commercial, residential) are included**

2. Synthesis of the Case Studies

- **Decision making framework (continued)**
 - **Smaller stakeholder groups or MPO committees approve preferred scenario**
 - Sacramento COG Board, San Joaquin Regional Policy Council, Gainesville MPO Board
 - **All preferred scenarios fed into the regional transportation planning process with various levels of success**
 - Albany and Charlottesville use the preferred scenario to establish principles of transportation investment
 - Sacramento, San Joaquin, Puget Sound, Gainesville, Missoula and Cheyenne use the preferred scenario as direct input into the regional transportation planning process
 - **Albany creates “4 themes, 31 principles, and 47 actions to govern transportation investment” based on the preferred scenario**

2. Synthesis of the Case Studies

- **Scenario evaluation tools**

- **All provide some type of system to describe how residents will live, travel and interact in the planned scenario environment**
 - Detailed land use models, sketch-level tools and descriptive visioning processes used to support the public forum and stakeholder processes
- **Sacramento creates I-PLACE3s (interactive land use visioning tool) to support visioning process**
 - I-PLACE3s accounts for changes in local land use plans and zoning ordinances to evaluate various scenarios
 - Accounts for land use changes at the local level – important for local buy-in
- **Albany creates “hypothetical workbook scenarios” focused on how a resident will live under each scenario**

2. Synthesis of the Case Studies

- **Timeframe, schedule and cost**
 - **All case study examples take 2-5 years to complete**
 - **Some act as the “front end” to the LRTP process**
 - ◆ Sacramento, Puget Sound, Gainesville, Missoula and Cheyenne include land use visioning into the 5 year LRTP update
 - **Others operate independently or have yet to make the link**
 - **Expanded land use planning horizon (e.g. 50 years) streamlines subsequent LRTP updates**
 - **Timeframe not necessarily controlled by the complexity of the planning region**

2. Synthesis of the Case Studies

- **Timeframe, schedule and cost (continued)**
 - **Cost range**
 - Gainesville \$250,000 over 2 year period
 - Cheyenne \$335,000 over a 2 year period
 - Albany \$400,000 over a 3 year period
 - Puget Sound \$3.0 million over a 5 year period (includes 2040 transportation plan)
 - Sacramento over \$1.0 million over a 2½ year period (includes tool development)
 - **Cost is tied to the –**
 - Type and level of public involvement
 - Level of tool development
 - Linkages to other associated planning process
 - MPO staff size and capabilities

2. Synthesis of the Case Studies

- **Legal authority / control**

- **Only Missoula has legal land use authority**
- **Land use planning goals accomplished in other ways**
 - **Strong local focus (and buy-in) during the scenario visioning and definition process**
 - ◆ Sacramento I-PLACE3s model designed to evaluate local land use and zoning decisions
 - ◆ Both Sacramento and San Joaquin Blueprints focus on parcel-level decisions
 - **Preferred scenario goals integrated into other transportation and land use planning initiatives**
 - ◆ Albany – themes, principles, strategies, actions linked to local planning studies

3. Summary of the Key Elements

- **Each case study has a critical driver controlling the process**
 - Land development, environment, congestion, air quality, livability, conservation, recreation
- **All include significant public outreach elements focused on defining a future land use and transportation “vision”**
 - Decisions and approvals made by a Board or Committee
- **Sketch tools and other methods are used to create a vision and develop scenarios**
 - Local buy-in is very important as part of this process

3. Summary of the Key Elements (continued)

- **Timeframe to complete is at least 2 years and should be integrated into other comprehensive planning programs**
 - **Should provide a connection into the LRTP process**
- **Cost are significant and based on –**
 - **The level and type of public involvement**
 - **Tool development**
 - **Internal staff level and capability**
- **Very few regional planning organizations have legal authority over land use**
 - **Local buy-in early is important to the process**

State-of-the-Practice Alternative Land Use and Transportation Scenario Development

Questions & Answers