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Project Overview

Examine approaches to planning for and implementing sustainability at a regional scale

Model Framework for Regional Sustainability Planning and Implementation
Project Overview

Framework used by organizations and stakeholders:

- interested in regional sustainability planning
- evaluating sustainability planning efforts

Adaptable model – variety of contexts and users
Project Context

HUD-DOT-EPA alignment

Sustainable Communities Grants  
Twin Cities + Region 5

Funded by U of MN Center for Transportation Studies

Collaboration with research advisory group
Methodology

Case study analysis:

• **Content** of regional plans

• **Processes** used to develop plans

• Approaches to **implementation** and monitoring

Diverse set of cases – organizational context, geography, sustainability issues, planning issues
Methodology

Review planning documents

Interview key participants

Capital Regional District – *Regional Growth Strategy* (Victoria, BC)

**New South Wales** – *Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036* (Australia)

**Denver** Regional Council of Governments – *Metro Vision 2035*

**Chicago** Metropolitan Agency for Planning – *Go To 2040*

**St. Cloud** Joint Planning District – *Sustainability Framework Plan* (MN)

Delaware Valley Regional Planning Council – *Connections 2035 Plan – Regional Plan for a Sustainable Future* (Philadelphia)

**Long Island** Regional Planning Council – *Sustainable Strategies for Long Island 2035 Plan*
Emerging Best Practices – Plan Content

Take the time to define sustainability relative to local context – land use, transportation, and environment most common

Document participation efforts in the plan

Display plan and background information online
Emerging Best Practices – Planning Process

Engage multiple stakeholders – including private sector, work through existing networks

Consider online participation and monitoring efforts

Issue-specific workgroups help make connections and offer resources
Emerging Best Practices – Implementation

Include clear implementation content in plan

Think beyond agency implementation – grants to support, toolkit

Start small – visible outcomes

Link to indicator or monitoring systems – varied approaches
MetroPulse is a web resource of the Regional Indicators Project, created in partnership by The Chicago Community Trust and the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning. This customizable site provides extensive data about issues that shape the livability of our communities. MetroPulse was created to facilitate effective decision making and to measure the region’s progress in implementing the GO TO 2040 comprehensive plan.
Road condition, travel time index, % population obese, % of regional trails complete, pedestrian environment factor, % of transit vehicles and stations ADA compliant, bridge condition rating, schools with safe routes to school programs
Acceptable Ride Quality By Percent of Route-miles for Interstate Freeway With Functional Class 1; 11; 12

All counties in the 7-county Chicago region

Source: Highway Performance Monitoring System

The number of highway route miles with International Roughness Index (IRI) above 170 divided by the total number of highway route miles. A higher IRI is an indicator of unacceptable roughness or road conditions. In addition to being an annoyance to motorists and other roadway users, pavement in poor condition has a significant safety and economic impact on the region's residents through increased wear and tear on vehicles. Tracking the percentage of the road system above the roughness threshold will serve to indicate the overall condition of the system. More data on road condition is available in the Drill Deeper into Data section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What We Track</th>
<th>How is the DVRPC Region Performing?</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR 1:</td>
<td>Between 2001 and 2005, the DVRPC region experienced an 18% decrease in fatalities per million VMT and less than 1% decrease in all crashes per million VMT. However, the overall number of crashes rose by 4.6% during this same time period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 2:</td>
<td>Congestion appears to be stable – neither improving nor worsening, though VMT has increased.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 3:</td>
<td>While transit ridership has experienced some fluctuation, it has increased in the last 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 4:</td>
<td>The number of bridges identified as structurally deficient in the DVRPC region has remained steady, but remains twice as high as the acceptable level set by FHWA in its current strategic plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 5:</td>
<td>The region saw a slight increase in road miles considered to be deficient, mostly due to NJDOT’s stricter standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 6:</td>
<td>The number of people driving to work by themselves continues to increase and is now 73% of all commuters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 7:</td>
<td>There are more cars and more drivers driving more miles every year in the region. The region appears to be more auto-dependent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 8:</td>
<td>Approximately 97% of the mapped 2007-2010 TIP project funding supports the Long Range Plan and its stated goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GM 3

How is the DVRPC Region performing?

Land consumption per person continues to rise. In 2005, each resident consumed 13% more land than in 1990.

What We Track

GM 3: How much land does each person in the region consume?

Indicator

Developed acres per person by planning area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Land per Person</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>5029</td>
<td>5180</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Developed Land per Person</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed Land per Person</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During that same time period, each person used nearly 6% less land.

Conversely, Developed Communities, which lost 1% of their population, use 3% more land for residential uses and nearly 5% more land for all land uses.

People living in Rural Areas continue to consume land at a greater proportion than any other Planning Area category. Residential land use continues to be the dominant land use in Rural Areas and each person consumed 14% more land for residential uses in 2005 than in 1990.

The significant increase in the region’s consumption of land between 1990 and 2005 is primarily due to increased development of all land use types in Growing Suburbs and Rural Areas.

The DVRPC region’s average use of land per person is closest to that of a person living in a Developed Community. This indicates that the largest proportion of the region’s residents live in Developed Communities and the largest proportion of developed land (though not total land area) is in Developed Communities.
Target: To achieve a minimum cycling mode share of 5% by 2026.

This indicator measures the percentage of cycle, walk, transit and auto trips (within a 24 hour period on a typical weekday) for the Victoria CMA and the three sub-regions. This indicator differs from the previous indicator as it measures mode share for all trip purposes, not just commuting.
Next Steps

Develop Framework for Regional Sustainability Planning and Implementation

*Final Framework available Fall 2011*

For more info, contact cschively@umn.edu