Indicator-Based Plans

For Reference? Advisory? Regulatory?
Today’s Session

• New Era of Data and Indicators
• Three Case Studies
  • City of Loveland, Colorado Comprehensive Plan
  • West Henderson Subarea Plan, Nevada
  • Jackson Hole / Teton County Comprehensive Plan, Wyoming
• Key Takeaways
• Panel Discussion
Remember the Data Dark Ages?

- Decennial census was king (1940-2000)
- American Community Survey became queen (testing in 2000, implementation in 2005)
Data in the Information Age

Walk Score

Livability Index

Wikipedia

City-Data.com

National Equity Atlas
Data versus Indicators

Data
- Quantitative or qualitative information
- Needs analysis and interpretation
- Not linked to community values

Indicators
- Measurable “vital” signs
- Track progress over time
- Reflect community values
Indicator Nuances

• Scale and level of detail
• Desired trend lines and outcomes
• Proliferation of resources and rating systems
• Maintenance and delivery
Indicator Nuances

- Data availability
- Source or messenger
- Level of understanding
- Political dynamics
Indicator Case Studies

• Reference (Loveland, CO)
• Advisory (Henderson, NV)
• Regulatory (Jackson Hole, WY)

For each, discussion of:
• How the indicators are used
• Implementation details
• Recommendations for success
Reference Indicators in Loveland

- General – Big Picture (Mostly)
- 12 Indicators
- Some directly related to planning – Some not

- Measure
  - Progress
  - Things important to City
  - Mostly outputs
Reference Indicators in Loveland

- Retail Activity
- Jobs / Housing Balance
- Development in High Risk Areas
- Downtown Economic Activity
- Residential Affordability
- Residential Density

- Property Investment Activity
- Neighborhood Walkability
- Residential Water Use
- Mode Split
- Sidewalks and Bicycle Infrastructure
- Connectivity
Using Indicators in Loveland

• Yearly Reports – Based on data sources
• Disparate Data – in one place
• Useful for next time
• Some collection

• Staff level
• Cross department collaboration
Getting to Indicators in Loveland

- **Timing**
- **Get buy-in on vision first**
- **Indicators support vision**
- **Why general?**
  - More acceptable
  - Readily available data sources

### Data Analysis

#### Drive Alone
- 2000: 82.5%
- 2013: 79.0%
- **-4.2% Change**

#### Carpool
- 2000: 10.8%
- 2013: 8.5%
- **-21.3% Change**

#### Walk
- 2000: 1.6%
- 2013: 2.3%
- **43.8% Change**

#### Public Transit (includes taxi)
- 2000: 0.1%
- 2013: 1.1%
- **1000% Change**
Getting to Indicators in Loveland

- Politics
  - What to measure – political question
  - What is a positive trend – political question
- Adequate explanation
  - Data
  - Concept

Today, one in five Colorado adults is obese and more than half are overweight.
Vision

West Henderson is the premier destination for economic development and livable neighborhoods through integrated mobility solutions, vast recreation amenities, and diverse housing opportunities.
Economic Development

1. Two Urban Centers
2. Two Employment Centers & a Series of Smaller Mixed Use Centers
3. Four Special Districts focus on:
   • Targeted Industries
   • Sports & Entertainment Venues
Neighborhoods

1. Range of Housing Types
2. Neighborhoods of 800 - 1,200 Units
3. Distributed Neighborhood Amenities from Greenways to Mountain Park
Transportation

1. Framework Streets
2. Increased Connectivity & Reduced Street Sizes
3. Transit System Including:
   • Managed Bus Lanes
   • Center-Running BRT
   • Dedicated-Lane BRT/ Streetcar
   • Shuttle to Sloan Gateway Park
   • Regional Connections
   • Park-N-Rides
PROST & Schools

1. Defined Placemaking Features (Civic Areas, Neighborhood Centers, Schools)
2. Greenways & Trails Throughout
3. Three Great Parks
   • Central Community Park
   • Sloan Canyon Gateway Park
   • Mountain Park
Balanced Community

1. Guided by an Adaptive Management Plan & Directed by 4 Guiding Elements:
   • Economic Development
   • Housing
   • Transportation & Infrastructure
   • Parks, Recreation, Trails, Open Space & Schools

2. Community to Live, Work & Recreate

3. Concentrated Industrial & Commercial Surrounded by Neighborhoods & Amenities
Building Program

- Metrics monitor progress toward the 4 components of the Vision
- Proposals must show how they advance 4 indicators
  - Economic Development
  - Neighborhoods
  - Transportation
  - Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLDS</th>
<th>JOB/HOUSING BALANCE</th>
<th>TAXABLE VALUE/ACRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>existing condition</td>
<td>3,435</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 desired future</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal</td>
<td>increase</td>
<td>increase</td>
<td>maintain</td>
<td>increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Placetypes & Neighborhoods

• Progress reviewed annually
• Annual workplans driven by metrics
• If inadequate → Plan Amendment
Transportation & Connectivity

Population Served by Transit
- Existing condition 2014: 0%
- 2050 desired future condition: 75%

Framework Street Row Dedicated or Constructed (Miles)
- Existing condition 2014: 14.8 miles
- 2050 desired future condition: 45.0 miles

Intersections Per Square Mile
- Existing condition 2014: 12
- 2050 desired future condition: 100

Transit Dedicated or Constructed (Miles)
- Existing condition 2014: 3.4 miles
- 2050 desired future condition: 15.0 miles

Trails & Bike Lanes (Miles)
- Existing condition 2014: 8 miles
- 2050 desired future condition: 95.0 miles
PROST & Schools

**AMOUNT OF OPEN SPACE, PARKS, AND TRAILS (ACRES)**
- **Existing condition 2014:** 23
- **2050 desired future condition:** 7.8 acres per 1,000 residents
- **City responsibility:** increase
- **Total acres of open space:** 3,200

**AMOUNT OF RECREATION FACILITIES (SQUARE FEET)**
- **Existing condition 2014:** 0
- **2050 desired future condition:** 132,000
- **City responsibility:** increase

**AMOUNT OF CIVIC AMENITIES**
- **High School / Middle School / Elementary School**
  - **Existing condition 2014:** 0
  - **2050 desired future condition:** 2/2/12
  - **City responsibility:** increase
- **Police & Fire Station**
  - **Existing condition 2014:** 0
  - **2050 desired future condition:** 2
  - **City responsibility:** increase
- **Civic Center**
  - **Existing condition 2014:** 0
  - **2050 desired future condition:** 1
  - **City responsibility:** increase
Regulatory

Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan, Code, Housing and Transportation Plan
Teton County

- 97% Public Land
- 3% Private Land
- 1 Municipality – Town of Jackson
Why So Tough With The Indicators?
Plan Update Process

Issues/Inventory
September 2007
Kickoff, Public, STAG/TAG Meetings

Vision/Goals
November 2007
Public, STAG/TAG Meetings

Choices/Scenarios/Surveys
January 2008
Keypads, Online, Phone Surveys; STAG/TAG Meetings

Land Use Plan/Policies
May - October 2008
3 Public Meetings; 3 STAG Meetings; TAG Meeting; 4 Town Workshops; 6 County Meetings
June 2008
Draft County Land Use Plan

Draft Comprehensive Plan
April - May 2009
JIM Rollout, JPC Rollout
9 Public Presentations; 4 STAG Meetings; 6 Open Houses

Joint PC Review
May 2009 - September 2010
41 Public Hearings with Public Comment
Buildout/Employee Generation Taskforce Roundtable Meeting with Stakeholders
May 2010
PC Preliminary Draft
September 2010
PC Certified Draft

Vision, Common Values, Achieving Our Vision
February - June 2011
Joint Elected Officials’ Review
10 Public JIMs (5 with Public Comment)
June 2011
Final Chapters Draft
July 2011
Chapters Approved

Illustration of Our Vision
July 2011 - March 2012
11 Community Workshops
Joint PC/Elected Review
December 2011
Draft Character Districts
February 2012
2 Joint PC Hearings with Public Comment
PC Certified Character Districts
March 2012
2 JIMs with Public Comment
Joint Elected Approval

Adoption
April - May 2012
1 JIM Hearing with Public Comment
April 2012
Approved Plan
May 2012
Adopted Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan
### Demographics

#### Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>4,472</td>
<td>8,647</td>
<td>9,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>9,604</td>
<td>11,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,172</td>
<td>18,251</td>
<td>21,294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census

#### % of Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census
Before the Plan
Community Driven Indicators
Vision

Preserve and protect the area’s ecosystem in order to ensure a healthy environment, community and economy for current and future generations.
Plan Framework
Components

Amount

Location

Character

5% Growth Trigger

> 40% in Rural County

> 60% in Suitable Locations

> 35% of Workforce Commuting

> 65% of Workforce Housed Locally
Implications - Code
Character Districts – Rural or Complete

- Depicts the characteristics each district and subarea
- Characteristics are described through mapping or shown symbolically
- Mapped features are illustrative of the character of an area and do not imply desired regulatory boundaries or specific locations of attributes
Character Defining Features

- Describe each subarea through text, Neighborhood Forms, and photos and/or drawings

- Neighborhood Form(s) depict the general pattern and intensity of development that meets the desired character

- Illustrations and/or photos provide a more detailed illustration of the desired built form
Use the map and the options on the menus on the left to apply zoning, incentive, and conservation tool concepts to the rural areas of the community. Use the tabs on the top to get more information about a concept. Feel free to bounce around your work will be saved.

Zoning

Choose a zoning concept for each region of the map by clicking on the map or using the selection boxes below. You may set all regions to default option or start with a blank slate.

Set all to:
- North Westbank Riparian
- Solitude Area
- Snake/Gros Ventre Parcels
- South Westbank Riparian
- South Park Riparian
- Snake/Hoback Parcels
- Hoback Subdivs
- Hog Island River Corridor
- Canyon Club
- Airport Subdivs
- Wilson Area Ag
- Westbank Ag
- Spring Gulch Subdivs
- Spring Gulch Ag
- Wilson Area Subdivs
- Indian Springs/3 Creek
- East Gros Ventre Butte
- West Gros Ventre Butte
- Reiter 1/Melody

Incentives

Tools

MAP

The below gauges provide an indication of how applying a concept will impact achievement of the community’s goals.

**Amount of Growth**

Residential units in thousands.

- 9.8k
- 10.2k
- 10.4k
- 10.6k
- 10.8k

**Location of Growth**

Percentage of growth in Rural Areas.

- 40%
- 50%
- 60%
- 70%
- 80%
- 90%
- 100%

**Type of Growth**

Likelihood of housing 65% of the local workforce.

- 1 Very Unlikely
- 2 Unlikely
- 3 Likely
- 4 Very Likely
TDR to Conservation Tools
Implications - Workforce Housing
Housing Tools

Cost/Complexity Per Unit

Potential Units Provided

- Dedicated Sales Taxes
- Stated Objectives & Metrics
- ARUs
- Limiting Commercial Growth
  - Density Bonus
  - Flexible LDRs
- Dedicated Property Taxes
- Trailer Parks/Microhousing
- Education
- Private Donations & Grants
- Technical Assistance
- Angel Fund

Public/Private Partnership
- Consistent Predictable Process
- Zone for Density
- Land Acquisition
- Residential Linkage
- Residential Inclusionary
- Rental Zoning
- SPET Secondary Additional
- “Granting” Rental Incentives
  - Bonus
  - Fee Waiver
- Expedited Project Approvals for Price Restricted Housing

Real Estate Transfer Tax
- Subsidize Housing Development

Preservation

- Tax Credits & Other Fed/State Funds
- Commercial Linkage

No Net Loss

- Expedited Project Approvals for Price Restricted Housing

- Expedited Project Approvals for Price Restricted Housing
Other Benefits

**BASELINE SCENARIO**
- No interventions (programs, policies, capital improvements) to the transportation system
- Land use and demographic trends that occurred between 2001 and 2013 continue
- Travel behavior patterns such as mode share and average trip length will remain at 2013 levels

**PLAN SCENARIO**
- ITP programs, policies and capital improvements are implemented
- Transit ridership doubles by 2024 (from 2013) and again by 2035 (from 2024)
- An additional 5% of single occupant vehicles trips shift to non-driving modes (walk, bike, transit) by 2035
- Walk and bike mode shares increase by more than 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Base Year</th>
<th>Baseline Scenario</th>
<th>Plan Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode Share (of total annual trips)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV (single occupant vehicle)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOA (multiple occupant auto)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual vehicle miles traveled (VMT)</strong></td>
<td>480 million</td>
<td>550 million</td>
<td>610 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Growth in VMT from 2013</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual transit ridership</strong></td>
<td>0.9 million</td>
<td>1.1 million</td>
<td>1.2 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paradise at the Price
Indicator Insights

• Lay the groundwork and check-in often
• Keep the level of effort and costs in mind
• Know what you have influence over versus not
• Be flexible and ready for lots of questions and opinions
• Embrace technology, but know what you’re embracing
• Be authentic and remain mindful of the “spin factor”

No indicator is a perfect match
Panel Discussion
Questions for the Panelists

• What do you think the outcomes will be in 10 years?
  • ...for the community/region?
  • ...for the indicators themselves?
• What worked well and/or what would you do again?
• What would you do differently next time?
• In general, what’s your greatest indicator issue or concern?
• What’s your favorite example of indicator success?
Questions for the Audience

- How many of you use indicators to inform your planning efforts?
- What are your main challenges?
- What have you found successful?
Foundation
History of Planning

1978 Plan
- Plan based on groundwater, slopes & floodplains
- Flexibility/Discretion

1994 Plan
- NRO, SRO, LO, AH, Town & Community Character
- Transportation Chapter in 2000
- Flexibility/Discretion

2012 Plan
- 1994 Policies
- Regionalism, GMP, CD, 65%, Sustainability, Economy
- Predictability, Accountability and Measurability
The Result - Transportation