

## Draft Policy Option #7: Smart Growth Modeling, Planning, Tools

(Option 1.4.3 from original policy matrix)

### 1. Policy Description:

- a. Lay description of proposed policy action: This bundle of 7 options are some of the most effective policies promoting Smart Growth. These policies contribute to GHG emission reductions by altering development patterns and reducing vehicle trips and total vehicle miles traveled.
- b. Policy Design Parameters:
  - i. Implementation level(s) beyond BAU: Target an overall reduction in VMT from passenger vehicles of **x%** by year **XXXX** through a combined approach utilizing a number of programs that fall under those listed below.
  - ii. Timing of implementation
  - iii. Implementing parties: cities, counties, state agencies. Also: developers, builders, homeowners, organizations.
  - iv. Other
- c. Implementation Mechanism(s): Indicate which mechanisms are to be used, and describe the specific approach that is proposed
  - i. Information and education
    1. ***Inform and educate developers on the state's building code for the rehab of older buildings (New Mexico adopted in international rehabilitation code).*** Building codes often create a substantial barrier to rehabilitation, leading to increased rates of new construction followed by neighborhood abandonment. Several states have developed rehabilitation codes that allow for the safe rehab of older buildings, which helps to retain investment in existing neighborhoods. *[Ken to provide additional info.]*
  - ii. Technical assistance
  - iii. Funding mechanisms and or incentives
    1. ***Make maintenance of infrastructure a priority.*** “Level the playing field” in the competition between infill development and new development, while also ensuring that existing communities have strong infrastructure. “Fix it first” - Ensure that maintenance of infrastructure is a priority and revise any state infrastructure programs (transportation, water, sewer) that fund new systems but not maintenance or upgrades for existing systems. *[De Anza to suggest benchmarks]*
    2. ***Replace “average cost pricing” for utility services with rate structures that charge full marginal costs for both new infrastructure and for water, sewer, electricity, and telephone service delivery.*** Current average cost pricing subsidizes distant development, which is more expensive to serve, and penalizes existing and centrally located development, which is cheaper to serve. Marginal cost-based rates help

“level the playing field.” [See Albuquerque approach to variable impact fees: <http://www.cabq.gov/council/impactfees.html>. Add police/fire/schools?]

3. **Use the broad set of state discretionary funding to reward localities that plan, zone and build for higher density development.** Planning decisions are typically made at the local level, but the state can support local decisions consistent with state goals by prioritizing funds for municipalities that adhere to smart growth principles. [Pass on larger shares of funds to MPO/RPO. Use of state funds is critical.]
- iv. Voluntary and or negotiated agreements
  - v. Codes and standards
    1. **Encourage and/or incentivize localities to adopt zoning practices, such as Form Based Codes (FBC), that result in compact mixed-use, walkable communities.** The state should use its grant of zoning authority to local jurisdictions, as well as technical assistance, to require/support changes in zoning codes to guide development toward compact mixed-use, walkable communities. For intro to FBC see: [www.lgc.org/freepub/PDF/Land\\_Use/fact\\_sheets/form\\_based\\_codes.pdf](http://www.lgc.org/freepub/PDF/Land_Use/fact_sheets/form_based_codes.pdf) [Albuquerque has used FBC in downtown area: <http://www.cabq.gov/planning/publications/down2010/process.pdf> Wisconsin requires localities to have the FBC option]
    2. **Abolish or reduce minimum parking requirements in zoning codes, and allow localities to establish parking maximums.** Local governments should have flexibility to include the ability to meet parking requirements off-site or in a central location, funded by in-lieu-of fees (fees paid by a developer instead of providing the required parking). Large parking minimums increase the amount of land necessary for a given size of development (making in-town development more expensive and driving development further out in search of cheaper land), and, by requiring every development to have its own large parking lot, they create strip development unfriendly to anything but SOV auto trips. Encourage “park once” development.
    3. **Reduce or eliminate acreage standards for K – 12 schools.** Acreage standards for public schools can unwittingly produce sprawl by requiring schools to move out of town in search of large / inexpensive parcels of land. [State funding is a big lever.]
  - vi. Market based mechanisms
  - vii. Pilots and demos
  - viii. Research and development
  - ix. Reporting
  - x. Registry
  - xi. Other?

2. BAU Policies/Programs, if applicable: **TBD**
  - a. Description of policy/program #1: TOD, TIF
  - b. Description of policy/program #2
  - c. Etc.
  
3. Types(s) of GHG Benefit(s):
  - a. CO<sub>2</sub> – *main benefit due to decreased VMT and fuel use*
  - b. CH<sub>4</sub>
  - c. N<sub>2</sub>O
  - d. HFC's, SFC's
  - e. Black Carbon
  
4. Types of Ancillary Benefits and or Costs, if applicable: **TBD**
  - a. Example #1
  - b. Example #2
  - c. Etc.
  
5. Estimated GHG Savings and Costs Per MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e:
  - a. Summary Table of:
    - i. GHG potential in 2012, 2020, 2050
    - ii. Net Cost per MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e in 2012, 2020, 2050
  - b. Insert Excel Worksheet showing summary GHG reduction potential and net cost
  
6. Data Sources, Methods and Assumptions:
  - a. Data Sources
  - b. Quantification Methods
  - c. Key Assumptions
  
7. Key Uncertainties if applicable:
  - a. Benefits
  - b. Costs

8. Description of Ancillary Benefits and Costs, if applicable:

- a. Description of issue #1
- b. Description issue #2
- c. Etc.

9. Description of Feasibility Issues, if applicable:

- a. Description of issue #1
- b. Description of issue #2
- c. Etc.

10. Status of Group Approval:

- a. Pending
- b. Completed

11. Level of Group Support:

- a. Unanimous Consent
- b. Supermajority
- c. Majority
- d. Minority

12. Barriers to consensus, if applicable (less than unanimous consent):

- a. Description of barrier #1
- b. Description of barrier #2
- c. Etc.