

CONCURRENT SESSION

The Interaction of Transportation and Land Use Planning: The Dog and Tail Wagging Each Other

1:30 p.m.—2:40 p.m.
Friday, April 22, 2005
Sturm College of Law

Moderator: **John Putnam**

Partner
Kaplan Kirsch & Rockwell, LLP
Denver, Colorado

Panelists: **Bill Johnston**

Metro Vision Planning Manager
Denver Regional Council of Governments
Denver, Colorado

Deborah Lebow

NEPT Program
Environmental Protection Agency
Denver, Colorado

Areas of Statewide Interest – H.B. 1041

- Areas around key facilities
- Natural hazards
- Natural resources of statewide importance
- Areas containing or having a significant impact on historical, natural or archaeological resources of statewide importance

Areas and Activities of Statewide Importance – H.B. 1041

- *CU v. Boulder County Case*
- Status of the State Land Use Commission
- Status of Legislation

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act

- Applies to federal DOT agencies -- FHWA, FAA, FTA
- Protects certain parks, recreation areas, historic sites, and wildlife refuges
- Localities can designate parks and other sites
- Requires no prudent and feasible alternative to use; and
- Requires all possible planning to minimize harm

IGAs and Corridor Agreements

- Can cover:
 - Transportation projects
 - Open space acquisition
 - Mitigation
 - Access control
 - Annexation
 - Land use
- *E.g.*, Northwest Parkway IGA; U.S. 85 Corridor Agreement

Questions?

- John Putnam, Kaplan Kirsch & Rockwell LLP
- jputnam@kaplankirsch.com
- (303)825-7000

**JOHN E. PUTNAM
KAPLAN KIRSCH & ROCKWELL, LLP**

**THE IMPACT OF CITY AND COUNTY PLANNING EFFORTS
ON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS AND PLANNING**

This panel, as a whole, evaluates the interactions between local, regional and state land use and transportation planning efforts, including the various feedback loops between the processes. This particular presentation focuses on the perspective of local entities and the manner in which their planning decisions can affect – and be affected by – regional or statewide transportation. Because of the limited time available, this presentation will address only on a few critical examples local and other planning efforts, including: (1) local comprehensive plans and zoning provisions; (2) local authority under Colorado’s H.B. 1041 Regulations; (3) local park and other recreation planning; and (4) the potential local role in corridor management plans and intergovernmental agreements (“IGAs”).

I. IMPACTS OF LOCAL LAND USE PLANNING ON REGIONAL AND FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Local comprehensive plans and zoning can play a significant role in the planning for large-scale transportation projects and plans.

A. Regional Transportation Plans

Under federal transportation law and the Clean Air Act, large metropolitan areas – through Metropolitan Planning Organizations (“MPOs”) like the Denver Regional Council of Governments (“DRCOG”) – are required to develop regional transportation plans (“RTPs”) in order to obtain federal highway and transit funds. 23 C.F.R. Part 450 (transportation regulations); 40 C.F.R. Part 93 (Clean Air Act regulations). Similarly, the Clean Air Act requires that MPOs and other recipients of federal highway and transit funding demonstrate that the RTPs and shorter-term Transportation Improvement Programs (“TIPs”) in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas conform with the State Implementation Plan (“SIP”) for the national ambient air quality standards. 42 U.S.C. § 7506(c). This is generally done by showing that the total emissions from motor vehicles, stationary sources and other sources will still be at a level that would allow the metropolitan area to meet the air quality standards. 40 C.F.R. Pt. 92, Subpt. B; 40 C.F.R. Pt. 51, Subpt. W.

As Bill Johnston of DRCOG will discuss in his presentation, the individual land use plans developed by the localities play an important part in the development of the RTP. The projected demand for land use changes, available property and allowable uses is used to develop regional estimates of population and employment, along with the distribution of these measures through the region. In turn, this drives models for transportation demand, which can be used to determine the adequacy of existing facilities and the effects of new facilities. The need to ensure both fiscal constraint of the models

and conformity with the SIP creates limits on the ability to meet all of the need for transportation improvements and forces the need to make often-difficult decisions about how to allocate new transportation capacity.

B. National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) Reviews

Local comprehensive plans and other land use provisions also play an important role during project- or program-level reviews for transportation measures under NEPA. NEPA is a procedural statute that requires federal agencies – including the Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”), Federal Transit Administration (“FTA”) and Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”) – to evaluate the effects of their actions on the human and natural environment, and consider project alternatives and mitigation that would achieve project aims with fewer environmental impacts. 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 – 4307f. Because NEPA is a procedural statute, it does not require the federal agencies to take the least (or even lesser) environmentally damaging approach; it only requires the agency to consider it. Nonetheless, the visibility of the NEPA process and potential litigation risks associated with the process make it a very important part of the transportation planning process.

Among the environmental impacts that federal agencies must consider are impacts on local land uses, social impacts and cumulative impacts, which will often depend on local land use plans as critical inputs. Thus, for example, the FHWA Technical Advisory on NEPA requirements requires FHWA to consider the following in its assessment of land use impacts:

This discussion should identify the current development trends and the State and/or local government plans and policies on land use and growth in the area which will be impacted by the proposed project.

These plans and policies are normally reflected in the area's comprehensive development plan, and include land use, transportation, public facilities, housing, community services, and other areas.

The land use discussion should assess the consistency of the alternatives with the comprehensive development plans adopted for the area and (if applicable) other plans used in the development of the transportation plan required by Section 134. The secondary social, economic, and environmental impacts of any substantial, foreseeable, induced development should be presented for each alternative, including adverse effects on existing communities. Where possible, the distinction between planned and unplanned growth should be identified.

GUIDANCE FOR PREPARING AND PROCESSING ENVIRONMENTAL AND SECTION 4(F) DOCUMENTS, FHWA TECHNICAL ADVISORY T 6640.8A at 13 (October 30, 1987). Similarly, in its guidance on social impacts, FHWA has provided:

Where there are foreseeable impacts, the draft EIS should discuss the following items for each alternative commensurate with the level of impacts and to the extent they are distinguishable:

(a) Changes in the neighborhoods or community cohesion for the various social groups as a result of the proposed action. These changes may be beneficial or adverse, and may include splitting neighborhoods, isolating a portion of a neighborhood or an ethnic group, generating new development, changing property values, or separating residents from community facilities, etc.

(b) Changes in travel patterns and accessibility (e.g., vehicular, commuter, bicycle, or pedestrian).

(c) Impacts on school districts, recreation areas, churches, businesses, police and fire protection, etc. This should include both the direct impacts to these entities and the indirect impacts resulting from the displacement of households and businesses. ...

Id. Again, for these issues, local comprehensive plans, transportation plans, service plans and other provisions will be critical in providing both basic information and criteria for impact. The other federal transportation agencies provide similar guidance for the evaluation of impacts that also rely on local land use planning.

As a result, the planning local entities undertake in their communities can have a significant effect on the extent to which the NEPA review for a transportation project is simple and uncontroversial or complex and difficult. In some cases, local planning that is inconsistent with a proposed transportation project can make the difference in finding significant impacts that will drive a full Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) instead of an Environmental Assessment (“EA”) or Categorical Exclusion.

C. Airport Land Use Compatibility

Local land use decisions also can determine the long-term future for transportation facilities such as airports. Throughout the country, there are numerous examples of airports that have seen considerable growth in residential and other noise-sensitive uses in their immediate vicinity. In some cases, this incompatible development can lead to political pressures (and often financial pressures) that will make it difficult or impossible to expand the facility to meet increasing demand. At the same time, residents in these areas of incompatible development will face serious noise and other impacts. In a few cases, the pressures may grow large enough to require the closure of the airport (such as Stapleton Airport) and relocation of the capacity to a new location.

As a result, many local entities zone areas around airports with noise overlay districts and similar tools to preserve and/or enhance compatibility. However, doing so can be difficult and controversial, especially at airports with large noise footprints.

Nonetheless, the extent to which jurisdictions are able to use land use planning for compatibility can have a significant effect on the ability of airports to sustain future growth.

II. LOCAL REGULATION OF “AREAS AND ACTIVITIES OF STATEWIDE INTEREST” UNDER COLORADO LAW – H.B. 1041

In Colorado, designation of “areas and activities of statewide interest” is a potentially powerful tool that local entities may use to affect the impact of certain projects of regional or statewide significance, such as highway construction and related development.

Under a Colorado law, commonly referred to as “H.B. 1041”, counties and municipalities are authorized to designate within their jurisdiction certain areas and activities of state interest and to adopt regulations applicable to development in those designated areas or to conduct of those designated activities. C.R.S. §§ 24-65.1-101 to -502. Once an area or activity has been designated and regulations governing development have been adopted, a developer must apply for a permit from the local government to begin any type of development in an area of state interest, or to conduct any activity of state interest within the jurisdiction of that local government. *Id.* at § 24-65.1-501(a)(1). The statute *mandates* that a locality deny any permit application which does not comply with the locality’s guidelines and regulations applicable to the designated areas and activities within its jurisdiction. *Id.* at § 24-65.1-501(3); *see also City of Colorado Springs v. Board of County Commissioners*, 895 P.2d 1105, 1110 (Colo. App. 1994).

Under H.B. 1041, localities are afforded significant latitude to adopt strict regulations for development within designated areas and for designated activities. While the statute supplies minimum criteria for local regulation of designated areas and activities, *id.* at §§ 24-65.1-202, -204, local regulations may be more stringent than the minimum state criteria, *id.* at § 24-65.1-202(3), as long as they “serve the objectives contained in the [statutory] guidelines.” *City and County of Denver v. Board of County Comm’rs*, 782 P.2d 753, 760 (Colo. 1988). The State Land Use Commission has drafted model regulations to provide technical assistance in this process. *See* Colorado Land Use Commission, H.B. 1041 Model Land Use Regulations at 1-i (Sept. 1976) (“Model Regulations”). These Model Regulations may be modified as appropriate for adoption by local jurisdictions.

Regulations adopted under H.B. 1041 are broadly applicable to public and private entities. The local permitting requirements for areas and activities designated under these provisions apply whether the developer is an individual, business entity, or public or corporate body, including the federal government and “any political subdivision, agency, instrumentality, or corporation of the state.” C.R.S. § 24-65.1-102(6). *Regents of University of Colorado v. County of Boulder*, No. 2001CV1896 (Colo. Dist. 2004) (2004) (County H.B. 1041 regulations were applicable to the State) (on appeal).

A number of the designated areas and activities of statewide interest directly relate to transportation, including:

- Site selection of arterial highways and interchanges and collector highways, C.R.S. § 24-65.1-203;
- Site selection of airports; *id.*;
- Site selection of rapid or mass transit terminals, stations and fixed guideways; *id.*; and
- Areas around key facilities in which development may have a material effect upon the key facility or the surrounding community, *id.* at § 24-65.1-201(1)(d).

The following sections briefly describe some of these areas and activities associated with transportation.

1. Site Selection of Arterial Highways and Interchanges and Collector Highways

Under H.B. 1041, “arterial highway” means “any limited access highway which is part of the federal-aid interstate system or any limited-access highway constructed under the supervision of the department of transportation.” *Id.* at § 24-65.2-104. “Collector highway” means “a major thoroughfare serving as a corridor or link between municipalities, unincorporated population center or recreation areas, or industrial centers and constructed under guidelines and standards established by, or under the supervision of the department of transportation. ‘Collector highway’ does not include a city street or local service road or a county road designed for local service and constructed under the supervision of local government.” *Id.*

The statute requires that, at a minimum, these highways and interchanges be sited so that “desirable community patterns” are not disrupted; “expansion of the demand for public services beyond the reasonable capacity of the community or region” will not occur; and “direct conflict with adopted Regional, State and local government master plans are avoided.” *Id.* § 24-65.1-204(5). In addition, the Model Regulations require that highways and interchanges be sited so as to not “detract from scenic resources” and so that “noise levels . . . will not exceed applicable local state or federal noise control laws or regulations.” *See* Model Regulations at § 19-306.

2. Site Selection of Airports

The statute defines “airports” to mean “any municipal or county airport or airport under the jurisdiction of an airport authority.” C.R.S. § 24-65.1-104(1). It is interesting to note that the Legislature excluded both federal facilities (generally military) and privately-owned airports (which tend to be much smaller than the covered public airports)

from this definition. H.B. 1041 provides that criteria for airport site selection shall provide, at a minimum, that “[a]irports shall be located or expanded in a manner which will minimize disruption to the environment of existing communities, minimize the impact on existing community services, and complement the economic and transportation needs of the state and area.” C.R.S. § 24-65.1-204(3). Site selection for airports is probably less important than the other modes of transportation due to the fact that few new airport sites are likely to be chosen in the near future, however.

3. Site Selection of Rapid or Mass Transit Terminals, Stations and Fixed Guideways

The statute provides extensive guidance regarding the criteria for transit related facilities. For example, it requires that:

Rapid or mass transit terminals, stations, or guideways shall be located in conformance with the applicable municipal master plan adopted pursuant to section 31-23-206, C.R.S., or any applicable master plan adopted pursuant to 30-28-108, C.R.S. If no such master plan has been adopted, such areas shall be developed in a manner designed to minimize congestion on the streets; to secure safety from fire, floodwaters and other dangers; to promote health and general welfare; to provide adequate light and air; to prevent the overcrowding of land; to avoid undue concentration of population; and to facilitate the adequate provision of transportation, water, sewerage, schools, parks, and other public requirements. Activities shall be conducted with reasonable consideration, among other things, as to the character of the area and its peculiar suitability for particular uses and with a view to conserving the value of buildings and encouraging the most appropriate use of land throughout the jurisdiction of the applicable local government.

C.R.S. § 24-65.1-204(4)(a). In addition, H.B. 1041 provides that proposed locations of rapid or mass transit terminals, stations and fixed guideways which will not require the demolition of residences or businesses shall be given preferred consideration over competing alternatives. C.R.S. § 24-65.1-204(4)(b). Finally, the statute explicitly notes that:

A proposed location of a rapid or mass transit terminal, station, or fixed guideway that imposes a burden or deprivation on a local government cannot be justified on the basis of local benefit alone, nor shall such a permit for such a location be denied solely because the location places a burden or deprivation on one local government.

C.R.S. § 24-65.1-204(4)(c).

4. Areas Around Key Facilities In Which Development May Have a Material Effect Upon the Key Facility or the Surrounding Community

Local designation of “areas around key facilities” may also affect planning on or near transportation facilities. “Key facilities” are defined to include “interchanges involving arterial highways,” airports and “rapid or mass transit terminals, stations and fixed guideways.” C.R.S. § 24-65.1-104.

The Model Regulations dictate that regulatory goals identified under this section include the facilitation of “orderly development” and the minimization of direct and indirect sources of air and water pollution. Model Regulations at § 12-11. With regard to interchanges, the Model Regulations specifically advise that the area designated around an interchange should include at least the area within a one-mile radius of the interchange as well as “all land that is likely to be influenced by the interchange and that requires regulation of development in order to accomplish the express purpose of H.B. 1041.” Model Regulation at 12-iii. The statute, in turn, requires that the designated area around an interchange involving arterial highways must be “developed to discourage traffic congestion, incompatible uses, and expansion of demand for governmental services beyond the reasonable capacity of the region or the community to provide such services *as determined by the local government.*” C.R.S. § 24-65.1-202(b) (emphasis added). By contrast, with regard to airports, the statute dictates that the surrounding areas “shall be administered so as to (I) Encourage land use patterns for housing and other local government needs that will separate uncontrollable noise sources from residential and other noise-sensitive areas; and (II) Avoid danger to public safety and health and to property due to aircraft crashes.” C.R.S. § 24-65.1-202(5)(a).

* * *

In addition to the areas and activities identified above that have direct relationships to transportation projects, H.B. 1041 also allows local governments to designate areas of significance that can be affected by transportation projects, including:

- Areas containing or having a significant impact on historical, natural or archaeological resources of statewide importance; C.R.S. § 24-65.1-104;
- Natural resources of statewide importance; C.R.S. § 24-65.1-201; and
- Natural hazard areas; C.R.S. §§24-65.1-201, -103.

Ultimately, H.B. 1041 gives Colorado local entities a significant tool to exercise potential control over a potential transportation project, or to protect a critical piece of transportation infrastructure. In particular, the statute allows local entities to exercise direct control over a project – at a relatively late stage in the project development process – as opposed to the primarily indirect controls local governments have through their normal land use planning roles.

III. LOCAL CONTROL THROUGH PARK AND OTHER RELATED DESIGNATIONS – SECTION 4(f) OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT

Local entities can also affect subsequent transportation planning for highways, transit and airports through their designation of parks, open space and other sensitive properties. Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, codified at 49 U.S.C. § 303, requires the modal administrations of the United States Department of Transportation (“DOT”)¹ to address the impacts of federal transportation projects on parks, recreation areas, wildlife refuges, archeological sites and historic sites. Specifically, the statute provides:

The Secretary may approve a transportation program or project ... requiring the use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife or waterfowl refuge of national, State or local significance, or land of an historic site of national, State, or local significance (as determined by the Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction over the park, area, refuge or site) only if—

- (1) there is no prudent and feasible alternative to using that land; and
- (2) the program or project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from use.

49 U.S.C. § 303(c). *See also* 23 C.F.R. § 771.135(a)(1) (identifying same Section 4(f) standards for FHWA). Unlike NEPA, this is a substantive requirement upon the federal agencies that can stop a project, require mitigation, or require choices among alternatives. Section 4(f) applies whenever a DOT agency must make some approval associated with a project, including funding, interchange approvals, or airport layout plan approvals. FHWA, FTA and other DOT agencies generally apply Section 4(f) as part of the NEPA process for a particular transportation plan or project.

As noted above, Section 4(f) is triggered whenever a transportation program or project requires the use of specific lands. The term “use” in this context has been interpreted to include “constructive use” through indirect effects like noise or interruption of scenic views. *E.g.*, 23 C.F.R. § 771.135(p)(1)(iii). Federal transportation regulations clarify that: “Constructive use occurs when the transportation project does not incorporate land from a section 4(f) resource, but the project’s proximity impacts are so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify a resource for protection under section 4(f) are substantially impaired.” *Id.* at § 771.135(p)(2). FHWA

¹ The main modal administrations in DOT are the Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”), the Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”), the U.S. Coast Guard (“USCG”), the Federal Railroad Administration (“FRA”), and the Federal Transit Administration (“FTA”) (formerly the Urban Mass Transit Administration).

has identified the following as examples of situations in which “constructive use” would exist:

(i) The projected noise level increase attributable to the project substantially interferes with the use and enjoyment of a noise-sensitive facility of a resource protected by section 4(f), such as hearing the performances at an outdoor amphitheater, sleeping in the sleeping area of a campground, enjoyment of a historic site where a quiet setting is a generally recognized feature or attribute of the site’s significance, or enjoyment of an urban park where serenity and quiet are significant attributes;

(ii) The proximity of the proposed project substantially impairs esthetic features or attributes of a resource protected by section 5(f), where such features or attributes are considered important contributing elements to the value of the resource. Examples of substantial impairment to visual or esthetic qualities would be the location of a proposed transportation facility in such proximity that it obstructs or eliminates the primary views of an architecturally significant, historical building, or substantially detracts from the setting of a park or historic site which derives its value in substantial part due to its setting;

(iii) The project results in a restriction on access which substantially diminishes the utility of a significant publicly owned park, recreation area, or a historic site;

(iv) The vibration impact from operation of the project substantially impairs the use of a section 4(f) resource, such as projected vibration levels from a rail transit project that are great enough to affect the structural integrity of a historic building or substantially diminish the utility of a building; or

(v) The ecological intrusion of a project substantially diminishes the value of wildlife habitat in a wildlife or waterfowl refuge adjacent to the project or substantially interferes with the access to a wildlife or waterfowl refuge, when such access is necessary for established wildlife migration or critical life cycle processes.

Id. at § 771.135(p)(4).

IV. LOCAL ROLES IN COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS REGARDING TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS AND LAND USES

Local entities can also play a significant role in shaping regional transportation and planning projects through cooperative agreements. Transportation projects often benefit from the creation of cooperative agreements that include affected government

agencies as well as public and private entities. In this context, local governments are often key players in the debate.

The Intergovernmental Agreement (“IGA”) for the management of US Highway 85 is a representative example. *See e.g.* National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Synthesis 337, “Cooperative Agreements for Corridor Management” (2004) at 20-22. In the case of US 85, each affected community joined in a multiparty IGA to manage the nearly 52 mile stretch between Interstate 76 and Weld County Road 80. This agreement included the Colorado Department of Transportation (“CDOT”) and eleven local entities (including towns, cities, and Weld County). *Id.* at 20. The parties recognized that coordinated regulation was essential to:

- Maintain the efficient and smooth flow of traffic;
- Reduce the potential for traffic accidents;
- Protect the functional level and optimize traffic capacity;
- Provide efficiency spacing for traffic signals; and
- Protect the public health, safety and welfare.

Id. at 21. As a result, the IGA governs the treatment of private accesses and new parcels and the allocation of costs; it itemizes individual access locations, planned modifications, and circumstances under which major adjustments to existing access may be made; and establishes specific procedures to be followed by any local jurisdiction in the event that an amendment to the access control plan is desired. Ultimately, it provides the parties with a comprehensive roadway access control plan. *Id.*

Another local example of the ability of municipalities to influence regional transportation projects is the IGA between the counties and cities related to the Northwest Parkway between US 36 and Interstate 25. Local entities were very successful in these cooperative agreements in obtaining significant financial benefits for local purposes. For example, the cities of Broomfield and Louisville secured a set aside of parkway financing proceeds to be used for perpetual conservation easements or fee title land purchases for the purposes of expanding open space. *See e.g.* Intergovernmental Agreement, Southeast Boulder County, South 96th Street, Dillon Road, and US 287 Area Comprehensive Development Plan at 7 (recorded in Boulder County on March 15, 1999 as Doc. No. 1916399). Through these IGAs, the communities were also able to shape both future development in the highway corridor and also growth impacts.

In this way, local governments can successfully use cooperative agreements for regional transportation projects to both protect local interests and to advance local initiatives. As a result, cooperative agreements are often an important planning tool for local entities.

V. CONCLUSION

Although regional transportation projects and planning are generally initiated at the state and federal level, local governments have a surprising array of tools with which

to shape plans and projects. In some cases, localities have the ability to exercise direct control over certain projects at a relatively late stage in the project development process, for example in the H.B. 1041 context in Colorado. For the most part, however, it requires significant advance work for a local entity to position itself appropriately to protect local concerns. This is most evident in the NEPA context, where the existence of comprehensive plans and land use provisions can impact the outcome of the environmental review. As a result, local governments should make sure to engage in appropriate long-range planning with regard to regional transportation projects.

The Interaction of Transportation and Land Use Planning: The Dog and Tail Wagging Each Other

Presentation Outline

Bill Johnston, AICP, Metro Vision Planning Manager
Denver Regional Council of Governments

1. Who is DRCOG?

- An association of 51 member governments.
- A regional planning agency authorized by state statutes.
- The metropolitan planning organization authorized by federal statutes.

2. What is Metro Vision?

- The growth and development, transportation and environmental quality plan for the nine-county Denver region.
- Originally adopted in 1997; updated in 2005.
- Local compliance not mandated by state statutes.
- Voluntary participation through the Mile High Compact.

3. Key features of the Metro Vision 2030 Plan

- Establishes an urban growth boundary.
- Identifies urban centers.
- Defines a visionary highway and transit system.
- Recognizes relationship between land use and transportation.

4. 2030 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

- Describes the fiscally constrained system.
- Based on policies contained in the Metro Vision transportation element.
- Must demonstrate that system will not adversely affect air quality standards.
- Establishes eligibility for regional funding (see TIP below).

5. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

- Mechanism for allocating federal funds for regionally significant projects.
- Developed every 2 years to determine funding for following six-year period (e.g., 2005-2010, 2007-2012, etc.).
- Projects proposed by local jurisdictions, CDOT, RTD and other agencies scored to determine funding priority.
- Scores based on how well the project satisfies certain criteria that reflect Metro Vision transportation policies.
- Some criteria also reflect Metro Vision growth and development criteria.
- Conformity analysis is required to demonstrate that programmed facility improvements will not adversely affect air quality standards.

6. Key interrelationships (summary)

- Metro Vision land use and transportation policies reinforce each other.
- Metro Vision policies provide framework for more specific Regional Transportation Plan.
- TIP scoring criteria favor projects that advance Metro Vision goals and policies.
- Metro Vision establishes the land use and transportation assumptions that are used to develop population and employment forecasts, which in turn are used as inputs into the regional air quality model (administered by the Regional Air Quality Council).
- Local land use plans, which should embody Metro Vision principles, are also used to develop population and employment forecasts.

- For additional information contact Bill Johnston at 303 480-6754 or go to www.drcog.org/regional_planning/metro_vision.