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Sustainability Planning Lab

Objectives

- Scan the broader landscape of local government sustainability planning
- Connect theory (academic analysis) with emerging planning practices
- Dissect city/county sustainability plan
- Identify different sustainability planning models and innovative practices
- Classify the applications of HUD’s 2010 regional sustainability grantees
- Share preliminary results of plan dissection and HUD grantee classification via presentations and web page
HUD Grant Analysis:

- Request and receive applications
- Examine the narratives and abstracts of 39 of the 45 grantees
- Develop and apply content classification template
  - Core grantee characteristics
  - Content rankings of core sustainability policy themes
- Compile and synthesize relevant results and observations

Applications Not Included in Analysis:

1. Evansville MPO [Evansville, IN]
2. Gulf Regional Planning Commission [Gulfport, MS]
3. Southern Bancorp Capital Partners Helena-West [Helena, AR]
4. University of Kentucky Research Foundation [Lexington, KY]
5. Apache County [St. John’s, AZ]

*Applications still missing
Profile of HUD 2010 Regional Sustainability Grantees: Who are they?

- There were 45 grants awarded.
- Majority were lead by MPOs.
- The average award was $2.1 million
- There are 28 Type I and 17 Type 2 grants
- There are 17 rural and 28 urban grantees
39 Grantees by HUD Region

Region 10: 2 Type I, 1 Type II
Region 9: 1 Type I, 1 Type II
Region 8: 1 Type I, 1 Type II
Region 7: 2 Type I, 1 Type II
Region 6: 1 Type I, 1 Type II
Region 5: 1 Type I, 5 Type II
Region 4: 6 Type I
Region 3: 2 Type I, 1 Type II
Region 2: 1 Type I
Region 1: 4 Type I, 3 Type II

Legend:
- Orange: Type I
- Dark Brown: Type II
Applicant Profile: Grants Analyzed

- Analyzed 39 grant applications
  - Twenty-two Type I grants
  - Seventeen Type II grants

- Rural/Urban Classification
  - 31% of applicants are rural (less than 200K)
  - 69% are urban (200K or more)
Core Partners

- Local Government: 46%
- Local Associations (NGOs): 17%
- Regional (beyond applicant): 11%
- Universities: 6%
- Foundations: 2%
- Housing Authority: 5%
- State: 5%
- Other: 8%
- Other: 8%
- Other: 8%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Breakdown</th>
<th>Classification Template Sustainability Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type I</strong></td>
<td>1. Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications focus on the process for creating regional sustainability plans</td>
<td>2. Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type II</strong></td>
<td>3. Land Use and Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications focus on capacity building and technical assistance to implement plans.</td>
<td>4. Environmental Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban</strong></td>
<td>5. Economic Development and Business Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan areas or regions with more than 200,000 total residents</td>
<td>6. Social/Civic Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td>7. Neighborhood/Community Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Metropolitan areas or regions with fewer than 200,000 total residents | }
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Applications</th>
<th>Category 1</th>
<th>Category 2</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Housing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Land Use and Form</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Economic Development and Business Sustainability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social/Civic Sustainability</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Neighborhood/Community Development</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type II Grantees

Scale of Plans Proposed in Type II Applications

- Multi regional: 2
- Regional: 29
- Jurisdiction (city or county comprehensive plan): 12
- Corridor, Neighborhood or District Level: 6
Type II Grantee Activities

Type II Proposed Activities

- Plans: 27
- Programs: 11
- Projects: 14
- Policy Changes: 12
- Capacity Building/Technical Assistance: 13
Collaborative Planning Process:
Intriguing Techniques + Technology

Process
- Steering Committees
- Data Gathering/ Base lining
- Plan synthesizing/combining

Technology Uses
- Simulations
- Social Media
- Websites
- Touchscreen Kiosks
Sustainability Content Analysis:

- Rankings reflect the RFP’s focus on transportation and land use. Environment, social equity, and economic development tended to receive less emphasis.
- Applications contained very little emphasis on neighborhood-scale issues.
- Housing elements tended to be based around affordable housing, but did not contain many other sustainability elements related to housing issues.
- Rural regions had much less focus on transportation than urban regions.
- There seemed to be a geographic influence of priorities- industrial and formal industrial regions have more focus on brownfields, coastal/wetlands regions focus more on water quality, etc.
- Few applications provided details on multi-regional collaboration.
Next Steps for the Planning Lab:

- Gather all 45 applications
- Update and refine our analysis
- Grantee review profiles
- Report ready for dissemination in July 2011
- Post profiles and report on sustainabilityplanninglab.wordpress.com
  - More in depth information on our grant analysis
  - Details about the sustainability plan scoring
  - Latest developments in the field of sustainability planning