

Strategies for Sustainable Growth: The Transportation/Land Use Intersection

Workshop Summary of Findings

June 18, 2009



About the Urban Land Institute

The mission of the Urban Land Institute is to provide leadership in the responsible use of land and in creating and sustaining thriving communities worldwide.

Founded in 1936, ULI has 40,000 members worldwide, representing the entire spectrum of land use and real estate development disciplines, working in private enterprise and public service. ULI is committed to:

- Bringing together leaders from across the fields of real estate and land use policy to exchange best practices and serve community needs;
- Fostering collaboration within and beyond ULI's membership through

mentoring, dialogue, and problem solving;

- Exploring issues of urbanization, conservation, regeneration, land use, capital formation, and sustainable development;
- Advancing land use policies and design practices that respect the uniqueness of both built and natural environments;
- Sharing knowledge through education, applied research, publishing, and electronic media; and
- Sustaining a diverse global network of local practice and advisory efforts that address current and future challenges.

About ULI Central Florida

ULI Central Florida is ULI at the local level. Through District Council–sponsored educational forums and events, ULI Central Florida offers an unbiased, nonpartisan, and open exchange of ideas impacting land use and the quality of life in the Central Florida region.

CentralFlorida.uli.org

Expert Review Panel

ULI Central Florida is grateful to these experts who served as reviewers for this document and provided additional insight and perspective:

James Sellen

Executive Vice President, MSCW

Brooke Myers

ULI Central Florida Exec. Committee

Gregg Logan

Managing Director, RCLCO

Chris Sinclair

President, Renaissance Planning Group

Tim Jackson

President, Glatting, Jackson, Kercher Anglin

Acknowledgments

ULI Central Florida gratefully acknowledges the support of the following partners:

Shelley Lauten

President, *myregion.org*

Linda Chapin

UCF Metropolitan Center for Regional Studies

Phil Laurien

Executive Director, East Central Florida Regional Planning Council

Harry Barley

Executive Director, Metroplan Orlando



UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
METROPOLITAN CENTER FOR REGIONAL STUDIES



ULI Program Staff

Mark Loeb

Manager, ULI Central Florida

Julie D. Stern

Writer, JDS Communications

©2009 ULI Central Florida
100 East Pine Street, Suite 302
Orlando, Florida 32801

ULI—the Urban Land Institute
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
Suite 500 West
Washington, D.C. 20007-5201

All rights reserved. Reproduction or use of the whole or any part of the contents without written permission of the copyright holder is prohibited.

Contents

Executive Summary	5
Overview	8
The Context: Building Walkable Urban Places	9
The Process	11
Barriers and Solutions: Common Themes	12
Transportation/Land Use Regulations	12
Incentives	12
Political Hurdles	13
Funding Imbalance	13
Too Much Suburbia	14
Lack of Connectivity and Regional Mobility	14
Limited Acceptance of Transit	15
The Florida Climate	15
Limited Vision and Leadership	15
Lack of Coordination and Cooperation	16
Lack of Appropriate Government Structures	16
Fear of Change and the Unknown	16
Need for Education	17
Looking Back, Next Steps	18
Workshop Organizers, Moderators, and Reporters	19
Additional Resources	21
Appendix: Questions and Responses	23

Executive Summary

Central Florida is at an important transportation policy crossroads. As a region we have an opportunity to revisit government structures, regulations and processes that have led to our current inefficient transportation system and work together to identify and implement principles that can foster sustainable growth to allow the region to thrive well into the future. With that opportunity and challenge in mind, on February 5, 2009, the ULI Central Florida District Council convened an interactive workshop with the goal of exploring barriers and solutions to developing a sustainable approach to the “transportation/land use intersection” in Central Florida.

The ULI workshop, sponsored by the University of Central Florida Metropolitan Center for Regional Studies and hosted on behalf of *myregion.org*, featured more than 150 elected officials, civic leaders, developers, business leaders, market analysts, real estate advisors, planners, designers, and public agency officials representing the seven-county Central Florida region (consisting of Brevard, Lake Orange, Osceola, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia Counties). The results of the workshop have enabled the ULI Central Florida District Council to produce a set of recommendations for regional leaders to consider as they make important decisions about transportation, land use and the crucial relationship between the two. Those recommendations were reviewed and commented on by selected regional experts in land-use and transportation, to make them as actionable as possible. This document summarizes those recommendations as well as the overall workshop results.

The workshop participants engaged in an interactive discussion around a number of key issues, including how to create transit-friendly/multi-modal land use patterns, improve regional mobility, increase public

and regulatory acceptance of compact, mixed use, and infill development, identifying both barriers and solutions.

Encouragingly, there was broad consensus among the participants on a number of major themes¹:

- 1) *Establishing a long-term regional vision for transportation*
- 2) *Creating a proactive communication and education plan around the vision*
- 3) *Improving transportation connectivity and regional mobility*
- 4) *Increasing the number of walkable, mixed-use places and reducing suburban sprawl*
- 5) *Providing for alternative forms of transportation*
- 6) *Revamping regulations that inhibit creating transit supportive walkable mixed-use places*
- 7) *Providing incentives to encourage creation of transit supportive walkable mixed-use places*
- 8) *Establishing a dedicated revenue source in support of transit*

There was consensus that Central Florida is overbuilt with suburban residential communities that require residents to drive everywhere (to work, shop, study, and play), and under-built with mixed-use, compact, walkable communities that can reduce traffic, limit the outward expansion of the metropolitan area, and improve public finances. The region needs to identify and remove the regulatory barriers to this type of development. Regulatory barriers like concurrency requirements that have the unintended consequences of reinforcing and extending sprawl must be changed, to facilitate creating the types of communities that will be most attractive to new homebuyers, reduce the amount of driving

¹ For a detailed description on each theme, please refer to Barriers and Solutions: Common Themes on page 12

people have to do, and support sustainable growth.

1. The first recommendation is that a regional transportation vision be created to facilitate the necessary changes in land-use regulations. Without a regional vision of how transportation investments will be made, localities will continue to be skeptical about changing their land use regulations or exaction techniques to promote more walkable, transit-oriented communities. The region's leaders need to be encouraged to make tough decisions on land use and transportation, decisions that are based on what will be best for the region over the long term. A shared, long-term vision for the region will help its leaders make these decisions.
2. Pursue strategies that encourage a much greater share of new development, or redevelopment, in existing centers and urban corridors. Redevelopment in these corridors should include all transportation modes, not just cars. Developing this infrastructure will encourage private investment in mixed-use development within these corridors.
3. To meet the market demand for development in city centers and redevelopment corridors, we need a commitment to fixed guideway transit. Based on research, "bus routes rarely figure in discussions of transit oriented development...bus routes have little appeal to most developers²" and so are not likely to attract significant investment to create the higher density walkable places that contribute to sustainability and meet market demand. Fixed rail transit provides the developers with the surety they need to invest in urban redevelopment – with it we will be able to create the kinds of communities that the market wants, at higher densities, and at higher values.

² Ten Principles for Successful Development Around Transit; Urban Land Institute, 2003

Its not just about moving people, it's about responding to what the market demands.

4. Transportation drives the change and funding drives transportation. In order to have a regional fixed guideway transit system, we must have a dedicated revenue source, a dedicated tax source.
 - a. The sense of the workshop participants was that funding is too heavily slanted towards roads and not sufficient for other transportation modes. However it appears there is insufficient funding for both road and transit. Currently, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) allocates 75% of its total roadway funding to the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS), which is limited to interstates, expressways and a few major arterials. In the Orlando region, only Interstate 4, the Florida Turnpike and Orlando-Orange County Expressway Authority's (OOCEA) expressways are in the SIS. The remaining 25% does not go very far.
 - b. The primary source of funding for non-SIS transportation infrastructure is impact fees and proportional fair share payments from developers. That limited source has run dry in the current economy. Furthermore there is no mechanism for shifting developer funding to transit, and the amount of developer contributions are not sufficient to pay for major transit improvements, let alone the on-going operations cost for transit. Multimodal Transportation Districts (MMTDs) are intended to provide such a tool, but they have had limited acceptance and the rules are so ambiguous that FDOT, Department of Community Affairs (DCA) and Regional Planning Councils (such as East Central Florida Regional Planning Council) fall back to proportional fair share

methods to exact money from developers. Thus, any money exacted from developers still goes to roads. (Note that since this paper was written, sweeping changes to State growth management regulations have been enacted that affect funding.)

5. Creation of a regional vision can help ensure that both the public and private sector pursue compatible strategies that reinforce the vision. Public investments in transit can increase property values and create opportunities for community building. Experts agree that transit-oriented-development “has enormous potential to increase real estate value, generate jobs, and increase tax revenues, and therefore should be part of a regional economic development strategy³”. The sense of the workshop participants is that this is not only good for sustainability, but is actually responding to the way that many people want to live, work and play.
6. Study places that have made similar tough decisions resulting in higher density and walkable urban development to inform the decision-making process and overcome the fear of change. Places that have made transformations, like Charlotte and Portland, made a compelling case for a different vision of their future and went so far as to map how that vision played out across the region. They built a strong case and gained public consensus which led to sales tax increases (the only viable regional transit funding source) that led to building transit lines that led to differing land use regulations.
7. Find ways to avoid fragmented, Balkanized decisions about transportation. The current system of local governments and multiple transportation authorities setting

transportation policies and funding transportation projects in an uncoordinated manner is ineffective. The region’s leaders should consider creating a single regional transportation authority and empowering it to coordinate policy and funding. It should reflect the future economic development strategy of the region.

8. Revise regulations, incentives and governmental structures to produce smart development—that is, development that creates desired land use patterns—in the right places—such as in infill projects that make use of existing infrastructure and in new development of mixed-use activity nodes along planned transportation/transit corridors. Existing attempts to regulate development have not been successful; new techniques are needed.
9. Finally, and most importantly, the region needs to ensure, through outreach and education efforts, that these messages reach all stakeholders. One way of doing this would be to create a Regional Design Manual for centers and corridors, not as a regulatory document, but as a more detailed vision, a document on how to redevelop in centers and corridors including re-developing for transit. A “guidebook” could be created identifying the major principles, and providing illustrative examples that could apply throughout the region. This could be an educational tool and a guide for the whole region.

In summary, the results of this workshop demonstrate the strong commitment of participants to work together at the regional level to enable Central Florida to grow in a sustainable way.

³ Ten Principles for Successful Development Around Transit; Urban Land Institute, 2003

Overview

The workshop brought 150 attendees—elected officials, civic leaders, public agency representatives, developers, planners, designers, and other interested individuals—together to spend an afternoon thinking and talking about land use and transportation in the context of sustainable growth. Gregg Logan, Managing Director of the real estate advisory firm RCLCO and Chair of ULI Central Florida, moderated the program. According to Logan, fostering a land use pattern that supports a range of transportation choices is not merely something good for the region’s sustainability; it is also responsive to the demands of the market and a driver of economic development opportunities.

Jim Sellen, Executive Vice President of planning and design for MSCW, Inc., and a member of the ULI Central Florida Executive Committee, noted in his introductory remarks, “We need to transform the way we think about transportation and land use. We need to take a more holistic approach, one that results in a pattern of land uses that supports true multimodal transportation opportunities. We need these multi-modal transportation systems to support a more compact, mixed-use pattern of development. The results will be tangible: more energy efficiency, less greenhouse gasses emitted into the environment, more affordable housing, and greater open space, as well as better accessibility and mobility throughout our region.”

Linda Chapin, immediate past Director of the University of Central Florida Metropolitan Center for Regional Studies, said Central Florida has been having one of the most interesting conversations about growth occurring anywhere in America. The discussion, led by *myregion.org*, has been instrumental in bringing together a broad-based coalition of partners—including: Florida Department of Transportation, Florida Department of Community Affairs,

East Central Florida Regional Planning Council, Central Florida Regional Planning Council, Central Florida MPO Alliance, the region’s seven counties, elected leaders, Orlando Regional Chamber of Commerce, business community, and over 20,000 citizens. She charged the group to take the conversation to the next level, to identify solutions and figure out how to implement the principles and consensus that have developed around *myregion.org*’s work.

Shelley Lauten, President of *myregion.org*—a groundbreaking regional development organization that has been a catalyst in bringing together Central Florida’s public officials, business leaders, and citizens—offered some context about what *myregion.org* already has done, how far the region has come in thinking and working regionally, and what still needs to be done. She addressed the challenges of coordinating the efforts of the region’s seven counties, 86 cities, 500 elected officials, 54 chambers of commerce, and 92 organizations that deal with economic development, to create and implement a shared vision that will make the region globally competitive while maintaining its residents’ quality of life.

Lauten focused on the importance of collaborating across city and county boundaries, across public and private sector lines; on thinking differently about regional problems to come up with new solutions; on creating a shared vision of growth in the 21st century; and on the need to have regional conversations about how the region can go about developing great transportation corridors, not just new roads, and developing great communities, not just new housing, office buildings, and shopping centers. “Imagine the future,” she challenged the workshop participants, and think about “regional-scale solutions to how we accomplish this vision of growth. That’s why we’re here today; that’s why we need your help.”

The Context: Building Walkable Urban Places

Christopher Leinberger—a visiting fellow at Brookings Institution and author of *The Option of Urbanism: Investing in a New American Dream*—gave the workshop’s keynote presentation. “What we’re here to talk about is the future,” began Leinberger, “and you have set a phenomenal foundation for that future.” He went on to discuss what he described as a fundamental structural change—and not just a cyclical down-turn—that is now taking place in our economy – but also in how we develop the built environment.

The built environment—which includes buildings and transportation infrastructure—makes up a whopping 35 percent of the wealth of the United States—yet growth in the built environment happens very slowly, because we only add about 2 percent to the base each year—at most. The built environment also has an enormous impact on energy use and climate change; it contributes more than 70 percent of all CO₂ and other greenhouse gasses that cause global warming. Leinberger went on to assert that *transportation drives development*; that transportation systems come first and land uses follow; and that the transportation systems that we choose therefore dictate what we build and where we build it.

Leinberger contrasted two forms of development: “walkable urbanism,” the prominent form of development in the 5,500 years that people have been building cities, which he describes as places where people are able to meet most of their daily needs by traveling on foot (or, in modern times, by train or some other form of transit), and “drivable sub-urbanism,” in which people are dependent on the car to get where they need to go. In the post–World War II era, drivable sub-urbanism became the dominant form of development, when we reached for the 1950s American Dream of a house in the suburbs for every family, as illustrated by popular television

shows such as *Leave It to Beaver* and *Ozzie & Harriet*. A de facto domestic policy, he maintained, has made drivable sub-urbanism the only legal form of development in 95 percent of U.S. jurisdictions today, and the federal government has provided massive subsidies to fund the transportation infrastructure required to support it.

“Then,” he noted, “something funny happened in the mid-1990s: the market decided it was tired of drivable sub-urbanism.” In what he referred to as the major social change of the 21st century, the millennial generation—people now in their 20s and 30s—decided they wanted a different lifestyle, one that is better represented by walkable urbanism and television shows like *Seinfeld* and *Sex and the City*, which present an appealing image of city life. A number of demographic and societal shifts, including downsizing baby boomer households, an increase in households with no children, boredom with the suburban lifestyle, and the rising cost of energy, all are creating pent-up demand for walkable urban development. This is resulting in huge price premiums—from 40 to 200 percent—for walkable urban housing and commercial space.

With drivable sub-urbanism, Leinberger argued, “more is less”; the more sub-urban development we have, the more problems it creates, including traffic congestion, environmental degradation, and so forth, and property values in existing suburbs decline. In walkable urbanism, however, “more is more”; the more dense, compact, development takes place, the more interesting and attractive a place becomes. Each new element adds value to those that were there before—as long as they are within walking distance and are appropriately managed and maintained. The implications for climate change are obvious, since a drivable sub-urban household uses and emits three times the

energy and CO₂ as a walkable urban household. “We will not achieve our climate change goals,” he asserted, “without a land use and transportation change.”

Developing and managing walkable urban places, Leinberger insisted, are fundamentally different processes than building traditional suburbs, and require entirely different skill sets. He compared the challenge of showing traditional suburban real estate developers how to develop walkable urban places to teaching a NASCAR driver to be a fighter pilot.

Central Florida has two regionally significant walkable urban places at critical mass—Winter Park—and Thornton Park/downtown Orlando. On a smaller but important scale, Baldwin Park and Celebration demonstrate the appeal of walkable environments. Yet the opportunity exists to create many more such places over the next ten to 20 years. “This is the future for us in real estate,” Leinberger asserted. “The big question for you today is where are these places going to be?” They can happen, he insisted, in many different types of places: close-in, in suburban town centers, in redeveloped older suburbs, and in suburban green-field developments—as he presented examples of each of these from the Washington, D.C., area and elsewhere.

The bad news today, Leinberger stressed, is that fringe real estate is structurally overbuilt. One reason for the current financial collapse, insisted Leinberger, is that “we have built trillions of dollars of real estate product and infrastructure in the wrong location, or at least wrong configuration.” Climate change legislation will increase energy costs and decrease the value of “drive ‘til you qualify” suburbs. The good news, he added, is that there is huge pent-up market demand for the alternative—walkable urbanism—that will keep real estate developers busy for the next generation—and that walkable urban infrastructure, on a per-square-foot or per-unit basis, is much less expensive

to build, since it is used much more efficiently than suburban infrastructure. No doubt we will need more development at the edges of our metropolitan areas, but we need to rethink the form of those developments. There is huge profit potential and huge value capture potential for, in particular, rail transit development.

Leinberger closed by highlighting five “next steps” for Central Florida:

- Keep working together, especially to educate legislators about the land use/transportation connection;
- Develop a regional blueprint that focuses on where the next seven to 11 regionally significant walkable urban places will be;
- Develop regional transportation corridors to link those walkable urban places together;
- Unleash creativity, especially by putting overlay zoning districts on top of those walkable urban places—mixed-use development must be legal; and, finally,
- Measure, inspect, and improve the management of urban places—which generally is done through business improvement districts

“That’s the future,” concluded Leinberger. “Take it and run!”

The Process

Following Leinberger's presentation, the participants at each roundtable were asked to address one of seven specific questions (please refer to sidebar) in an interactive and creative way. Tables were tasked with identifying and discussing the barriers and potential real-world solutions to a particular question, to prioritize those barriers and solutions, and to report the findings back to the rest of the participants during a group presentation.

To ensure that each table was focused and productive, a moderator facilitated the conversation, allowing an open exchange of ideas. A table reporter noted participants' comments on an easel and later summarized the table's highest-priority barriers and solutions on index cards. The top-priority items were then typed up and displayed on the video screens to the workshop participants as each table presented their findings during the group presentation portion of the day. For a complete list of each table's responses, please refer to the Appendix.

Lauten, Leinberger, and Logan added their insights to the participants' findings and captured the key points of the workshop to wrap up the day.

The Questions

Participants at each table were asked to respond to one of the following questions:

- 1) What are the regulatory/funding barriers and solutions to creating transit-friendly/multimodal land use patterns?
- 2) What are the barriers and solutions to reducing driving (total vehicle miles traveled)?
- 3) What are the jurisdictional/funding barriers and solutions to making transit viable?
- 4) What are the barriers and solutions to reducing energy use and greenhouse gas emissions through transportation and land use?
- 5) What are the barriers and solutions for improving regional mobility?
- 6) What are the barriers and solutions to public acceptance of transit?
- 7) What are the barriers and solutions to public and regulatory acceptance of compact, mixed-use, and infill development?

Barriers and Solutions: Common Themes

Encouragingly, a broad consensus on the barriers and solutions emerged amongst the workshop participants on a number of major themes. Though each table worked independently, the findings were remarkably similar from table to table. A summary of the thirteen major themes from the participants follow below.

Transportation/Land Use Regulations

Barriers- Most regulations in place strongly favor automobile-oriented development patterns (sprawl) including wide roads, single-use land patterns and lack of transportation alternatives and discourage, or make illegal in some cases, transit-friendly, multi-modal, mixed-use, and compact development patterns. This is true at all levels of government from the Federal level to the State down to local jurisdictions. Specific examples include State concurrency requirements focused on level-of-service standards; rigidly imposed impact fees; and land development codes and other existing laws and regulations whose requirements often limit redevelopment options.

Leinberger commented that, “drivable suburban and walkable urban land use patterns are as different as chalk and cheese,” and must be tested and regulated by fundamentally different measures and mechanisms. Regulations and performance measures designed for drivable suburban land use patterns discourage—or even prohibit—walkable urban ones.

Current regulations are often too rigid, restrictive and one-size-fits all. This makes the job of regulators easy but often has the unintended consequences of creating more traffic, generating greater energy use and pollution, accelerating loss of open space and lowering quality of life. Impact fees were identified as an example where the consequences are not well understood.

Leinberger noted that impact fee analyses show that the per-unit costs of extending infrastructure for drivable suburban development are ten to 22 times those for walkable urban development. Yet, in many jurisdictions, the impact fees are the same. He likens this to politicians requiring all restaurants to charge the same price for a meal thus requiring those ordering smaller portions to subsidize those who over-indulge. “And that’s how we allocate infrastructure,” he concluded.

Solutions- The potential solutions involve rethinking and redefining (or even eliminating) concurrency requirements—including valuing transit and other alternatives to more roads, exempting redevelopment and infill areas from concurrency requirements, requiring narrower roads including restriping existing roads for 10-foot lanes using the extra width for bike lanes, lower speed limits, eliminating minimum off-street parking requirements, considering different types of performance-based measures, allowing more flexibility and discretion in enforcing them based on performance rather than prescriptive measures, particularly at the staff level, and introducing new laws, codes, and comprehensive plans that create incentives for the development of walkable neighborhoods. Bike racks should be required at all major destinations.

Incentives

Barriers- Current transportation and land development policies and funding mechanisms offer little or no incentive for developing alternative transportation solutions and walkable urbanism that could improve regional mobility and/or reduce driving. In general, automobile-oriented development patterns continue to be the priority and leveling the playing field for alternatives needs to occur.

Leinberger pointed out that one of the criticisms of walkable urbanism has been its high cost. This has been caused primarily by the lack of such development to meet market demand resulting in buyers paying a premium to live there. Incentives to build more walkable communities will make them more affordable by increasing supply.

Solutions- A range of incentives were suggested to promote redevelopment, infill, transit-friendly, multi-modal, mixed-use, and compact development including providing financial incentives (perhaps through public/private partnerships), exempting certain types of development from concurrency requirements, waiving or recalculating fees to promote desirable development patterns, providing more predictability in the approval process and expediting permitting processes for alternative approaches, and allowing height and/or density incentives.

Other incentive might include reducing or eliminating requirements that result in high development and maintenance costs such as oversized roads and parking lots, as well as, requirements that reduce efficiency such as excessive setbacks and maximum floor-area-ratios. Encouraging and rewarding projects that make use of existing infrastructure (roads, utilities, schools, hospitals, and so forth) also can reduce development costs while benefiting the broader community.

Political Hurdles

Barriers- The current fragmented governance structure of municipalities, counties, agencies and districts has created too many political boundaries and funding sources to deal efficiently with regional issues. Adding to the situation are the many different and occasional conflicting rules, regulations, and priorities. Despite the valuable work of groups like *myregion.org*, the Regional Planning Councils and the MPO Alliance, the region suffers from a lack of inter-county and regional coordination.

Communities that will not directly benefit from proposed regional projects often do not support them, and that lack of support can become an impediment to a project's realization.

Solutions- Overcoming political barriers will require on-going education and communication to create a shift in the cultural/political thinking about the importance of the inter-connectedness of the regional. In addition, formation of regional governance structures, such as a regional transportation authority was strongly encouraged. As Leinberger commented, "We've inherited an 18th century Constitution and 18th century jurisdictions," and are trying to use them to govern a 21st century economy. "We have a missing level of government at the regional level," he added.

Funding Imbalance

Barriers- The imbalance in transportation funding was frequently noted as a barrier with too much money going to build new roads and highways or add extra capacity to existing ones, and not enough money going to transit, biking, and pedestrian facilities. In order to receive funding, transit has to prove that the system will work independently, whereas no such burden is placed on the highway system. The region needs a different method for determining how transportation funding is distributed and prioritized. The high cost of transit, especially where it must be retrofit into the existing development pattern, also was cited as a barrier that must be overcome.

Solutions- Implementing a dedicated funding source for transit in Central Florida was identified as a top priority. Related to that, investment in transit-oriented-development and surrounding areas hinge on developers and communities having the assurance that transit service will be put in place and continue over the long term. Creation of a regional transportation authority with the ability to impose taxes

was frequently mentioned as a solution. A regional gas tax also was suggested as a potential new source of funding, as were innovative methods of financing such as tax-increment financing and alternative types of impact fees. The importance of a consistent, reliable funding stream for transit could not be stressed enough.

Other recommendations include conducting a more thorough cost/benefit analyses for transit to account for the many spin-off benefits it brings to a community such as increased land values, decreased traffic congestion, and improved air quality. Finally, localities should explore the possibility of funding facilities that encourage transit use and/or transit-friendly, mixed-use land patterns, including vertical parking structures, walking and biking trails, and so forth. Other ways to fund transit and related facilities, noted Leinberger, involve public/private partnerships and capturing the tremendous amount of value created at transit stations.

Financing is also an issue when it comes to developing transit-oriented-development and other types of walkable, mixed-use communities. Capital is scarce, and lenders are much more familiar with—and willing to finance—conventional real estate projects like single family neighborhoods, office parks, and strip shopping centers. Developments that integrate multiple uses can be tremendously expensive to develop, particularly early in the process, when they typically must provide parking at suburban ratios—and then give it away. “At \$15,000 per space,” Leinberger noted, “that’s a surefire way to go bankrupt.” Yet over the following ten to 20 years, parking decks can become “cash cows” for their owners. “Patient equity” is the term Leinberger uses—rather than “subsidy”—for long-term investments in such projects.

Too Much Suburbia

Barriers- Most of Central Florida developed during the era of the automobile resulting in

land use patterns that separate homes from offices, schools, stores, and recreational facilities, forcing residents and tourist to drive almost everywhere they go. This development pattern also results in higher levels of energy use and green-house gas emissions.

“A structural shift in development patterns must occur,” notes Leinberger.

Solutions- Central Florida must develop and redevelop in ways that make transit, ride-sharing, walking, and biking viable alternatives to driving. Denser, more compact, mixed-use and/or transit-oriented-development projects will appeal to potential homebuyers who are eager to save on energy and transportation expenses, reduce their carbon footprints, and connect with their neighbors and communities in more meaningful ways. Imposing minimum density requirements for new buildings could help increase density, while eliminating minimum parking requirements could help reduce the seas of asphalt in new developments and discourage unnecessary driving. Vehicle-sharing programs like Zipcar can reduce vehicle-miles-traveled and car ownership by making vehicles available as needed, to people who live downtown or in other walkable communities and need to drive only occasionally, or for households that only rarely need a second car.

Lack of Connectivity and Regional Mobility

Barriers- Limited access neighborhoods and cul-de-sacs have created a lack of connectivity and an incomplete road network, making it difficult for Central Florida residents to get around the region without driving on expressways and other major thoroughfares; beltways make regional car travel necessary. The region needs more “modes and nodes”—modes of transportation that connect nodes of activity.

Solutions- Complete streets— streets that are connected to other streets and accommodate multiple transportation modes for all users—can help relieve pressure on congested roadways. The region’s streets also need to become more multimodal by adding bicycle lanes, connected, wide and shaded sidewalks, and accommodating to transit. Developing more mixed-use, compact and walkable communities will help. Safety must not be neglected in this process; new and redesigned streets and pathways must provide for the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists alike. Funding must shift from roadways to multimodal transportation systems.

Connectivity also is important to the viability of transit systems. Transit stops and stations must be shaded and include benches and route information. The areas around them should be developed as appealing, amenity-rich places.

Limited Acceptance of Transit

Barriers- Central Florida residents typically view riding the bus as less convenient, less dependable, less safe, and more expensive than driving. Connectivity also is an issue with transit; it can be difficult to get from one’s home to a transit stop/station and, at the other end of the trip, just as hard to get to work, school, or the store. Finally, because the region is so large and fragmented, people and leaders in parts of the region not served by transit do not take an interest in transit and do not support it because they do not recognize how it will benefit them and their areas.

Solutions- Solutions include more options for transit beyond fixed-guideway rail and bus routes, developing an integrated transit plan, increasing the frequency of transit service, providing better information about the transit system and how it operates, better connecting transit routes with existing job centers, making transit faster and more convenient than other forms of

transportation, making transit ridership more fun, and creating multiple urban nodes.

“Commuter rail must become a catalyst for a regional mass transit solution,” stressed one table reporter, while another added that “the opening of commuter rail must be seen as the launching pad for transit in metro Orlando for the next generation—not the end” of the process. SunRail needs to become a “real world” example of how well transit can work, and ultimately should become the centerpiece of a transit marketing effort.

The Florida Climate

Barriers- Central Florida’s warm, humid climate can discourage people to walk, bike, and wait at transit stops. It also contributes to the region’s energy consumption and the creation of heat islands.

Solutions- The climate’s impact on pedestrians can be moderated by including more shade and benches, and shorter distances between destinations. More showers in office buildings would encourage more people to bike to work.

The heat island effect could be moderated by utilizing lighter-colored surfaces, increasing the tree requirement in landscape codes, requiring green building standards, and utilizing renewable energy sources.

Limited Vision and Leadership

Barriers- The lack of a shared vision among federal, State, and local authorities and the general public is an impediment to sustainable growth. At the regional level, this is reflected in a lack of regional thinking, comprehensive planning, and coordination of efforts. At the local level, it results in a “suburban mentality” in which people view themselves as residents of a disconnected, powerless suburb, rather than of a large and powerful metropolitan area.

Solutions- By providing leaders at all levels with good information and real-world examples on a timely basis, their thinking will change and they will gain the “cover” to act in accordance with the regional growth vision for Central Florida. While *myregion.org* already has accomplished much to develop a shared, long-term vision—particularly with its “How Shall We Grow?”, additional efforts will be needed to refine this vision, convince local leaders to buy into it, and determine out how to implement it across the entire region. Although politicians tend to think in four- and eight-year cycles and benchmark visions by what they can accomplish during their terms in office, the business and civic community can transcend that limited timeframe and keep the region working toward a shared vision that looks 25 to 50 years out.

A “champion” would be a powerful tool to promote ideas both to the public and to decision-makers. A public relations campaign to emphasize the economic, social, and competitive advantages of implementing the solutions is another powerful tool to create critical mass.

Lack of Coordination and Cooperation

Barriers- Local jurisdictions need to coordinate their efforts and cooperate more often and more effectively to solve problems that don’t recognize political boundaries. Developers, regulatory agencies and neighbors are frequently at odds leading to poor outcomes.

Solutions- The top solution is to put someone in charge—an individual or an agency with the vision, authority and funding to make things happen.

Lack of Appropriate Government Structures

Barrier- The existing government structures of states, counties, and cities do not reflect

the realities of a regional economy competing in a global marketplace. Land use and transportation decisions made at the federal, state, and local levels often produce unintended consequences and rarely address regional needs. Lauten noted that “We are trying, in this region, to govern ourselves collaboratively without putting a new government structure on top of [an existing one]. This is a new process that’s still in its infancy.” Logan suggested looking to regional governmental structures established elsewhere—such as the Atlanta region’s Georgia Regional Transportation Authority and Portland, Oregon’s Metro regional government—as examples.

The metropolitan economy, he noted, is the fundamental building block of the 21st century U.S. economy, yet most transportation funding decisions still are made at the state level.

Solutions- The Florida Department of Transportation and the Department (FDOT) of Community Affairs (DCA) should focus on state-oriented priorities while allowing regional agencies and local governments to do their own planning and fashion their own solutions to regional and local issues.

Fear of Change and the Unknown

Barriers- People everywhere are resistant to change and Central Florida is no exception. Local jurisdictions often are unwilling or reluctant to make changes to the status quo. They take the attitude that “this is the way we’ve been; this is the way we want to stay,” and are unwilling to create higher-density development, redirect roads, support transit, and so forth. Much of this reaction stems from fear of what will happen if they *do* make changes. Misperceptions about compact, mixed-use, transit-oriented-development, and infill development all result from a fear of the unknown.

The fear of change also can translate into a resistance to subsidizing transit, since people who grow up in areas without

regional mass transit are not used to riding transit and view it as something foreign and unfamiliar.

Solutions- As ways of overcoming the widespread fear and stigma of change, pilot projects can help to demonstrate the viability of alternative choices. Being sensitive to the community's character when making changes is also critical. Finally, hiring staff members and consultants who have experience with transit, and compact, mixed-use development will make change easier to implement.

Leadership and education, as described in the sections above and below, were cited as the primary solutions to overcoming this barrier.

Need for Education

Barriers- A lack of public awareness or understanding about land use and transportation issues, as well as about the costs, benefits, and options of transit and the coming commuter rail system, was cited by almost all as a major barrier to sustainable growth. Public officials and the general public often have a very limited understanding of the development process, particularly the financial aspects.

Solutions- Education through various means and on a continual basis is the primary solution. This extends to all groups including politicians, homebuyers, lenders, developers, civic and business leaders, and the general public.

Informing and educating citizens about transportation and land use issues about the benefits of transit and the advantages offered by walkable, transit-friendly, mixed-use communities, will be crucial to making any progress. Much work has been done on this through efforts like those of *myregion.org* and the "How Shall We Grow" effort.

Developers should be more proactive in educating the public and other stakeholders about their development plans—and in seeking and responding to their input—early in the planning process.

Publicizing success stories—particularly those that implement best practices—will be an important part of the public education process. This should involve educating members of the local media and involving them in these efforts. As Lauten noted, most local citizens know very little about the coming commuter rail system, but when they do hear about it their reactions are overwhelmingly enthusiastic. Yet the local media outlets tend to report only negative stories about transit and development issues. Building relationships with members of the local media and informing them about successful plans and projects—both in Central Florida and elsewhere—is strongly recommended.

Educating schoolchildren about development is important to build for future successes. Logan mentioned ULI's UrbanPlan, a classroom-based educational program in which high school students learn about the issues of development and how the complexity, trade-offs and economics drive decisions about the world where they live. The goal of UrbanPlan is to create a more sophisticated level of discourse among local stakeholders involved in land use decisions through the education of tomorrow's voters, neighbors, community leaders, public officials, and land use professionals in order to create better communities, and Logan encouraged participants to become involved in the program.

In conclusion, the more informed the public is about land use and transportation issues, the less politicians will have to fear opposition of decisions that, while they may create major changes in the status quo, ultimately will result in sustainable growth. "Given good information, our citizens will do the right thing," noted Lauten.

Looking Back, Next Steps

In December 2003, ULI launched the Florida Initiative on Regional Collaboration to identify what the state of Florida can do to promote regional collaboration to ensure the future economic competitiveness and livability of Florida and its communities. All of the state's ULI District Councils participated in this effort, and this ULI Central Florida workshop was a continuation of that process. The goal of the Florida Initiative on Regional Collaboration was to identify barriers to regional cooperation and forge a consensus around effective actions and reforms that can help facilitate regional solutions. *Building Florida's Future: Strategies for Regional Cooperation*, a report from the Florida Initiative, outlines how the state's communities can benefit economically and maintain a high quality of life for their residents by working more closely together.

The Florida Department of Transportation estimates that between 2000 and 2030, vehicle miles traveled will increase by 103 percent. Although the economy is struggling in 2009, most forecasters agree that the state will continue to experience substantial growth. The need to figure out how to make regional coordination work is as great as ever, particularly as it relates to future transportation systems.

Participants at the February 2009 ULI Central Florida workshop on transportation and land use expressed very clearly their belief that the Central Florida region must find ways to avoid fragmented decisions about transportation. The current system, in which local governments and specialized transportation authorities set transportation policies and fund transportation projects in an uncoordinated manner, is not as effective as workshop participants believe is possible. Yet it is unclear who or what groups would

be most effective in coordinating the region's transportation decisions, policies, and funding.

The Central Florida Congress of Regional Leaders—an important regional organization of elected officials who are dedicated to developing shared regional policies that will implement a shared regional growth vision—has the potential to help fill this void. The Congress of Regional Leaders includes 16 elected officials representing city and county governments and the school boards of the region's seven counties (Brevard, Lake, Orange, Osceola, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia Counties).

The creation of this group is a good start, and has the potential to demonstrate that Central Florida can come together as a region to deal with difficult issues like the transportation/land use intersection, to help ensure the region's economic and environmental sustainability and quality of life for all of its residents. On February 6, the day after the Transportation/Land Use Intersection workshop, Jim Sellen presented the preliminary findings at a Congress of Regional Leaders event called Connecting the Dots. Sellen summarized Leinberger's presentation and the barriers and solutions presented by workshop participants.

The February 5 workshop was a logical next step in implementing the regional vision on transportation and land use. The remarkable consensus amongst the diverse participants made the barriers and solutions seem crystal clear. Coming away, the expectation is that the regional leaders will also find clarity in both the findings and the belief that the community is ready for change.

Workshop Organizers, Moderators, and Reporters

The Strategies for Sustainable Growth: The Transportation/Land Use Intersection workshop held on February 5, 2009 was the product of a diverse group of stakeholders from Central Florida committed to solving one of the most urgent needs of the region. It was organized by the ULI Central Florida Executive Committee and implemented by ULI Central Florida Manager Mark Loeb. Table moderators and reporters from both the public and private sectors also were largely responsible for the workshop's success.

ULI Central Florida Executive Committee (as of February 5, 2009)

Gregg Logan, *RCLCO; District Council Chair*
Carey Hayo, *Glattig Jackson Kercher Anglin, Inc.; Assistant Chair*
Jim Sellen, *MSCW, Inc.; Immediate Past Chair*
Melina Duggal, *RCLCO*
Steve Flanagan, *Land Advisors*
Brooke Myers, *Walt Disney Imagineering*
Andrea Ostrodka, *Glattig Jackson Kercher Anglin, Inc.*
Jill Rose, *Colliers Arnold*
Barb Scherer, *Engauge*

ULI Central Florida Transportation/Land Use Workshop Committee

Jim Sellen, *MSCW, Inc., Committee Chair*
Linda Chapin, *UCF Metropolitan Center for Regional Studies*
Steve Flanagan, *Land Advisors*
Carey Hayo, *Glattig Jackson Kercher Anglin, Inc.*
Laurence Lewis, *Glattig Jackson Kercher Anglin, Inc.*
Gregg Logan, *RCLCO*
Jeremey Micrut, *East Central Florida Regional Planning Council*
Karolyn Stewart, *MSCW, Inc.*

Moderators

Melina Duggal, *RCLCO*
Alice Gilmartin, *Florida's Turnpike Enterprise*
Kathy Hattaway, *HCI Planning & Land Development Consultants*
Mike Holbrook, *Bowyer-Singleton*
Brent Lacy, *Glattig Jackson Kercher Anglin, Inc.*
Phil Laurien, *East Central Florida Regional Planning Council*
Jim Lee, *HDR*
Bob McClelland, *MSCW, Inc.*
Geoff McNeill, *MSCW, Inc.*
Steve Miller, *MSCW, Inc.*
Tim Palermo, *HDR*
Mary Raulerson, *Glattig Jackson Kercher Anglin, Inc.*
Scott Stearns, *Bowyer-Singleton*
Laura Turner, *Laura Turner Planning Services*
Rich Unger, *MSCW, Inc.*
Bill Walsh, *Florida Department of Transportation, District 5*

Reporters

Karen Adamson, *Florida Department of Transportation*

Jeff Arms, *City of Orlando*

Cecelia Bonifay, *Akerman Senterfitt*

Sam Bowyer, *Bowyer-Singleton*

Carol Conner, *MSCW, Inc.*

Lance DeCuir, *Florida Department of Transportation*

Chris Hayes, *Christopher W. Hayes, P.A.*

Carla Bell Johnson, *Orange County*

Christine Kefauver, *City of Orlando*

George Kinney, *East Central Florida Regional Planning Council*

Jeremy Mikrut, *East Central Florida Regional Planning Council*

Andrea Ostrodka, *Glatting Jackson Kercher Anglin, Inc.*

Karl Passetti, *Kittelson & Associates, Inc.*

Jill Rose, *Colliers Arnold*

Alison Stettner, *Seminole County*

Clif Tate, *Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.*

Additional Resources

Web Sites

The Brookings Institution- <http://www.brookings.edu>
East Central Florida Regional Planning Council- <http://www.ecfrp.org>
Metropolitan Orlando- <http://www.metroplanorlando.com>
[myregion.org](http://www.myregion.org)- <http://www.myregion.org>
Smart Growth Network- <http://www.smartgrowth.org>
SunRail (Central Florida's planned commuter rail transit system)- <http://sunrail.com>
UCF Metropolitan Center for Regional Studies- <http://metrocenter.ucf.edu>
ULI Central Florida- <http://CentralFlorida.uli.org>
ULI—the Urban Land Institute- <http://www.uli.org>

Books and Reports

Barnett, Jonathan et al. *Smart Growth in a Changing World*. Chicago: American Planning Association, 2005.

Beyard, Michael D. and Michael Pawlukiewicz. *Ten Principles for Reinventing America's Suburban Strips*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2001.

Bohl, Charles. *Place Making and Town Center Development*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2003.

Booth, Geoffrey et al. *Ten Principles for Reinventing Suburban Business Districts*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2002.

Bruun, Eric. *Better Public Transportation Systems: Analyzing Investments and Performance*. Chicago: American Planning Association, 2007.

Dunphy, Robert T. et al. *Developing Around Transit: Strategies and Solutions That Work*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2005.

Ewing, Reid et al. *Growing Cooler: The Evidence on Urban Development and Climate Change*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2008.

Hall, Kenneth B. and Gerald A. Porterfield. *Community by Design: New Urbanism for Suburbs and Small Communities*. New York: McGraw-Hill Professional, 2001.

Gause, Jo Allen and Richard Franko. *Developing Sustainable Planned Communities*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2007.

Girling, Cynthia and Ronald Kellett. *Skinny Streets and Green Neighborhoods: Design for Environment and Community*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 2005.

Haughey, Richard. *Urban Infill Housing: Myth and Fact*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2001.

———. *Higher-Density Development: Myth and Fact*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2005.

———. *Getting Density Right: Tools for Creating Vibrant Compact Development*. ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2008.

Heid, James M. *Greenfield Development Without Sprawl: The Role of Planned Communities*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2004.

Hudnut, William H. *Changing Metropolitan America: Planning for a Sustain-*

able Future. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2008.

Leinberger, Christopher B. *The Option of Urbanism: Investing in a New American Dream*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 2008.

The Moving Cooler Collaboration. *Moving Cooler*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, forthcoming (2009).

myregion.org, “How Shall We Grow?” *A Shared Vision for Central Florida*. Orlando, *myregion.org*, 2007.

———. *The New Regional Agenda: The Regional SourceBook*. Orlando, *myregion.org*, 2003.

Nelson, Arthur C. and Robert E. Lang. *The New Politics of Planning*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2009.

Newman, Peter, Timothy Beatley, and Heather Boyer. *Resilient Cities: Responding to Peak Oil and Climate Change*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 2009.

Pawlukiewicz, Michael. *Ten Principles for Smart Growth on the Suburban Fringe*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2003.

Peiser, Richard B. and Adrienne Schmitz. *Regenerating Older Suburbs*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2007.

PennDesign. *Central Florida: Our Region in the Year 2050*. Prepared for the Metropolitan Center for Regional Studies, University of Central Florida, 2005.

———. *An Alternative Future: Florida in the 21st Century 2020 2040 2060*. Prepared for the Metropolitan Center for Regional Studies, University of Central Florida, 2007.

Porter, Douglas R. *Making Smart Growth Work*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2003.

———. *Smart Growth Transportation for Suburban Greenfields*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—Urban Land Institute, 2003.

Schmitz, Adrienne. *The New Shape of Suburbia: Trends in Residential Development*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2003.

Schmitz, Adrienne and Jason Scully. *Creating Walkable Places: Compact Mixed-Use Solutions*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2005.

Swaback, Vernon. *Creating Value: Smart Development and Green Design*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2007.

ULI—the Urban Land Institute. *Building Florida’s Future: State Strategies for Regional Cooperation*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2005.

———. *Regional Cooperation for Florida’s Future: A Report to the ULI Florida Committee for Regional Cooperation*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2004.

———. *ULI Community Catalyst Report Number 2: Translating a Regional Vision into Action*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2005.

———. *ULI Community Catalyst Report Number 6: Compact Development: Changing the Rules to Make It Happen*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2007.

———. *Higher-Density Development: Myth and Fact*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2005.

Zyscovich, Bernard and Porter, Douglas R. *Getting Real about Urbanism: Contextual Design for Cities*. Washington, D.C.: ULI—the Urban Land Institute, 2008.

Appendix: Questions and Responses

This section contains the top barriers and solutions identified by each individual table group, in response to a specific question, as presented at the end of the February 5 workshop.

Question 1: What are the regulatory/funding barriers and solutions to creating transit-friendly/multimodal land use patterns?

Table 4:

Barriers

- Concurrency—too much emphasis on level of services
- Growth management—one size fits all, limited redevelopment options
- Funding of transportation—unbalanced against transit
- Land development codes/regulations “existing”

Solutions

- Rethink concurrency—value alternatives, define performance measures
- Dedicated funding source to transit
- Develop a concise, shared federal/state/local vision

Table 9:

Barriers

- Cultural mindset needs to change
 - DOT
 - Users
 - Developers
 - Lenders
- Rigid regulatory structure; impact fees only for roads
- State regulations; DCA is antiquated (Burt Harris Act)
- Concurrency log jam
 - School
 - Transportation
 - Parking
- Product/land use complacency

Solutions

- Educating the following regarding Walking Urban Areas
 - Politicians
 - Baby Boomers
 - Millennials
 - Lenders/Developers
- Mobility fees/districts (public); encourage zip-car like programs (private)
- Incentivize urban developers, remove regulations tax/community redevelopment areas
- Exempt redevelopment areas from concurrency, but fund vertical parking projects

Table 15:

Barriers

- State concurrency regulations

- Distribute of funding for roads versus transit

Solutions

- Redefine concurrency and its process
- Eliminate level-of-service, peak hours as now defined
- Study and implement a different funding distribution for roads versus transit

Question 2: What are the barriers and solutions to reducing driving (total vehicle miles traveled)?

Table 16:

Barriers

- Lack of regional/comprehensive thinking/coordination
- Outdated code
- Inefficient transit system
- Dependency on cars
- Suburbia
- Lack of critical analysis
- Lack of density
- Lack of alternatives
- Lack of connectivity
- Lack of infrastructure
- Congestion leading to alternate routes
- Difficulty in zoning
- Lack of public awareness
- Lack of bike/pedestrian connectivity
- Public opinion
- Lack of political leadership
- Improper funding, i.e. too much funding for roads

Solutions

- Authority with taxing authority
- Regional transportation
- Regional gas tax
- Transit options
- Do not focus on additional highway capacity
- Mixed-use development
- Minimum density/intensity; floor/area ratio
- Reduce parking requirements

Question 3: What are the jurisdictional/funding barriers and solutions to making transit viable?

Table 5:

Barriers

- Fear of change
- Lack of coordination and cooperation between jurisdictions
- Unwillingness to change
- Lack of dedicated funding

Solutions

- Put some one in charge, individual or agency with single vision and empowerment to make things happen
- Survey and educate communities
- Prepare better/more thorough cost-benefit analysis for transit

Table 7:

Barriers

- Cost of transit
- Land use
- Urban form
- Politics/vision
- Short and long term

Solutions

- Shared long term regional vision and implementation
- Consistent policies across jurisdictional boundaries
 - Transit-oriented-development
 - Urban place
 - Urban form
 - Amenities
 - Pedestrian friendly
- Innovative financing
- Education/understanding
- Dedicated funding

Question 4: What are the barriers and solutions to reducing energy use and greenhouse gas emissions through transportation and land use?

Table 6:

Barriers

- Need bike lanes, pathways, and alternate routes to and from jobs, homes, and parks
- Legal (laws, rules, codes) force us to build auto oriented/energy dependent communities
- No sense of place
- Not economically feasible for mixed-use at initial development

Solutions

- Educate local government and public
- Change land use patterns to increase land use density/intensity
- Must have true mixed-use—jobs, homes, recreation
- Design oriented versus legal oriented codes

Table 12:

Overarching concept—current view is individual, parochial, piecemeal. To reduce natural resources consumption, need to take broader, big picture view that considers the future.

Barriers

- Auto-based design
- Government regulations
- Resistance to change
- Florida climate

Solutions

- Increase walkable places and connections
- Compact development
- Complete streets—multimodal
- Provide for safety in design
- Provide for society in design
- Provide for facilities, goods, and services that are accessible and near each other
- Modernize ordinances to support walkable communities
- Provide for financial incentives
- Decrease costs
- Provide for process predictability
- Improve/implement fuel efficiency standards
- Educate elected officials, stakeholders, lenders, general public
- Implement plans/programs that are energy friendly
- Point to success stories, identify best management practices
- Landscaping
- Shorter walking distances
- Take advantage of emerging technologies (efficiencies)

Question 5: What are the barriers and solutions for improving regional mobility?

Table 1:

Barriers

- Beltways making regional car travel necessary
- Funding
- Education as it relates to:
 - Costs of transit
 - Transit options
- Decentralized nature of current development pattern

Solutions

- Reallocation of money from roadways to multi-modal systems
- Regional authority versus current fragmented system
- Dedicated funding source
- Using regional efforts and organizations like *myregion.org* and ULI
 - Teach in schools
 - Educate politicians and jurisdictional staff
- Incentive versus regulate—incentivize more compact development patterns and remove regulatory barriers

Table 11:

Barriers

- Auto dependency/lack of options
- Too many political agency boundaries

Solutions

- “modes and nodes”—need more of both, and full connectivity between them
- Education/communication
- Regional commitment/check egos
- Cultural shift/political wills

Table 13:

Barriers

- Transportation concurrency
- Lack of inter-county coordination and coordinated regional coordination
- Lack of support for regional projects by communities not directly benefiting
- Fear of density
- Disadvantage of buses versus private cars

Solutions

- Dedicated source of funding for transit
- More options for transit beyond fixed rail transit and buses
- Managed lanes/variable pricing
- An integrated transit plan
- Create multiple urban nodes

Question 6: What are the barriers and solutions to public acceptance of transit?

Table 3:

Barriers

- Connectivity/convenience—frequency, reliability, good system information, on-time, job center connection, conformance to existing development patterns
- Education —knowledge of products/programs, financial loss, subsidy, out-of-pocket expenses, no uniform message, not getting correct message
- Fragmentation—it will not get to me, no benefit to me, lack of clear approach

Solutions

- Encourage infill development—incentivize private development
- Make transit faster than other uses, make it more fun, club cars make it convenient
- Train must be catalyst for regional mass transit solution
- Critical mass education—real cost versus alternative cost. Leverage millennials to teach boomers. Different messages to different groups. Marketing. Advertising. Give examples of success.

Table 10:

Overarching concept—the commuter rail opening is the launching pad of transit in central Florida —not the end.

Barriers

- Fear of density/change
- Cost > benefit
- Cultural versus transit
- Functionality

Solutions

- Education
- Management of system/facilities
- Leadership
- Marketing

Question 7: What are the barriers and solutions to public and regulatory acceptance of compact, mixed-use, and infill development?

Table 2:

Barriers

- We lack a comprehensive regional vision for transportation
- We need to define the network and specify the modes
- We have a suburban mentality, we see ourselves as a big suburb rather than a city
- Capital is scarce

Solutions

- Create a vision with participation from public, elected officials, and regional business community... we need a champion, someone in this room
- We need a public campaign emphasizing unity
- Encourage/reward the use of existing infrastructure

Table 8:

Barriers

- Lack of knowledge/misperception of exactly what mixed-use, compact, and infill development really is
- Outdated codes that lack an established vision including a visual representation of that vision
- Lack of public sector understanding of the financial aspects of project delivery from the developer's perspective

Solutions

- More incentives to encourage the desired type of development—emphasis on financial incentives, but also regulatory incentives
- Educate at a broader level
- More flexibility in concurrency regulations

Table 14:

Barriers

- Fear of change/the unknown

Solutions

- Local government adopting mixed-use, transit supportive criteria and standards for development
- Use incentives to get what they want