UP 502/NRE 592 ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING COURSE OVERVIEW

State/Local Authority - Land Use/ Env. Planning
Key Problems: Land Conversion, Water, Climate Change, Consumption, Population, Affluence, Common Pool Resources

Quiz

1. Development Practices
2. Farmland Preserv./ Growth Management
3. Water/Septic
4. Air Quality/Env Justice
5. Env Justice/Heat
6. Natural Features/Habitat
7. Energy Planning
8. Green Development/ Stormwater

CASE STUDIES

Assignment 1
Comparative Farmland Conversion – Two Cases

Assignment 2
1000 Acre Development Plan with $ Constraints – Washtenaw Case

Midterm

Assignment 3
Comparison of Climate Action Plans – Two Cases

UP 502/NRE 592 ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING OVERVIEW

CASE STUDIES

Consistent Depth and Variables
Different Issues and Contexts

Teaching Goals:

Critical thinking – Systematic Factors – not always present in each case
Creating a Matrix of Relevant Information
Formulating Hypotheses
Collecting Evidence
Identifying Cross-Cutting Themes
Forcing Assessment

Organizing A Complex Amount of Information – Matrix

Column Headings:
Place – Population Dynamics & Economics
Biophysical Conditions,
Impetus for Action,
Innovative Programs and Partnerships,
Funding,
Government Organization,
Lessons Learned

Place	Biophysical	Impetus for Action	Innovative Programs & Partnerships	Funding	Government Organization	Lessons Learned
Austin, TX	Arid in the North	Water quality issues	Land Acquisition	Used water utility to get secure funding source	Dispersed Government Responsibilities	Framing argument around water has been very powerful
680,000 people	River recharge in the West	Rapid population growth	Separate Zones for: 1) Development (fee waivers, streamlined process) and 2) Drinking Water Protection		OK relationship with Travis County (non-confrontational)	Decentralization has worked for them.
					No central planning	In-House real estate people (covert land acquisition keeps prices low)
					Old Master Plan (1970)	
				ts of State funding.	Large Planning Capacity	
				rtnerships with Lands Trusts d Schools	County-Level Decisions (only 1 govt. body)	
				from developers in lieu of ormwater remediation	No annexation from Baltiomore	
					County departments did not receive exceptions to policies	
			project. Tree Nursery		"People's Council" (volunteers who defend the local master plan)	
Eugene, OR	Wet praire, normal praire, Oak savanah.	Rapid population growth	Urban Growth Boundry (1990)	Army Corps monye for river restoration	Regional Open Space Planning	Used three techniques to add development restrictions:
140,000	46" of precip in 4 months	Listing of Salmon as endangered species	West Eugene wetlands preservation	Federal lobbying to raise funds (unusual)	Public Works Dept. collaborating with Open Space people	1) Natural Resource Protection Zone
	Hillside forest and Bottomlands forest	Post-industrial economy	Utility active in watershed protection	Bonds	Environmental Policy Team	2) Waterside Protections Overlay District
	Volcanic region		community engagement	Stormwater money	Wastewater Regional Management	3) Wetlands Buffer Overlay District
			PUD (encourages wetlands in development, required that vegitation be specified on site plans)			Noise restrictions further added to Wetlands Buffer.
			Consistant Zoning in most townships (exclusively ag. In 30/34)	$30M Bond	Strong County Executive (focused on in-fill dev. In cities and higher density)	Needed 3,000 vollenteers to maintain natural areas (community involvement)
			Urban Service Boundries, PDR program	Land Donations	60 local units of Government	Regional Planning set a cooperative precedent
			Environmental Corridor Pland (prevents bisection)	County donated to non-profits	Conservative County, Liberal City	
			Site-level runoff modeling (to keep warm water out of cold trout streams)			
			Had Regional Planning (legacy of cooperation even though program has ended)			
			TDR (called it Transfer of Development Units)	Sales Tax	Informal cooperation on growth management areas	PDR is less expensive than fee-simple (don't have to maintain)
			Framed it as "protecting character of the west and vistas"	Impact Fees from developers ($15,000-$20,000 per home)	Home Rule State	Buying land outside of city boundry raised issues of public access
			Good mapping (Colorodo State Univ. helped)	$ from lottery		
			Conservation Developments (require 50-80% land preservation)			
			Renamed things to make them more acceptable to community			
			Created very good maps (Bunny Map showed wildlift habitat)	Bonds	State Law allows "Wildcat Subdivisions" (divide land into 5 plots with no review)	Water shortage is a big factor. People see a reason for planning.
			Ecosystems approach to preservation (instead of individual species)	Sales Tax		Collaborative process helped garner support for bonds
			Used science			Tourism industry another factor for gain support
			Included cultural aspects in preservation plans			Lack of affordable housing is a sig. issue
			Collaborative Planning Process (community engaement)			

UP 502/NRE 592 ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING OVERVIEW

CASE STUDIES

Asking Good Questions & Seeing Patterns

What Motivated Action?
Dillon's Rule or Home Rule State?
Regional planning or uncoordinated local efforts?
Funding Sources and Planning Capacity?
Regulations or Incentives or both?
Progressive Techniques - Urban Growth Boundaries/ Urban Service Boundaries/ Greenbelts used/ PDR/ TDR ?
Engagement of the public?
Methods of assessment?

UP 502/NRE 592 ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING OVERVIEW

CASE STUDIES

Gaining Deeper Understandings of Sustainability Efforts

Application of Lecture Materials/ Theory

Introduces the Complexity of Reality

- Environmental efforts
- Economic realities
- Social Conditions
- Political Context

Vocabulary of Examples

Need for Creativity & Compromise

Power of Building on Successful Actions

Improvement is possible