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Regional Development Framework (1985)
The impetus for a new plan

- Overlapping, contradictory local plans
- Regional composite buildout > 1,000 sq. mi.
- Air quality concerns
- Growing traffic congestion and VMT
- Political battles over transportation spending
- Practical need for better ability to forecast future growth

Evolution of Metro Vision 2020

1992: Vision statement, principles and policies

1995: Scenario analysis and urban growth boundary target

1997: Adoption of final Metro Vision plan, UGB map

2000: Mile High Compact
Metro Vision 2020: Scenarios

Corridor alternative

- 750 mi$^2$ of urban
- Transit and highway improvements in corridors
- Open space between corridors
- Urban centers in each corridor

Metro Vision 2020: Scenarios

Satellite cities alternative

- 750 mi$^2$ of urban
- 6 major freestanding communities
- Heavy rail connections
- Open space buffers
**Metro Vision 2020: Scenarios**

**Dispersed development alternative**
- 850 mi² of urban
- Major highway investment
- No significant centers
- No effort at open space preservation

**Compact development alternative**
- 650 mi² of urban
- Major transit investment
- Open space buffer
- Limited growth in Longmont, Brighton and Castle Rock
Initial 2020 target = 700 sq. mi.

1. Composite of local comprehensive plans
2. Sub-regional mapping
3. Jurisdictional growth targets
   *Adopted by Board in 1997*

---

Subsequent updates

- **Metro Vision 2030 (2005)**
  - UGB expanded to 750 square miles plus 20 square mile “Bank”

- **Metro Vision 2035 (2007)**
  - New scenario analysis
  - New mapping method
  - Bank depleted
  - 2035 UGB = 920 square miles
    *(increase mainly due to new mapping method)*
Purpose of the UGB
(Text from Metro Vision 2020)

An urban growth boundary provides predictability in planning for local and regional facilities. **It acts as a staging tool, so that the costs of infrastructure and services are reduced and can be managed efficiently.** A climate of certainty in development decisions is a positive outcome for both public and private interests. Further, an urban growth boundary fosters the preservation of open space and the protection of environmentally sensitive lands and habitats . . .

Both the forecast and the extent of urban development will be reviewed and updated biennially and subject to major reconsideration every five years. This should provide the flexibility to respond to market conditions and new understandings of the effects of growth on the plan’s goals.

UGB implementation

- Flexibility provisions
  - Self-certification
  - Regional review and input
  - DRCOG Board action
- Urban growth area communities
  - Not mapped until specific development plans in place
  - Approximate maps used for modeling purposes
  - Longmont, Thornton, Aurora, Castle Rock, and Adams County
UGB implementation

• Integration with transportation planning
  – Areas without UGB
    not expected to need facilities

UGB implementation

• Integration with transportation planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UGB/A-Related TIP Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>(100 total points possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>Project is at least 90% contained within UGB/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>Project is at least 40% contained within UGB/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UBG implementation

- Integration with water quality planning

2007 UGB workshops

- Concerns raised by Board:
  - ownership
  - consumption
  - DRCOG and the entitlement process
  - county vs. city planning needs
  - planning issues for infill development vs. development on the fringe
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