

3-2017

Metropolitan Centers Mean Smart Growth

Richard D. Margerum
University of Oregon

Rebecca Lewis
University of Oregon

Keith Bartholomew
University of Utah

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/trec_briefs



Part of the [Transportation Commons](#), [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Richard Margerum, Rebecca Lewis and Keith Bartholomew. Metropolitan Centers Mean Smart Growth. NITC Project Brief, Project Number 2016-761. Portland, OR: Transportation Research and Education Center (TREC), 2017.

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in TREC Project Briefs by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.



NITC

NATIONAL INSTITUTE
for TRANSPORTATION
and COMMUNITIES

Web: <http://nitc.us>



METROPOLITAN CENTERS MEAN SMART GROWTH

NITC researchers examine the planning processes leading to high-density metropolitan centers as a smart growth solution.

The Issue

Across the United States, local governments and state agencies in metropolitan regions make a range of land use and transportation decisions that have cumulative impacts such as: increasing congestion, rising infrastructure costs, decreasing air quality, loss of open space, and increases in greenhouse gas emissions. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are federally established organizations serving larger metropolitan regions that are required by law and regulation to carry out certain transportation planning and coordination responsibilities. In response to concerns about the lack of transportation and land use integration, many MPOs have developed voluntary regional visioning processes that examine scenarios and regional goals and objectives.

In this study, a multidisciplinary team from the University of Oregon and the University of Utah examined regional metropolitan center programs and policies in the Salt Lake City and Denver regions. The goal of the study was to examine this topic on two levels. First, to learn how and why local governments have adopted the concepts of metropolitan centers over time and the related supporting and constraining factors. Second, to understand how demographics, land use, and transportation choices have changed over time in the designated centers.

The Research

NITC researchers Richard Margerum and Rebecca Lewis of the University of Oregon and Keith Bartholomew of the University of Utah evaluated the planning process surrounding metropolitan centers in the regions

THE ISSUE

MPOs across the United States are encouraging high-density development to address congestion.

THE RESEARCH

Researchers studied urban centers in Denver and Salt Lake City to learn:

- What incentivizes local governments to encourage high-density urban development;
- What features these centers have in common;
- How the programs and policies around them have evolved over time.

IMPLICATIONS

This study offers insights into regional vision influence on local planning and the opportunities and constraints facing centers.

Photo: City Creek Center, a mixed-use development in Salt Lake City, Utah

of Denver and Salt Lake City. Both of the case study regions have adopted voluntary regional policies for promoting smarter growth, and they rely on regional consensus and collaboration rather than a state growth management framework.

Denver and Salt Lake City offer an interesting context for this work, because they typify some of the current challenges and future potential opportunities facing metropolitan regions, including rapid growth, air quality concerns, low-density urban form, and a significant investment in mass transit. Across both regions, there is increasing use of the concept of metropolitan centers, including urban centers and transit-oriented development.

The Denver metropolitan region has included the concept as part of its regional plan since 2000 and included it in its transportation funding criteria since 2008. In the Salt Lake City area, a regional vision of centers did not emerge until 2005 and was not part of transportation funding criteria until 2015. There has also been gradual change in the vision of these centers over time. They have evolved from centers of single-use activity (such as employment or retail) to mixed-use centers offering more urban amenities.

This evolution is occurring more quickly in some cities than others and, in general, cities in the Denver region are further along than the Salt Lake City region. For many jurisdictions, transit investment is the important catalyst to initiate this transformation, although some planners argued this could occur in areas without transit.

Implications

Although centers have had a mixed response in both metropolitan regions, there is a significant increase in the development of mixed-use amenity centers,

| Denver Region | Population (2012 Census) | Location: Type |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Denver | 604,356 | Central: Central City |
| Aurora | 326,249 | Southeast: Inner-ring suburb |
| Arvada | 106,965 | Northwest: Outer-ring suburb |
| Westminster | 106,750 | Northwest: Outer-ring suburb |
| Thornton | 118,747 | North: Outer-ring suburb |
| Centennial | 106,114 | Southeast: Outer-ring suburb |
| Lone Tree | 10,941 | South: Outer-ring suburb |
| Greenwood Village | 13,932 | South Central: Inner-ring suburb |
| Lakewood | 143,496 | West: Inner-ring suburb |
| Englewood | 30,565 | South: Inner-ring suburb |
| Salt Lake City Region | Population (2014 Census) | Location: Type |
| Salt Lake City | 189,267 | Central: Central City |
| Clearfield | 30,484 | Northwest: Outer-ring suburb |
| Lehi | 56,275 | South: Outer-ring suburb |
| Murray | 48,822 | South: Inner-ring urban |
| Pleasant View | 8,948 | Northwest: Standalone rural |
| Sandy | 91,148 | South: Outer-ring urban |
| South Jordan | 62,781 | Southwest: Outer-ring suburban |

Case Study Cities

This graph shows the 10 case study cities near Denver and seven case study cities near Salt Lake City that were analyzed in the report, along with their location types.

most of which are focused around transit. These locations are likely to have the biggest regional benefits to housing, transportation and land use, and according to researchers, should be the highest priority for regional policies and incentives.

Market forces also play a significant role in driving new development in both regions. The market demand is for a more urban living experience with access to amenities and services. MPOs may be able to capitalize on this trend by providing analysis and evaluation of market demands, working with developers and housing organizations to identify key factors necessary to support investment, sharing case studies from other regions that highlight trends and projects, and offering grants to support planning in locations likely to attract this kind of development.

PROJECT INFORMATION

TITLE: Metropolitan Centers: Evaluating local implementation of regional plans and policies

LEAD INVESTIGATOR: Richard Margerum, Ph.D., University of Oregon

PROJECT NUMBER: 2016-761

CONTACT: Justin Carinci, 503-725-2843 carinci@pdx.edu

MORE INFORMATION <http://nitc.trec.pdx.edu/research/project/761>