Summary

An important step in the development of a new Blueprint Denver plan is a retrospective on what worked and what didn’t work in the original 2002 Blueprint Denver. This Diagnostic measures how well the plan guided new development based on four key goals.

Goal 1: Direct growth to Areas of Change and manage and limit change in Areas of Stability.

- Areas of Change comprise 18% of Denver’s land area and captured 83% of permitted development, 67% of new housing units and 64% of new jobs created since 2002.

Goal 2: Maintain the character of Areas of Stability yet accommodate some new development.

- Areas of Stability comprise 82% of Denver’s land area and captured just 17% of permitted development, 33% of new housing units and 36% of new jobs since 2002.

- Areas of Stability bordering Denver’s major centers and Areas of Change saw higher development than most other Areas of Stability.

Goal 3: Improve the function of streets. Streets should be viewed as a means to move people not just cars.

- Investments in transit and bicycle infrastructure have dramatically improved the function of the transportation network in certain locations, but are not system-wide.

- Although significant progress was made, Denver still has work to do when it comes to moving more people by more modes.

Goal 4: Promote mixed-use development and urban centers.

- Most of the planned rail transit network in Denver has been built out, but little progress has been made to build out an “enhanced-bus” network in Denver. The majority of urban centers are connected by high frequency transit.

- Significant opportunities remain to increase the mix of uses and walkability of station areas and urban centers.
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Introduction

The original Blueprint Denver plan, adopted in 2002, included a relatively innovative approach to planning for the physical growth of Denver by better linking transportation and land use. At the time the plan was developed, Denver had just experienced new growth pressures throughout the 1990s after two decades of population decline. Blueprint Denver 2002 was created to help implement Comprehensive Plan 2000 and to help ensure that the projections for continued growth in housing and jobs positively impacted our community.

Growth continued as expected in the early 2000s until the Great Recession in 2008 and 2009. Since the recession, Denver’s growth has accelerated to historic rates. Denver has already exceeded the projections for 2020 population and housing units used in 2002 Blueprint Denver, and despite the job losses associated with the recent recession, will fall just short of projected employment increases. As Denver prepares the next Blueprint Denver to help accommodate and manage projected growth for the coming 20-25 years, it is helpful to look back at the goals of the 2002 plan and assess how we’ve done achieving those goals. The 2002 Blueprint Denver Diagnostic utilizes a handful of measures for each goal to provide a better understanding of our progress.

Approach

This Diagnostic evaluates the growth framework and implementation strategies from 2002 Blueprint Denver by studying what has occurred since the plan was adopted. The purpose is to measure how well the plan guided new development based on four key goals. The Diagnostic also aids in understanding the impact of implementation actions taken by the City and its partners.

2002 Blueprint Denver identified four main goals for guiding growth.

- **Goal 1:** Direct growth to Areas of Change and manage and limit change in Areas of Stability.
- **Goal 2:** Maintain the character of Areas of Stability yet accommodate some new development.
- **Goal 3:** Improve the function of streets. Streets should be viewed as a means to move people not just cars.
- **Goal 4:** Promote mixed-use development and urban centers.

Wherever possible, the measures of each goal assess change from 2002 to 2016. In some cases, the data does not exist to look at the entire period of time so the closest years were used instead. It should also be noted Areas of Stability and Areas of Change are unique geographies that straddle neighborhoods and do not coincide with the boundaries of US Census geographies or other typical data sources. The Diagnostic also provides a reporting on the level of implementation for the major action items recommended in 2002 Blueprint Denver. The discussion of each goal then concludes with several lessons learned from the evaluation.

Before taking a deeper dive into the goals and the measures selected for each, it is beneficial to understand some of the major components of 2002 Blueprint Denver. The following sections of the Diagnostic provide an overview of the plan’s Building Blocks and the central theme of the growth framework built around Areas of Stability and Areas of Change. The final section before the evaluation of each goal highlights major changes that have occurred between 2002 and 2016 and how they have impacted growth.
Building Blocks

A set of building blocks for land use and transportation was established by 2002 Blueprint Denver to better articulate envisioned land uses, transportation systems and links between the two. Descriptions of the building blocks, land-use and street types are intended to indicate the future composition and urban design of different areas in Denver with an understanding that there is not a one-size-fits-all solution for new growth.

The land-use building blocks are Districts, Parks and Open Space, Residential Areas, Centers, and Corridors. The different types of districts identified in the plan include Downtown, Employment, Industrial, Campus, and Entertainment/Cultural/Exhibition. Residential areas can be Mixed-Use Neighborhoods, Single-Family Residential, Single-Family/Duplex Residential, or Urban Residential. Centers are generally categorized as Neighborhood Centers, Town Centers, Regional Centers, or Transit Oriented Development. Finally, corridors are either Pedestrian Shopping Corridors or Commercial Corridors.

The transportation building blocks include the Regional Rapid Transit System and the Multi-Modal Street System. The regional rapid transit system is made up of light rail transit (LRT), high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, bus rapid transit (BRT), transit stations and park-n-ride facilities. Multi-modal streets are streets that can comfortably accommodate multiple modes of transportation, including pedestrians, bicycles, transit, private vehicles, and freight. Multi-modal streets consider all types of transportation to be equally important and accommodate more trips by more people in the same amount of space by improving transit and providing better pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The multi-modal street system is based upon the idea of addressing and enhancing the interface of all streets with its users and adjacent land use. 2002 Blueprint Denver assigns special “street type” categories for each multi-modal street according to the adjacent land uses. The resulting street types of Denver’s multi-modal street system are residential, main street, mixed-use, commercial, and industrial.

Areas of Stability and Areas of Change

A central idea underpinning 2002 Blueprint Denver is the concept of directing the majority of development to strategic locations in order to reduce the development pressures on other areas. Areas of Stability include the stable residential neighborhoods where no major changes in development patterns were expected over the life of the plan. The Area of Stability designation was intended to help more mature neighborhoods maintain their character and accommodate some new development and redevelopment that would contribute to the vitality of the area over time. Areas of Change include areas that were expected to benefit from and thrive on an infusion of population, economic activity and investment.

The Areas of Stability accounted for the bulk of residential neighborhoods and approximately 82% of the entire City and County of Denver. Preserving neighborhoods was a big focus of 2002 Blueprint Denver, as some neighborhoods were experiencing significant amounts of development activity through the form of “scrape-offs” and “pop-tops” of existing residential units. Other neighborhoods needed reinvestment and were not seeing much development activity at all. As a result, the plan introduces the idea that Areas of Stability can be either areas needing character preservation in response to high development demand (committed areas) or needing investment to revitalize them (reinvestment areas). The plan does not indicate which category each neighborhood fits into.

The Areas of Change designation was applied to approximately 18% of Denver. In 2002, the City and County of Denver was coordinating two large master planned redevelopment projects and one new development area that represented a large repository of developable land to accommodate growth within Denver. These included the former sites of the Stapleton International Airport and the Lowry Airforce Base, as well as the Gateway area to the Denver International Airport. There was a significant amount of land designated as Areas of Change outside of the Big 3. The remaining areas were selected based on existing or potential links between transportation and land use. They included Downtown and areas along commercial corridors and near existing and proposed transit stations.
Areas of Stability and Areas of Change from Blueprint Denver 2002

- **Areas of Change**
  - JEFFERSON PARK/HIGHLANDS
  - NORTHEAST DOWNTOWN
  - WEST 38TH AVENUE
  - BRIGHTON BOULEVARD
  - NORTH INDUSTRIAL
  - JEWELL
  - SOUTH BROADWAY
  - GATES TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT
  - MISSISSIPPI
  - SOUTH FEDERAL BOULEVARD
  - Alamedal Town Center
  - Morrison Road
  - Alameda

- **Legend**
  - City/County Boundary
  - Areas of Change
  - Areas of Stability
  - Arterials

- **EAST COLFAX (WEST OF COLORADO BLVD.)
  - EAST COLFAX (EAST OF COLORADO BLVD.)
  - GATEWAY
  - STAPLETON
  - 6TH
  - 38TH
  - 1-70
  - Front Range NPD
  - HARRIS

- **West 38th Avenue**
  - WEST COLFAX/WEST TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT
  - BEAVERTON
  - MARYMONT
  - SHERIDAN
  - COLORADO AVE
  - I-25
  - I-70
  - 8TH
  - 38TH
  - BROADWAY
  - YALE
  - I-70
  - GATEWAY
  - STAPLETON
  - 6TH
  - 38TH
  - 1-70
  - Front Range NPD
  - HARRIS

- **South Federal Boulevard**
  - SOUTH FEDERAL BOULEVARD
  - SOUTH BROADWAY
  - GATES TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT
  - MISSISSIPPI
  - SOUTH BROADWAY
  - GATES TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT
  - MISSISSIPPI

- **South 38th Avenue**
  - SOUTH 38TH AVENUE
  - WEST 38TH AVENUE
  - 38TH
  - 1-70
  - Front Range NPD
  - HARRIS

- **South Broadway**
  - SOUTH BROADWAY
  - GATES TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT
  - MISSISSIPPI
  - SOUTH BROADWAY
  - GATES TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT
  - MISSISSIPPI

- **Legend**
  - City/County Boundary
  - Areas of Change
  - Areas of Stability
  - Arterials
Explosive Population Growth
As mentioned previously, 2002 Blueprint Denver was developed on the heels of Denver adding 89,000 new residents in the 1990s after losing population the two decades prior to that. Denver continued to grow steadily until a slow-down from 2008 to 2010 related to the recession. Denver’s population has been growing rapidly since 2010, with an additional 78,000 new residents added between just 2010 and 2015. Denver is on pace to add approximately one-third more housing units by 2020 than was projected at the time 2002 Blueprint Denver was developed.

Boom or Bust Employment Growth
The rate of employment growth in Denver has not matched the rate of housing growth since 2000. Two economic recessions between 2000 and 2016 had more significant impacts on employment than they did on housing. The “Dot Com” recession in the early 2000s resulted in greater job losses in Denver than the “Great Recession”. Both recessions created a loss of at least 35,000 jobs, offsetting much of the employment growth since 2002 Blueprint Denver was adopted. Thus, Denver has added only 18,000 new jobs since 2001. With that said, the rate of job growth seen since 2010 puts Denver on pace to come within 10% of projections included in the 2002 plan.

Form-based Zoning Code
One of the major implementation actions called for in 2002 Blueprint Denver was to reorganize and revise the zoning code and map for the City. The City had not performed a major zoning code and map update since the 1950s. In 2010, the City and County of Denver overhauled its existing zoning code by adopting a new context and form-based zoning code. The goal of the code is to use new development standards to permit development that fits the context and character of areas instead of the previous approach, which focused on land use and did not reflect the different contexts, or neighborhood types, throughout the city. The purpose was to make the zoning code more user-friendly, encourage more mixed use development, and better support context sensitive implementation of the 2002 Blueprint Denver building blocks.

Transportation and Transit Improvements
The planned transit lines and general station areas that would evolve into the FasTracks plan were included within 2002 Blueprint Denver, but the station areas were not comprehensively addressed within the Areas of Change designation. This major introduction of regional transit service is relatively new, as the A Line, B Line, Flatirons Flyer, and Denver Union Station have just recently opened and the West Line has only been open for a few years. The City and County of Denver has done substantial planning for their transit stations through the TOD Strategic Plan and subsequent station area planning efforts.

PROJECTED VERSUS ACTUAL

NEW HOUSING UNITS
BETWEEN 2000-2016

48,600 PROJECTED

62,900 ACTUAL

NEW JOBS BETWEEN 2001-2014

70,000 PROJECTED

18,000 ACTUAL

78,000 RESIDENTS ADDED BETWEEN 2010-2015

Sources: Metro Vision Projections; Colo. DOLA; ACS; ESRI; Economic and Planning Systems
GOAL 1
Direct growth to areas of change and manage and limit change in areas of stability

The first goal of 2002 Blueprint Denver was intended to target residential and employment growth to strategic areas in order to lessen the development pressure on large portions of the community. Areas of Change comprise less than one-fifth of the land area of Denver, but were identified in the original Blueprint as the intended recipients of the majority of new housing units and jobs through the planning horizon of 2020.
Measures

Private investment in Areas of Change
The first measure tracks the total permit value for new development in Areas of Change and Areas of Stability. The annual ratio of investment in Areas of Change to Areas of Stability was calculated for each year since 2002. The ratio has fluctuated between 3.3 to 6.5 from 2002 and 2015 with highs in 2013 and 2015. The highest ratios were in 2013 and 2015 of any of the 14 years tracked, 6.5 and 6.0, respectively, with an annual average investment ratio of 5.0. The Areas of Change make up just 18% of the land area of Denver and were the recipients of 83% of permitted development. By this measure, Areas of Change successfully captured a significant share of growth.

Capture of new jobs and housing units in Areas of Change
This measure estimates how much actual housing and job growth occurred in Areas of Change since 2002. For housing, City and County of Denver permit data was examined to determine the proportion of net new housing units that were constructed in Areas of Change. Based upon this analysis, approximately 67% of new housing units since 2002 were built in the 18% of Denver designated as Areas of Change. On a per acre basis, the analysis shows that Areas of Change had, on average, 2.08 new housing units per acre and 1.36 new jobs per acre in contrast to Areas of Stability which saw average increases of 0.22 new housing units per acre and 0.16 new jobs per acre, this is close to ten times more houses and over eight times more jobs added in Areas of Change than were added in Areas of Stability. Analysis of other data sources produced similar results.

Capture of new jobs and housing units by area
The last measure of Goal 1 is the comparison of capture of new jobs and housing units within the three main categories of Areas of Change: Downtown, the Big 3 (Gateway, Lowry, Stapleton), and the remaining Areas of Change around rapid transit and major transportation corridors. Downtown captured 18% of citywide housing growth and 41% of citywide job growth. The Big 3 captured 28% of citywide housing growth and 15% of citywide job growth. Areas of Change around rapid transit stations and major transportation corridors captured 21% of citywide housing growth and 8% of job growth.
New Jobs and Housing in Areas of Change

Total Percentage of Growth Captured in all Areas of Change

**NEW JOBS**
- Downtown: 15%
- Big 3: 8%
- Remaining Areas of Change: 41%

**NEW HOUSING**
- Downtown: 21%
- Big 3: 18%
- Remaining Areas of Change: 28%

Source: City/County of Denver; US Census LEHD; Economic and Planning Systems
2002 Blueprint Denver included 44 specific actions intended to implement the plan goals. The Implementation Matrix found on pages 30 to 33 provides a complete listing and categorization of the 44 actions. It should be noted that many of the implementation actions address two or more of the plan goals. For this Diagnostic, each implementation action was assessed to determine which goal or goals it was intended to implement and what level of completion has been achieved to date. It was determined that 28 of the 44 action items address Goal 1. Other key takeaways include:

- Nearly 80% of action items related to Goal 1 have shown significant or partial progress.
- Significant progress has been made on actions related to land use include major updates to the zoning code and design standards to align with 2002 Blueprint Denver.
- Denver has assumed a strong partner role with RTD in the implementation of FasTracks and transit-oriented development.
- Denver has established a storm water management plan and new parking standards that promote innovative solutions.
- Denver has also successfully partnered to fund façade improvements, provide gap funding for priority projects, and stimulate development around transit through land development strategies and regulatory changes.

Relative to land area, Areas of Change captured a significant proportion of investment and new growth. Areas of Change comprise 18% of Denver’s land area and captured 83% of permitted development since 2002. The high level of investment in Areas of Change suggest that 1) the designations captured many of the areas that were most desirable for new development and 2) that the actions taken to guide the majority of development to Areas of Change were relatively successful.

The majority of new housing units were built in Areas of Change, but Downtown captured a small share relative to its development potential. Areas of Change accounted for 67% of new housing units permitted by the City and County of Denver since 2002 despite constituting less than one-fifth of land area. With that said, while Downtown captured a significant number of new housing units (including many built in the last two years that are not captured in this data) it did not attract as nearly as much as desired in 2002 Blueprint, or relative to its development potential in terms of zoning capacity. In contrast, it is the areas immediately adjacent to Downtown that captured more new housing than anticipated since 2002.

The majority of employment growth occurred in Areas of Change, but tended to follow historical patterns. While Areas of Change captured approximately 64% of new jobs since 2002, the majority of that growth occurred in Downtown. The aim of directing more jobs to the other areas of change proved much more challenging. Historically, employment growth appears to be harder to guide than housing. Development of housing in the new neighborhoods of Stapleton and Lowry has been successful, but employment uses tend to have more location specific access needs and higher development costs.

Small area planning was a successful implementation component of 2002 Blueprint Denver that refined and reinforced Areas of Change. 2002 Blueprint Denver emphasized the importance of small area planning to refine concepts at a more local scale. Over 30 small area plans have been adopted since 2002 and most of those planning areas corresponded to an Area of Change. The small area plans helped redefine the Areas of Change and better reflect local conditions and community input.
GOAL 2

Maintain the character of areas of stability yet accommodate some new development

2002 Blueprint Denver’s Goal 2 is generally the converse of Goal 1. In order to maintain the existing character of established neighborhoods, the goal was established to direct the majority of new housing and jobs away from these areas. While Areas of Stability were intended to accommodate some new development, the aim was to minimize the amount of overall development, new housing units and new jobs in the majority of existing neighborhoods.
Measures

Private investment in Areas of Stability

The first measure is the converse of the investment ratio calculated for Goal 1. For Goal 2, the measure tracks the total permit value for new development in Areas of Stability as compared to its proportional land area. Areas of Stability make up 82% of the land area of Denver and were the recipients of just 17% of permitted development. By this measure, Areas of Stability did accommodate some new development, but the vast majority of investment went to Areas of Change.

Development of new jobs and housing units in Areas of Stability

This measure estimates how much actual housing and job growth occurred in Areas of Stability since 2002. For housing, City and County of Denver permit data was examined to determine the proportion of housing units that were constructed in Areas of Stability. Based upon this analysis, approximately 33% of new housing units since 2002 were built in the 82% of Denver designated as Areas of Stability. Analysis of other data sources produced similar results.

Distribution of new housing units in Areas of Stability

Using permit data from the City and County of Denver, net new housing units (the difference between new permitted housing unit and permitted demolition of housing units) since 2002 was calculated for each neighborhood. The resulting increase in housing units was then mapped against Areas of Stability and Areas of Change. The map shows that the areas with the greatest increase in housing units tend to align with Areas of Change. On a per acre basis, the analysis shows that Areas of Change had, on average, 2.08 new housing units per acre and 1.36 new jobs per acre in contrast to Areas of Stability which saw average increases of 0.22 new housing units per acre and 0.16 new jobs per acre; this is close to ten times more houses and over eight times more jobs added in Areas of Change than were added in Areas of Stability. However, certain Areas of Stability did experience substantial growth in the number of housing units. Specifically, portions of Areas of Stability adjacent to Downtown appear to have experienced a spillover effect from development pressure related to this and other Areas of Change. In addition, several Areas of Stability had characteristics (large quantities of undeveloped land, large employers, major institutions, or existing transportation infrastructure) that are typically attractive to new housing development.
Areas of Stability, Areas of Change and Net New Housing Units
As stated previously, 2002 Blueprint Denver included 44 specific actions intended to implement the plan goals. The Implementation Matrix found on pages 30 to 33 provides a complete listing and categorization of the 44 actions. It was determined that 11 of the 44 action items address Goal 2. Key takeaways include:

- Over 90% of action items related to Goal 2 have seen significant or partial progress.
- Nearly 80% of the actions related to Goal 2 were land use-oriented, with just three actions addressing infrastructure and partnerships.
- All actions related to zoning code changes were addressed with the adoption of a context- and form-based code in 2010.
- The Neighborhood Planning Initiative, a comprehensive approach to small area planning for Areas of Stability that creates capacity for timely and meaningful planning is underway.
- The only action item with little to no implementation progress is related to the creation of a small area planning handbook.
- Some multi-modal streets that would enhance Areas of Stability have been planned, designed and/or constructed.

As planned, Areas of Stability experienced a relatively small proportion of investment related to new growth, especially relative to their land area. Areas of Stability comprise 82% of Denver’s land area and captured just 17% of permitted development since 2002.

Areas of Stability bordering Denver’s major centers saw higher development than most other Areas of Stability. Areas of Stability that saw the greatest number of new housing units were around the edges Downtown and Cherry Creek. These highly desirable centers drive demand for housing and employment uses and were designated as Areas of Change. There appears to be a spillover effect from development pressure in these high demand centers. Looking forward, there may be a benefit in better planning for transition areas between high intensity uses in mixed use centers and stable single family neighborhoods.

The amenities, location and character of many Denver neighborhoods have led to strong market demand for housing within these neighborhoods. Some of Denver’s most desirable neighborhoods have seen significant levels of demolition of existing units to make way for new units.

Inconsistent map designation of Areas of Change may have led to a significant amount of development in select Areas of Stability. A quarter of the new housing units built in Areas of Stability were in neighborhoods that likely could have been an Area of Change, inflating the proportion of housing and jobs that went to Areas of Stability. Examples include the area around the Belleview Station in southeast Denver, portions of Green Valley Ranch, and the Marston neighborhood in southwest Denver. Land in these areas were undeveloped, yet were designated Areas of Stability.
GOAL 3

Improve the function of streets to move more people in more ways. Streets should be viewed as a means to move people, not just cars.

The major aim of Goal 3 was to diversify the ways in which people get around Denver. With a relatively auto-oriented culture in Denver and the larger region, a major emphasis of the original Blueprint plan was to provide more options to driving and to create environments that would promote the use of those options. The idea of using streets for moving people and not just cars was a significant paradigm shift for Denver.
**Measures**

**Improve the function of the streets**
This measure evaluated the change in dedicated facilities or services for walking, biking and transit since adoption of 2002 Blueprint, based on a variety of data sources. The transit revenue hours for the entire Denver region* increased by an annual average of 2%. Miles of sidewalks within the City has increased by approximately 1% per year and miles of on-street bikeways in the City has increased by an annual average of 19% in recent years. There has been a modest decrease in fatalities since 2002 overall, but an increase in fatalities in the last several years.

**Move more people**
Travel data for each major mode of transportation (driving, transit, walking and biking) was used to measure how many more people are moving within Denver. Individual metrics were chosen based on the most relevant data available for each mode and then examined for a common period from 2002 to 2014. For the sake of comparison, the population of Denver increased from 561,000 residents to 683,000 residents for an overall increase of 22% over the same time. Regionally*, daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) only increased by 16% over that period while regional annual transit ridership increased by 27%. Although the number of people commuting to work on foot or by bike was relatively low in 2002, the increases are significant. People commuting by bike increased by 240%. People commuting by foot nearly kept pace with population growth with an overall increase of 21% between 2002 and 2014.

**Move people in more ways**
Change in commute mode share data was used as the measure for quantifying whether people in Denver were moving in more ways. The citywide changes in commute mode share are relatively small with the greatest changes being a 5% decline in the share of people commuting by carpool and 2% increases in the share of people commuting by driving alone, biking and telecommuting. There was no change in the share of people walking to work and a 1% decline in the share of people commuting on transit. A more detailed neighborhood analysis was also conducted using 2010-2014 American Community Survey data. Maps for changes in driving alone and transit commute shares are included here. The drive alone commute mode share increased significantly since 2000 in many inner-ring neighborhoods, while the transit commute mode share has increased substantially in southeast Denver neighborhoods flanking the southeast light rail corridor, which opened in 2006.

---

*Regional data for VMT was compiled from DRCOG; transit data was compiled from RTD.

---

*Data includes crashes on all streets and highways within Denver City limits (including interstates)
MOVING MORE PEOPLE
MORE USERS OF ALL MODES SINCE 2002

- 21% INCREASE IN DENVER COMMUTERS WALKING
- 240% INCREASE IN DENVER COMMUTERS BIKING
- 16% INCREASE IN REGIONAL VMT
- 27% INCREASE IN REGIONAL TRANSIT RIDERSHIP
- 22% INCREASE IN DENVER POPULATION

Source: National Transit Database, RTD, DROG, 2000 U.S. Census, 2014 1-yr American Community Survey

GROWING BIKE INFRASTRUCTURE
100 MILES OF BIKE LANES ADDED SINCE '08

2008
44 MI

2016
144 MI

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, 2014 1-yr American Community Survey

*Bike lanes include protected bike lanes.

MOVING MORE PEOPLE IN MORE WAYS
MINIMAL SHIFT IN COMMUTE MODES SINCE 2002

2014 DENVER MODE SHARE

- Drive Alone - 70%
- Carpool - 9%
- Transit - 7%
- Telecommute - 6%
- Walk - 4%
- Bike - 3%

% CHANGE 2002-2014

- 2% up
- 5% down
- 1% down
- 2% up
- 0%
2000-2014 Change in Drive Alone Commute Mode Share by Denver Neighborhood

5% inflation adjusted income growth in the red and orange neighborhoods since 2000 compared to a 2% decline citywide.

**LARGEST INCREASE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun Valley</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnum</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Park</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LARGEST DECREASE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platt Park</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, 2010-2014 5-yr American Community Survey
2000-2014 Change in Transit Commute Mode Share by Denver Neighborhood

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, 2010-2014 5-yr American Community Survey
Implementation Actions

Of the 44 specific actions included in the original Blueprint plan (listed in full on pages 30-33), it was determined that 30 address Goal 3 in some way. Key takeaways from an assessment of those implementation actions include:

- Less than a quarter of Goal 3 related actions have seen significant progress and over a third of Goal 3 related actions have seen little to no progress.
- 80% of action items related to Goal 3 address infrastructure with the remaining actions split evenly between land use and partnerships.
- Actions are highlighted by the revitalization of Denver Union Station and the revival of a nationally-renowned intermodal hub for the region.
- The majority of other actions that have seen significant progress are programmatic and include partnerships related to transit and transit-oriented development, development of more progressive parking strategies, and relationships with local organizations and jurisdictions.
- Actions related to implementing complete streets, creating enhanced transit corridors, developing a small area traffic management program, expanding capacity of major streets in Areas of Change and inventorying infrastructure have seen partial progress.
- Significant actions that have seen little or no progress to date include development of a sidewalk maintenance policy, creating green streets to connect parks, and funding for shared parking solutions in priority areas.

Goal 3 Lessons Learned

- Although significant progress was made, Denver still has work to do when it comes to moving more people by more modes. Despite important improvements, implementation of the plan’s multi-modal goals has been challenging. This is likely due to the significant levels of funding needed to build multi-modal infrastructure as well as difficulty stimulating changes in travel behavior. Refined strategies and additional investments related to transportation will be needed in order to have a significant impact on mode share.
- Investments in transit and bicycle infrastructure have dramatically improved the function of the transportation network in certain locations, but are not system-wide. The large investment in Light Rail Transit (LRT), commuter rail and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) was largely focused on providing alternatives for regional trips. However, local bus service in Denver has not seen the same level of investment, this is due in part to RTD being a regional transit authority with many competing priorities. Bike network improvements with fewer obstacles have generally been implemented, leaving projects with greater trade-offs to consider going forward.
- Partnerships are critical. Many of the most impactful transportation projects are complex and cannot be accomplished by the City and County of Denver alone. Achieving future transportation goals will require partnerships among departments within the City as well as between the City and other agencies, including, but not limited to: RTD, CDOT, federal agencies, neighboring jurisdictions, neighborhood groups, the business community and the public.
- Blueprint provided policy direction resulting in important next steps and shifts in transportation investment:
  - Pedestrian Plan
  - Downtown Multimodal Access Plan
  - Strategic Transportation Plan
  - Strategic Parking Plan
  - Denver Moves: Peds and Trails
  - Living Streets Initiative
  - Denver Moves: Downtown
  - Denver Moves: Bicycles
  - Denver Zoning Code
  - Denver Moves: Transit

Goals to reduce single-occupancy vehicles to 60 percent by 2020 with a bike and pedestrian mode-share of 15 percent by 2020 have not been met as of 2016. These goals should be reevaluated.

- Blueprint lacked clear policy on some of the “big ideas.” Multimodal streets and enhanced transit corridors were some of the more significant elements identified in the 2002 Plan. Although multimodal improvements have occurred on a project by project basis (14th Street, Broadway, Tennyson), direction from Blueprint Denver on how to implement these ideas was vague and has not yet been achieved on a scale large enough to achieve the Plan’s transportation goals.
GOAL 4
Promote mixed-use development and urban centers

The fourth goal of 2002 Blueprint Denver has the aim of creating more mixed-use development and urban centers where residential, retail, and commercial functions overlap. Improving the multi-modal capacity of our streets as discussed in Goal 3 further enhances the creation of mixed-use areas where people can accomplish their daily errands by walking, biking, or transit. Car trips in mixed use areas and urban centers will be less frequent, and require shorter distances when they occur. Several measures clarify the intent of Goal 4. The first measure is to build out a rapid transit system and create capacity for moving people between and within urban centers and other mixed use areas without using their cars. The second measure is to support a greater mix of uses within urban centers. The final measure is to ensure high quality transit and pedestrian infrastructure that allow people to take advantage of mixed-use places and meet more of their daily needs close to home.
Measures

**Build out of proposed rapid transit system to add capacity and accommodate more trips**

The first measure related to Goal 4 is to build out a more robust rapid transit system that connects and supports mixed-use areas and urban centers. Rapid transit is defined as limited-stop, high-capacity, high-frequency transit within a partially or mostly dedicated right-of-way. This includes rail and bus rapid transit (BRT). By most measures, RTD, Denver and other regional partners have been hugely successful at building out the rail transit network. The number of rail corridors grew from 3 to 8, the miles of rail transit more than tripled, and the number of rail stations in Denver has doubled since 2002. The two remaining FasTracks rail corridors to be implemented in the City and County of Denver include the North Metro rail line (set to open in 2018), and the extension of the Central Corridor on Downing Street (no timeline).

Despite the growth in the rail network, the same successes cannot be said for expansion of BRT routes in Denver. Since 2002 one BRT corridor has been added, the Flatiron Flyer between Denver and Boulder opened early in 2016, and no additional bus-only lanes have been added within the City since 2002.

**Provide opportunities for more intense mixed-use development in urban centers**

The implementation chapter of 2002 Blueprint Denver called for the revision of the zoning code to implement the Areas of Change and Areas of Stability construct and to create more opportunity for new mixed use development. The overhaul of the zoning code in 2010 created more districts that allow mixed use development. An estimated 6,118 acres were rezoned from single use zoning categories to a mixed use zone district and a large percentage of these areas are near existing or planned transit stations.

Allowing for mixed use development and realizing the vision for mixed use development are two distinct topics. 2002 Blueprint Denver projected a specific mixture of housing and employment in the Areas of Change. The actual mix of new housing and new employment was compared to the Plan projections in each of the larger categories of Areas of Change. In Downtown, the actual ratio of new housing to new jobs has been 1 to 4, respectively. This is more skewed toward jobs than the Plan projection. In the Big 3, the mix of new housing and jobs nearly mirrors Plan projections with a 1 to 1 ratio. In the remaining Areas of Change, the actual ratio of new housing to new jobs has been nearly 9 to 1 in comparison to the Plan projections of 1 to 2, respectively.

---

**GROWTH OF RAPID TRANSIT**

75.7 MILES OF RAIL ADDED SYSTEM-WIDE SINCE 1994
20 STATIONS ADDED IN DENVER SINCE 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Stations</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mix of Uses in New Development in Areas of Change

**DOWNTOWN**
- **Housing**: 19%
- **Jobs**: 81%

**BIG THREE**
- **Housing**: 50%
- **Jobs**: 50%

**REMAINING AREAS OF CHANGE**
- **Jobs**: 12%
- **Housing**: 88%

Source: City/County of Denver; US Census LEHD; Economic and Planning Systems
Provide multi-modal connectivity within and between mixed-use developments and urban centers

The third set of measures for Goal 4 is related to pedestrian and transit access and connectivity to mixed-use developments and urban centers. Three measures were analyzed:

- **Pedestrian Access to Rail Stations** – The miles of streets that can be accessed within a ½-mile walkshed around rail stations via a continuous network of sidewalks (ADA compliant width of ≥4 feet) was compared to the total miles of streets within a ½-mile driveshed of rail stations to understand what portion of streets in the station area accommodate pedestrians and what level of pedestrian connectivity would be possible if all streets (represented by the driveshed) had sidewalks of ADA compliant width. On average, 63% of streets within a ½ mile driveshed of rail stations are connected to a station via a continuous network of sidewalks of ADA compliant width. This metric does not account for missing gaps in the street network itself that, if addressed, present an opportunity to additionally increase pedestrian accessibility to rail.

- **Sidewalk Completeness in Urban Centers** – To measure pedestrian connectivity within Denver’s 31 urban centers, an analysis of sidewalk completeness revealed that 22% of streets within the urban centers in Denver do not have sidewalks with ADA compliant widths.

- **Urban Centers Connected to High-Frequency Transit** – Out of Denver’s 31 urban centers, 18 (58%) are connected (within a ¼ mile walk) to rapid transit (rail or BRT) and 27 (87%) are connected to high-frequency transit (bus or rail with ≤15 minute frequencies throughout the day). Of the 27 urban centers connected to high-frequency transit, it’s worth noting that 4 (Cherry Creek, DU Campus Urban Center, 29th Ave Town Center and Pena & 40th) are only marginally connected, meaning significant portions of the urban center’s land area are not within walking distance of a station served by a high-frequency transit route. Stapleton North Regional Center (Northfield), MLK Town Center, Lowry Town Center and Denargo Market (Brighton Blvd) are urban centers not connected to high-frequency transit.

**Travel Sheds**

**Walkshed:** The area that can be accessed on foot using sidewalks and trails of ADA compliant width (≥ 4 feet) within a certain distance of a particular location.

**Driveshed:** The area that can be accessed by motor vehicle using streets within a certain distance of a particular location.
Mix of New Jobs and New Housing Units in DRCOG Urban Centers (2002-2014)

Source: City and County of Denver, Economic Planning Systems, US Census LEHD
On average, 63% of roadway miles within a ½-mile driveshed of a rapid transit station can be accessed from a station via a continuous network of sidewalks (ADA minimum width of 4 feet).

Source: City and County of Denver, RTD, Fehr & Peers

Note: Walksheds were developed based on the City and County of Denver’s sidewalk GIS data that was 94% complete as of publication and are subject to change. Walksheds shown here differ from those created as part of the City’s TOD Strategic Plan, which was based on the street network along with additional modifications to accurately reflect street and trail network connections, but did not account for sidewalk width or presence on streets.

Legend:
- Denver County Limits
- Arapahoe County
- Streets
- Rail Line
- Rail Station
- 1/2-mile Walkshed
- 1/2-mile Driveshed

1. Only sidewalks 3-4 feet (ADA accessible width) are included; half the distance was counted for streets with sidewalks on one side of the street.
2. Walkshed includes area connected to station by public sidewalks and trails of ADA compliant width (2-4 feet).
3. Driveshed includes area connected to station by public streets.
Of the 31 designated urban centers in Denver, 18 are connected by rail and 27 are connected by high frequency transit routes. About 22% of streets in urban centers lack sidewalks of ADA compliant width (≥ 4 feet).
Of the 44 specific implementation actions included in 2002 original Blueprint Denver (listed in full on pages 30-33), it was determined that 19 address Goal 4 in some way. Key takeaways from an assessment of those implementation actions include:

- Nearly 75% of action items related to Goal 4 have seen significant or partial progress.
- The 19 action items related to Goal 4 address land use, infrastructure and partnerships equally.
- While the majority of actions related to land use were implemented with the adoption of the context- and form-based code in 2010, there has been little no progress on the development of transit and pedestrian overlay districts.
- There has been substantial progress on supporting infrastructure investments, zoning changes, development incentives, and other transit-supportive strategies to achieve a Transit-Oriented Development (TOD).
- There has been some progress in investing in pedestrian infrastructure to support transit ridership for light rail and enhanced bus corridors.
- There has been little to no progress related to public-private partnerships for shared-use parking structures, regulations related to Transportation Management Associations, or provision of transit passes as part of rent in station areas.

### Goal 4 Lessons Learned

- Most of the planned rail transit network in Denver has been built out. This has been achieved through implementation of most of the FasTracks rail lines and stations planned in Denver.

- Little progress has been made to build out a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or “enhanced-bus” network in Denver. The 2002 Blueprint Denver Plan identified a number of potential arterial bus corridors to implement enhanced bus or BRT services. Little progress has been made in this regard, and since 2002 no new bus-only lanes have been added to the street network.

- Most households and employees in Denver are still not within walking distance of a rail transit station or high-frequency bus route. Despite the successful implementation of most of the planned rail corridors in Denver, only 8% of households and 24% of employees are within ½ mile of a rapid transit station. Similarly, only 29% of households and 44% of employees are within ¼ mile of a high-frequency bus service (≤15 minute frequency throughout the day). FasTracks rail transit has primarily been (or will be) built along most of the highways, active freight railroads, or abandoned rail corridors in Denver where right-of-way is available. There is a need to better connect residents and employees in Denver to high-frequency transit options.

- The mixture of new jobs and new housing units in mixed use areas and transit station areas is strongly skewed toward residential. Mixed use areas identified in 2002 Blueprint Denver had a greater capture of housing units than jobs at a ratio of nearly 4 to 1. When you remove Downtown and Denver International Airport from the calculations, transit station areas have primarily attracted only housing units and with new jobs in these areas only accounting for 6% of new jobs in Denver.
• **Gaps and barriers remain to ensuring access to rapid transit stations by pedestrians.** Existing data illustrates that there are significant gaps in both the sidewalk and street network within ½ mile of rail stations, particularly along the Southeast and East rail corridors. Only 63% of streets within a half mile driveshed of rail stations are connected to a station by a continuous network of sidewalks (ADA compliant width of ≥4 feet). Additionally, only about 70% parcels that could be within ½ mile walk of a rail station if they were connected by a well-connected gridded street network are accessible by the current street network. Thus, significantly more land around rapid transit stations could be made accessible to pedestrians through the addition of both new sidewalks as well as new street or trail connections.

• **Most Urban Centers are connected to the high frequency transit network, but significant gaps remain.** While 87% of Denver’s 31 designated urban centers are technically connected by high-frequency transit, only 58% are accessible by rapid transit (rail or BRT) and many areas within these urban centers are not actually accessible to a high-frequency transit route. This is because they are either too far from transit stations, most notably in Cherry Creek and DU, or streets within the urban centers lack adequate sidewalks that are of ADA compliant width. Lastly, of the 4 urban centers not accessible by high-frequency transit, 3 are in Stapleton and Lowry (with the fourth being Denargo Market along Brighton Boulevard).
### Implementation Action Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>Site Plan Review</th>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Transportation Design Standards and Guidelines</th>
<th>Small Area Planning</th>
<th>LAND USE PROGRESS SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reorganizing Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reorganize the zoning code with language amendment that reduces and standardizes use definitions and adds development and design standards</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amend code to eliminate obsolete zone districts and amend map to apply new zone districts to affected areas</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modify zone districts that do not reinforce the policies of Blueprint Denver</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correct significant discrepancies between land use and zoning in Areas of Stability</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modify the Zoning Map to be more compatible with the Blueprint Denver Land-use Map and to reinforce the Areas of Change and Stability</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare language to create transit and pedestrian overlay districts in the zoning code. Recommendations to apply the city-wide overlays will come through small area plans or as the zoning code is revised</td>
<td>Little to No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidate site plan review processes and procedures as the zoning code is reorganized and amend the site plan rules and regulations to reinforce the development &amp; design standards</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amend the subdivision ordinance and associated rules and regulations</td>
<td>Little to No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop transportation standards and guidelines manual</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meet demand for small area plans due to A of C and A of S</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare a small area planning handbook</td>
<td>Little to No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAND USE PROGRESS SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goal 1: Growth to AOC</th>
<th>Goal 2: Maintain AOS</th>
<th>Goal 3: Move People</th>
<th>Goal 4: Promote Mixed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Progress (count and percent of goal)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>5 (62%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Progress (count and percent of goal)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little to No Progress (count and percent of goal)</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>1 (13%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Goal 1: Growth to AOC</td>
<td>Goal 2: Maintain AOS</td>
<td>Goal 3: Move People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFRASTRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and develop enhanced bus corridors.</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a leadership role with RTD to define where, when and how the regional rapid transit system can be completed</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support infrastructure investments, zoning changes, development incentives, and other transit-supportive strategies to achieve a Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) in rail station areas and at other key transit locations</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop small area bus circulators to provide non-auto access to transit stations</td>
<td>Little to No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadways and Other Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to develop inventory and condition assessments for key City infrastructure including bridges, alleys, sidewalks, storm sewers, sanitary sewers, street pavement, street curbs, street gutters, street ramps and sidewalks. Develop priorities for replacement and repair of inadequate infrastructure based on City policy and adopted plans.</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote multi-modal street reconstruction projects that either enhance Areas of Stability or facilitate desired development in Areas of Change</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide targeted capacity improvements in Areas of Change and other significant travel corridors</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a storm water management plan to promote regional solutions to water detention and water quality issues.</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Traffic Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a traffic management program by integrating the principles into the small area planning and development review processes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate information about the many available traffic management strategies to interested groups and individuals</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate and refine the program periodically.</td>
<td>Little to No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Enhancements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the updated Bicycle Master Plan to fill in the missing links in the bicycle network</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian Enhancements</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Goal 1: Growth to AOC</th>
<th>Goal 2: Maintain AOS</th>
<th>Goal 3: Move People</th>
<th>Goal 4: Promote Mixed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Pedestrian Master Plan that establishes a basic inventory of pedestrian infrastructure, identifies priority pedestrian areas, and establishes enhanced pedestrian access as a cornerstone of public policy</td>
<td>Little to No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize investment in pedestrian infrastructure to support transit ridership for light rail and enhanced bus corridors and to improve safety</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a sidewalk maintenance and replacement policy, including recommendations for dedicated funding sources</td>
<td>Little to No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop green streets to connect parks.</td>
<td>Little to No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking & Transportation Management Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Goal 1: Growth to AOC</th>
<th>Goal 2: Maintain AOS</th>
<th>Goal 3: Move People</th>
<th>Goal 4: Promote Mixed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate new parking requirements in revisions of the City’s zoning code to facilitate reduced parking, shared parking, and parking structures where appropriate</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop public policies and funding sources and public-private partnerships to construct shared-use parking structures in key transit-oriented centers, public entertainment locations, and high-intensity employment or activity areas</td>
<td>Little to No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop regulations which require development of and participation in a Transportation Management Association for private developments, employment centers and activity centers above a certain size</td>
<td>Little to No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase efficiency of the entire transportation system through better traffic management and operations</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parks and Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Goal 1: Growth to AOC</th>
<th>Goal 2: Maintain AOS</th>
<th>Goal 3: Move People</th>
<th>Goal 4: Promote Mixed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green streets concept should be coordinated with master planning for better pedestrian connections</td>
<td>Little to No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for and enhance S. Platte River south of Colfax</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Growth and Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Goal 1: Growth to AOC</th>
<th>Goal 2: Maintain AOS</th>
<th>Goal 3: Move People</th>
<th>Goal 4: Promote Mixed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build out regional transportation system</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase and create regional intermodal transit center at DUS</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRESS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Goal 1: Growth to AOC</th>
<th>Goal 2: Maintain AOS</th>
<th>Goal 3: Move People</th>
<th>Goal 4: Promote Mixed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Progress (count and percent of goal)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (28.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Progress (count and percent of goal)</td>
<td>5 (46%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>10 (42%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little to No Progress (count and percent of goal)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (38%)</td>
<td>2 (28.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Goal 1: Growth to AOC</th>
<th>Goal 2: Maintain AOS</th>
<th>Goal 3: Move People</th>
<th>Goal 4: Promote Mixed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use City resources (often federal) to lend funds to businesses for improving their facades or expanding their businesses to create new jobs; also lend money to developers to create mixed-income housing</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide financing to fill the gap needed to make priority projects feasible</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemble land in priority areas</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with associations to promote transit use or to maintain public spaces</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with local jurisdictions in the region to address transportation and growth issues</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider making mixed-income housing developments along transit corridors a priority for housing resources; loans, LIHTC, HOME, PAB’s, TIF, etc.</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing parking requirements near transit stations</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In TOD’s provide Eco-passes as part of rent</td>
<td>Little to No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARTNERSHIPS PROGRESS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNERSHIPS PROGRESS SUMMARY</th>
<th>Goal 1</th>
<th>Goal 2</th>
<th>Goal 3</th>
<th>Goal 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Progress (count and percent of goal)</td>
<td>5 (72%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Progress (count and percent of goal)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little to No Progress (count and percent of goal)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF ACTIONS</th>
<th>Number of Actions</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little to No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>