Straw Man

Working Framework
To Develop
Planning Tools Matrix

The following outline is derived from the **Principles** and **Planning Tools** Task Forces reports of September 25, 2008 and is meant to be the starting point of discussion at the Planning Tools Task Force meeting on October 10, 2008.

I.   _Aspirational Principles_
- broad range of public and private transportation choices
  - **a.** transit ridership
  - **b.** walking & bicycling rates
  - **c.** VMT rates
- compact development
  - **a.** community design
  - **b.** number of approved development projects
  - **c.** water supply/consumption
  - **d.** wastewater capacity
- preservation of open space
  - **a.** community design
  - **b.** land cover/watershed health
- diversified economic development
  - **a.** number type of jobs
  - **b.** jobs/housing ratio
  - **c.** retail sales
  - **d.** population and housing forecasts
- education investment
  - **a.** school performance/success
  - **b.** health indicators
- "green" sustainable environment
  - **a.** climate change
  - **b.** energy
  - **c.** air quality
  - **d.** solid waste disposal/recycling

II.   _Strategic Principles_
- walkable mix-use environment
  - **a.** walking//bicycle rates
  - **b.** transit ridership
  - **c.** community design

- full range of affordable housing
    a. jobs/housing ration
    b. housing sales/foreclosures
    c. community design
- public infrastructure to sustain "corridors/cluster" concept
    a. walking//bicycle rates
    b. transit ridership
    c. community design
    d. jobs/housing ratio
    e. number/type of jobs
    f. population and housing forecasts
    g. development within activity centers and clusters
- constant engagement with Federal Government
    a. number and types of jobs
    b. school performance
    c. crime and security
    d. energy
    e. climate change

III.   *Social Principles*

- full access to jobs, quality healthcare, education and social services
    a. number and types of jobs
    b. school performance
    c. health indicators
    d. community design
- accommodate and understand region's diverse population
    a. population demographics
    b. household forecasts
    c. health indicators
    d. types of jobs
    e. retail sales
- support funding mechanisms that all should pay in proportion to benefits received
    a. health indicators
    b. school performance
    c. community design
- support subsidies for equity, environment, or public policy
    a. transit ridership
    b. community design
    c. health indicators
    d. crime and security

IV.   *Participatory Principles*
- extensive community and stakeholder participation in planning decisions
  a. community design
  b. number of approved projects
  c. development within activity centers and clusters
  d. school performance
  e. health indicators
- information about such decisions should be broadly distributed
  a. community design
  b. school performance
  c. health indicators
- mechanism for public input maintained and enhanced
  a. transit ridership
  b. community design
  c. school performance
  d. crime and security

An example of how to take existing COG data measurements (see first page of **Inventory of Existing COG Data** published for last meeting) and apply them to a metric matrix is as follows:

Community Health Indicators

1) **Physical Activity**   **47%**
2) **Overweight and Obesity**   **62%**
3) Tobacco Use   33%
4) Substance Abuse   22%
5) Responsible sexual behavior   33%
6) **Mental health**   **12%**
7) Injury and Violence   26%
8) **Environmental quality**   **25%**
9) **Immunization and infectious diseases**   **56%**
10) **Access to health care**   **33%**

The **example** here is to illustrate (*please note all the percents are fictitious*) how we could focus on the most important metrics (highlighted in red) to develop an overall indicator by aggregating the published reports.

The average of the five chosen categories is 47%. So where the Community Health indicator would appear in a published matrix we would use the 47%. Weighting could be considered, but in the interest of ease of understanding I believe a simple average would work best.

The goal is to keep the published report easy to read and understand, easy to maintain by the various reporting jurisdictions and minimizes the need to create new metrics.