

Strategy # 1: Implement Coordinated Plans

MetroFuture is a bold and achievable plan for a Greater Boston Region, and requires all of the region's stakeholders to work together to make that vision a reality. Cities and towns, state agencies, regional organizations, business and industry, advocacy organizations, and individuals all have a role to play. Most of these stakeholders are already involved in activities that effect the region's growth and development: planning, funding, building, voting, and more. Greater coordination across all sectors will help to harness these many existing efforts toward a common purpose. This Strategy outlines mechanisms to establish that coordination, thereby reducing redundancy, contradictory efforts, and conflict. As a result, the region will be able to take a more proactive approach to growth and development, using scarce resources more efficiently.

Effective growth and preservation efforts in Metro Boston are currently inhibited by fragmentation, reactive planning, and lack of resources. Organizational, geographic, and topical fragmentation is typified by permit approval processes that fail to consider long-term costs, planning efforts that do not reflect a regional perspective, and state policies that provide conflicting directives to municipalities, to name a few. In an absence of policy continuity, each new challenge must be dealt with as it arises, in a reactive process that requires stakeholders to resolve their differences in the heat of the moment, rather than through deliberate, forward-looking consensus building. Meanwhile, lack of resources—fiscal, technical, organizational—limit the ability of communities to make informed choices or investments that would have long-term benefits.

The negative outcomes of this broken process rapidly proliferate. For example, planning boards promoting commercial growth may require developers to large parking lots – but the runoff pollutes water supplies and prevents the recharge of the aquifer. In an effort to protect the water supply, towns zone for two-acre lots, only to see vast sections of woodlands and fields converted to subdivisions with expensive homes beyond the financial reach of most first-time homebuyers. Searching for homes they can afford, people move farther and farther away from employment centers – only to spend the money they save on gasoline for longer commutes. Municipalities build new interchanges to stem traffic congestion, but the interchanges draw businesses away from town centers and urban downtowns, with little long-term benefit on traffic patterns.

Coordinated planning can break this cycle of negative consequences. Comprehensive local planning efforts provide a structure to evaluate many critical interests and values—economic development, environmental preservation, housing creation, transportation choice—and to build consensus around broad approaches to balancing those interests. Such efforts should have two essential products: municipal policy recommendations consistent with each other, and a local constituency to advocate for the adoption and faithful implementation of those policies. Building such plans requires significant local capacity: municipal staff, knowledgeable committees, technical assistance, and innovative planning tools. Creating that capacity will require resources from the Commonwealth and MAPC. Implementing those plans will also require modernizing the region's zoning statutes and supporting broad application of modern planning and zoning tools that are common in other states but underutilized in Massachusetts.

State and regional actors also have a role to play in creating consistency across various geographic levels. Regional plans should be consistent with the Commonwealth's Sustainable Development Principles, and MAPC should create a framework for making local plans consistent with MetroFuture. Most importantly, the Commonwealth needs to send a strong message by aligning its many programs with the Sustainable Development Principles and establishing strong incentives for local planning efforts to be consistent with regional plans.

Of course, the private sector will be ultimately responsible for much of the development that occurs in Metro Boston over the coming decades. Individuals and corporations can contribute to a more sustainable future through their decisions about where and how to build, and they need information and education that will support regionally-minded decisions.

The recommendations in this Strategy represent significant changes in many aspects of Metro Boston's development process—the way residents engage in planning decisions, the relationship between municipalities and the state, the priorities that private entities use when selecting a location. Yet only through these changes can the region make progress toward a brighter future. Without a strong framework of coordination, all the other policies recommended by MetroFuture—for economic development, transportation improvements, healthier families, or environmental preservation—will be inefficient at best, and conflicting at worst.

A. Increase municipal planning capacity

The region is shaped by hundreds of local planning and development decisions, ranging from the creation of municipal comprehensive plans down to the approval of subdivisions and building permits. Each city and town must have the capacity to make planning decisions that support sustainable growth for the region. Regional plans and state policies—no matter how well crafted—will see little impact if cities and towns lack the tools and capacity to make them a reality. Each municipality needs to have the ability to evaluate alternatives for growth and development, build consensus, create sustainable plans and zoning, and ensure that they are implemented well.

Unfortunately, many cities and towns lack this capacity. Dozens of municipalities lack a full-time planner, and many more have planning departments that are understaffed and overworked. Residents have few opportunities to develop the “planning literacy: that will help them to more constructively engage in boards, committees, and public processes. Abutters and community members engage in development review from a NIMBY (Not In My BackYard) perspective, rather than a broader recognition of public interest. The technical tools and assistance that could inform important planning decisions are hard to come by, not to mention the financial resources to support long-range planning efforts.

The first step to creating the needed capacity is to ensure that each municipality has a professional planner who can address comprehensive planning challenges—if not a full-time planner, then one shared with neighboring towns. Meanwhile, the capacity of local boards and residents can be strengthened through expanded training opportunities and a cultural

emphasis on informed evaluation and engagement at the local level. This engagement can be supported through visual, quantitative, and facilitative planning tools that help communities understand the implications of different alternatives and support consensus building. Finally, technical resources and financial support are necessary to enable the deliberate planning efforts that form the foundation of coordinated municipal planning.

1) Ensure each municipality has professional planning staff

If municipalities are to be expected to develop and implement sustainable plans, they must have professional staff dedicated to this task. Professional planners bring technical expertise that can rarely be matched by volunteer boards or committees.

In 2008, approximately 70% of the 101 cities and towns in the MAPC region had at least one full time planner; about 10% had only part time planners or consultants and the rest did not have any professional planners on staff. Even in many municipalities that have full-time planning staff, those staff are often so occupied with review of individual development proposals that they have little time to devote to actual long-range planning issues. Increased capacity in those municipalities would allow planning staff to devote sufficient attention to careful review of development proposals, while also addressing long-range planning, public education, outreach, regional collaboration, and stakeholder development.

Increasing this capacity will require additional resources at both the local and state level. Municipalities must prioritize funding for planning staff, considering it an investment that will help to preserve natural and financial resources. The state can also support this effort by creating a new funding stream dedicated to support local planning, with the understanding that this new funding should be used to increase local planning capacity, rather than replacing existing local funding. The goal should be for each municipality to be served by a professional planner (possibly shared with another municipality), with a long-term goal of at least one full time planner for each municipality.

- 1.a Municipalities should seek opportunities to raise new funds for local planning efforts and should use these funds to increase their capacity**
- 1.b The legislature should provide dedicated funding for municipal planning staff**
- 1.c MAPC should create model job descriptions for long-range municipal planners**

2) Increase capacity of citizen boards through education

Development of Metro Boston is driven in large part through decisions made by citizen boards and committees. In order to make informed decisions, citizen boards and committees need training and education about planning issues and the regulatory environment.

Planning Boards, Zoning Boards of Appeals, Boards of Health, and Conservation Commissions are all responsible for the implementation of state and local planning and development controls; their perspective and understanding of regulation and planning issues influences the decisions they make. Many other citizen committees participate in development decisions less directly, through Master Plan committees, CPA committees, and other advisory or planning bodies.

Many training opportunities already exist but are poorly utilized, and many board members have no formal training associated with their very important role as regulators. MAPC, state agencies, educational institutions, and service providers should collaborate to expand access to such training.

Board and committee members should consider it their obligation to participate in such training opportunities on a regular basis, and chief municipal officials and citizen board chairs should reinforce this expectation. Professional planners must participate in continuing education in order to maintain their status as a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners. Similarly, municipalities might consider requiring board members to participate in continuing education in order to be eligible for reappointment or reelection (with the recognition that restrictions on the eligibility for elected positions may require enabling legislation).

Absent a mandate for citizen board and committee members to be certified, a focus on board development as part of regular activities, as well as dissemination of information on training opportunities, could effectively create a culture in which regular training is expected and received.

The Citizen Planner Training Collaborative (CPTC) is a critical resource for local planning and zoning officials. CPTC provides workshops and trainings, examples of proposed and existing municipal bylaws, a Planner's Toolkit, planning links, and information on further training programs and conferences. CPTC already offers two levels of certification, and is considering offering a third. This certification could provide an objective benchmark to determine whether board members are meeting continuing education expectations.

Other states require training of planning, zoning, and other pertinent board members as a precondition for current and future board members. In New Jersey, legislation requires board members to attend training courses. The purpose of the course is to provide a uniform educational experience for all planning and zoning board members throughout the state and to provide the basic practical information they will need to fulfill their responsibilities.

The Massachusetts Interlocal Insurance Association (MIIA) provides discounts on insurance for completion of specified training programs. This adds a more immediate fiscal reason for communities to ensure that all pertinent board members have completed specified training, as it will both lower the

municipality's insurance rates and ensure that their boards have the capacity to make informed planning decisions.

2.a MAPC should collaborate with stakeholders and service providers to expand opportunities for training and education

2.b Board and Commission members should participate in relevant training opportunities

2.c Municipalities should establish expectations for continuing training prior to reelection or reappointment

3) Foster informed public participation in planning efforts

Innovative new ways to increase “planning literacy” in the general population are needed for residents to more effectively and productively represent their interests in planning and development processes. In particular, the region needs to find creative ways to cultivate the participation of low-income, minority, and immigrant populations traditionally under-represented in planning processes.

Planners throughout the region have seen many development proposals—even good proposals whose benefits far outweigh their impacts—meet opposition that results from resistance to change and concern about localized impacts. Resident participants who can put development proposals in a broader context will be quicker to recognize benefits and find creative “win-win” solutions to addressing impacts. Yet few residents get regular exposure to planning and development concepts or are familiar with their municipality's plans. Traditional strategies for public participation in planning efforts tend to draw small crowds from limited constituencies. As a result, it is difficult for those plans to represent a diversity of voices, and the constituency available to advocate for their implementation is small.

In light of these challenges, municipalities and advocacy organizations must redouble their efforts to engage residents in planning efforts and educational opportunities, all within the context of regionalism and sustainability. These efforts must look beyond conventional methods of public outreach, and instead using organizational networks and technology to provide information through the venues that residents are already familiar with.

3.a MAPC should collaborate with municipalities, service providers, and stakeholders to offer more innovative planning education for residents

3.b MAPC should collaborate with area leadership academies and educational institutions to foster civic leaders who are knowledgeable and committed to MetroFuture's goals

4) Build local capacity to use planning support tools

Recent years have seen tremendous advancement in “planning support tools” that help regulators and stakeholders to understand the implications of different approaches to planning and development. Such tools can help to build consensus, resolve disputes, and maintain consistency and accountability over time, and can be applied at a variety of different scales and time horizons, from an individual development proposal to a comprehensive plan.

MetroFuture itself used such tools (in particular, the Community Viz software model) to help educate participants about the implications of alternative scenarios across a wide variety of topic areas. Other planning support tools include more information about existing conditions or regional growth trends that will affect local conditions and should inform local decisions.

However, many municipalities do not have the capacity to utilize such planning support tools. Some towns have little data on recent development and current conditions; even fewer have the capacity to evaluate different future alternatives in a data-driven context. The “buildout” maps funded by the state in 2000 contained useful information but the associated projections did not functionally support alternative decision-making.

Municipalities need regularly-updated base maps that depict existing development, environmental resources, developable land, zoning and regulatory constraints, and infrastructure resources, and are accompanied by demographic, economic, and fiscal data about current conditions. Decision support tools such as the Community Viz model could draw on the information contained in these maps to evaluate the impacts of alternative plans or development proposals.

Consensus building and alternative dispute resolution (ADR) are also key tools that can help stakeholders resolve differences of opinion productively, rather than leading to divisiveness and litigation. Consensus building techniques can be applied in during planning efforts to foster agreement on desired futures. Alternative dispute resolution techniques involve a mediated effort to reach agreement voluntarily, without the use of mitigation. Such techniques are widespread in other states but underutilized by municipal governments in Massachusetts. The Massachusetts Office of Dispute Resolution is a state agency charged with expanding the use of ADR in the Commonwealth.

4.a MAPC and the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs should partner to create updated buildout maps for each municipality

4.b MAPC should develop prototype municipal-level applications of the Community Viz model

4.c MAPC should partner with Massachusetts Office of Dispute Resolution and private service providers to develop guidelines for the use of alternative dispute resolution for land use

5) Provide more general non-contract technical support through MAPC subregions

The MAPC subregions are at the core of the agency’s mission and activities and should be primary instrument for coordinating the efforts of the agency and member municipalities.

Subregions provide a key avenue of communication between MAPC and member municipalities, and subregional coordinators are often the first point of contact for local officials or boards. Coordinators are expected to keep abreast of planning and development issues in their subregion, and their advice or technical assistance is often sought. However, these coordinators have a limited amount of time to devote to these activities, and little remains after meeting preparation, general communications, and other logistics are accomplished.

Subregional coordinators could strengthen the relationship between MAPC and its member municipalities, and could be key players in the implementation of MetroFuture. Regular consultation with municipal planners and boards (and occasional attendance at those meetings) would help local officials incorporate a regional perspective in local decisions. The regular presence of coordinators at meetings and offices would help MAPC’s visibility in the subregions, making municipalities more likely to turn to the agency for technical assistance contracts and to support its legislative and policy agendas.

Subregional coordinators might also provide “small-scale” technical assistance, such as reviewing and commenting on the scope for project review, or providing feedback on a plan or study provided by a third party consultant. They might also make it regular practice to review and comment or testify on significant zoning changes and major development proposals where appropriate (such as development with regional impacts), including MEPA applications. These technical assistance activities might necessarily involve small amounts of time for other staff with particular specialties, and general funding should be available to support this staff time

Subregional coordinators could also productively support local efforts through advocacy, outreach, and education. These activities would seek to develop a constituency committed to regionally-minded planning and willing to support municipal planning initiatives to advance policies consistent with MetroFuture. Coordinators might organize their networks of subregional contacts in support of a particular zoning change, for example; or they could provide data, targeted educational materials, and media outreach related to a particular issue.

5.a MAPC should seek additional funding, perhaps through increased assessment, to increase subregional capacity

5.b MAPC should increase subregional advocacy/organizing activities

5.c MAPC and municipalities should develop a process for MAPC review (advisory) of proposed zoning changes

6) Support the development of local plans and zoning consistent with MetroFuture

Municipalities, MAPC, and the state must dedicate more resources to support the development of local plans and zoning consistent with MetroFuture. Ideally, this effort must be more deliberate, intensive, and far-reaching than other recent initiatives such as Executive Order 418, which provided funding to municipalities for the development of local plans, but without any significant attention to regional consistency or local implementation. State and regional support for these efforts would involve two components: technical assistance from MAPC and other public agencies (supported by state funding), and direct state funding in support of comprehensive planning processes.

In order to build in consistency with MetroFuture, MAPC should be a close partner in the local comprehensive planning processes, and the MetroFuture scenario should be an explicit point of reference for these plans. Local planning efforts should apply planning support tools in the context of deliberate (and diverse) public participation with an emphasis on learning and stakeholder development. In this manner, local plans will reflect local priorities and decision making while being consistent with the regional plan.

MetroFuture’s population, housing, and employment scenario for each municipality should form a basic expectation of what each comprehensive plan should seek to achieve. While MetroFuture targets should be the starting point for development of local comprehensive plans, MAPC should also develop a mechanism to adjust those targets based on local conditions and preferences, while maintaining the broad outlines of the MetroFuture scenario.

Given a “palette” of appropriate land uses that recognizes different Community Types, the comprehensive planning process would allocate land uses to places in the municipality based on the criteria for where each is appropriate. On aggregate, each municipality would end up with:

- A plan for sufficient capacity to accommodate its population and employment targets;
- Designation of sensitive and/or important landscapes that should be protected from development;
- An understanding of the positive and negative impacts of putting the plan into action as well as how impacts are distributed across the community and its populations;
- Housing production, economic development, open space, and other plans that are demonstrably consistent and together demonstrate how the municipality expects to achieve its comprehensive plan; and
- A detailed description of zoning and regulatory changes necessary to implement the plan.

While comprehensive plans are important, they must often be supported by district plans and capital plans that provide a greater detail regarding specific growth areas or infrastructure improvements necessary to support growth. Such plans are necessary to ensure that the capacity exists to support planned growth, or to define the improvements necessary to develop the needed capacity.

6.a The Legislature and Governor should establish a significant new funding program for regular and ongoing local comprehensive planning efforts

6.b MAPC should develop best practices and checklists for development of local plans within a regional context, on a community type basis

6.c MAPC should develop MetroFuture-based summaries of target population and employment by municipality

B. Modernize planning and development tools

In order to create a sustainable future for the region, municipalities need more than good plans—they need a well-stocked toolkit of land use controls. These controls should provide the instruments necessary to promote development in smart growth locations, discourage growth in areas designated for preservation, protect private property rights, streamline permits for proposals consistent with land use plans, and manage the rate of growth for a specific development or an entire municipality.

Unfortunately, cities and towns now have few tools to accomplish these goals. While local authorities retain most responsibility for regulating development, the Zoning Enabling Act and other state laws contain unclear or restrictive provisions that effectively deprive municipalities of authority consistent with their responsibilities. With the restrictions imposed by state statute, cities and towns have no means by which to implement local plans. Efforts to focus growth or protect natural areas are impeded by a complex tangle of exemptions, prohibitions and zoning freezes. Meanwhile, best practices common in other states are not expressly permitted here or are significantly underutilized.

7) Modernize the Zoning Enabling Act

Legislative reform is necessary to eliminate antiquated provisions in the zoning code which impede municipal efforts to implement sustainable land use plans.

The Massachusetts zoning enabling act is nationally regarded as antiquated; it was listed by the American Planning Association as among the weakest and most outdated land use frameworks statewide. Certain subdivisions of land require no local review or approval; excessive “grandfathering” provisions frustrate attempts to modify zoning; and municipalities are prohibited from regulating “teardowns” or establishing very low-density zoning districts.

Numerous zoning reform proposals have been identified and recommended in recent years. Four specific reforms are identified here, but other zoning reform

concepts are addressed in other sections of this strategy or elsewhere in the implementation plan.

7.a The Legislature should eliminate the “Approval not Required” process for all municipalities

7.b The Legislature should reform grandfathering provisions to apply to development proposals only, for a period of three years

7.c The Legislature should explicitly permit low-density zoning in designated resource protection areas

7.d The Legislature should eliminate the current prohibition on regulation of the maximum interior floor area of residential structures

8) Adopt best practices for permit streamlining

Productive relationships between municipalities and the development community foster compact growth. Municipalities should adopt best practices that can make permitting more predictable, equitable, cost effective, and efficient.

Inefficient permitting and approval processes can discourage compact growth. Developers who face a long, costly, and uncertain permitting process are likely to shift their resources and efforts to other locations, regions, or states. This is especially concerning if inefficient permitting in appropriate locations causes developers to choose alternate locations that are inconsistent with the MetroFuture land use plan. Even in municipalities with relatively efficient permitting, special permit requirements for many developments may add to uncertainty and discourage developers from pursuing good projects.

Application of streamlined permitting processes does not require municipalities to lower their standards or feel pressured to approve bad proposals. Applied appropriately, Permit Streamlining Best Practices should reinforce local jurisdiction; encourage community supported projects; preserve local resources; and maintain the standard of review.

Municipalities should also establish an intermediate “as of plan” review that is somewhere between current practice for special permits and as-of-right development. Such a review might be appropriate in designated growth areas and could include design review, inclusionary zoning, and a public review process. It would not, however, include review of plan elements that conform to the requirements of an approved plan; for example, parking requirements, setbacks, or heights would not be subject to special review if they conform to the criteria established in the plan.

8.a Municipalities should adopt the permitting recommendations outlined in the “Best Practices Guide for Streamlined Local Permitting”

8.b MAPC should develop a framework for a streamlined “as of plan” review within the special permit process

9) Establish local and regional Transfer of Development Rights programs

One method of preserving open space while increasing density in designated areas is through Transfer of Development Rights (TDR). As the name implies, TDR involves shifting the development rights from one property to another piece of property in a designated area. The result is a (usually neutral) increase in the allowable density of development in the receiving area and a reduction of density in the sending area.

TDR distributes the burden of land use regulations more evenly than straight zoning or legislation. Landowners in the sending area share in the financial gains of development by selling their development rights to willing buyers. In this way, the benefit in the receiving area can be distributed among all affected landowners, including those in the sending area. TDR has the advantage of allowing the market to generate individual transactions while serving the overall policy goal of shifting and concentrating development.

TDR programs generally operate under one of two models: 1) the municipality administers the program and sellers and buyers deal with each other directly; or 2) a development credit bank administers the program and buys and sells credits. The credit bank can be run by the municipality, the state, or a nonprofit or other entity.

TDR is fairly complex to operate because it requires a large amount of oversight. Even if a credit bank is involved, the local government must still make many administrative decisions, such as defining sending and receiving areas, tracking transfers and development, and defining the process for taxation and other legal issues. A regional TDR Bank managed by MAPC would reduce the administrative burden on individual municipalities and would streamline the process of buying and selling rights.

The Commonwealth should encourage Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) through legislation to promote TDR and funding to support technical assistance and establishment of TDR “banks.” MAPC should initially concentrate on establishing working TDR programs within as many communities as possible, and then work on inter-municipal transfer of development rights.

9.a MAPC should develop a pilot program with individual municipalities to establish formal Transfer of Development Rights programs

9.b MAPC should collaborate with state environmental and housing agencies to develop a framework for regional Transfer of Development rights

10) Use phased development and rate-of-development controls to manage growth

Phased Growth Controls should be coordinated with a municipality's ability to provide services to the new development such as sewers, water, public safety, schools or transportation. Rate-of-development programs limits the number of building permits issued in a municipality each year. These programs, when combined with bonuses for building in smart growth locations and building affordable housing, be another tool to help municipalities direct growth where they would like it. For example, a community that allows 10% of the lots in a development to be permitted in a given year under the conventional rate-of-growth bylaw could allow more permits each year to developers who provide cluster plans. If the developer allows public access to the open space in the cluster, they gain an additional bonus in lots released for sale per year. Other public benefits (such as more affordable housing) could also yield greater lot release per year.

A legislative change would allow municipalities to adopt rate-of-development restrictions consistent with local and regional growth targets, with certain exceptions such as affordable housing.

11) Formalize development agreements

Development agreements are contracts between municipalities and individual developers that spell out what the developer must do to develop a particular project. These voluntary agreements can cover topics as diverse as what kind of uses will occur on the land in question, the timeframe for the development, how many units will go on the property and the maximum size of the proposed buildings, and what kind of access to public facilities and services will be available to the development. They can increase the chance of favorable outcomes for both parties involved by making the development process more predictable, as well as ensuring that the restrictions and the benefits are tailored to the circumstances of a particular project.

In Massachusetts, municipalities currently can enter into development agreements, especially around zoning changes that enable specific types of development to occur. But development agreements are not formally structured to either preclude extraneous and time consuming negotiations, or to reinforce state and regional goals. A legislative change would be necessary to clarify municipalities' power to enter into development agreements with the private sector, as well as to align the development agreements with broader goals.

C. Establish consistency of plans across all levels

Almost all of MetroFuture's recommendations are based in the understanding that land use plans and development controls at all levels and across all geographies must be aligned with each other. Plans and policies cannot run at cross-purposes, and actual development decisions must adhere to the plans that have been established. Deliberate efforts are necessary to establish this consistency and monitor it over time.

Currently, there are no mechanisms to coordinate planning objective in Massachusetts. The Commonwealth Sustainable Development Principles represent a powerful and progressive vision for the state, but lack specific objectives that could be used to shape policy, programs, and priorities. Regional planning agencies are required to prepare growth projections, but there is no requirement that regional growth plans reflect Sustainable Development Principles. When transportation planning, water permitting, and other programs use regional growth plans that reflect “current trends” instead of sustainable development, these programs end up reinforcing unsustainable growth patterns. Similarly, municipal plans, where they exist, are developed without any formal mechanism to address the regional context, and there is little expectation that zoning is consistent with land use plans, much less a formal requirement. The result is a series of plans and policies—from the state to the local level—with little relation to each other and little capacity to shape growth in the region.

The Commonwealth needs new mechanisms to ensure that state, regional, and local plans are consistent with each other. While the Sustainable Development Principles should provide the guidance for such consistency, that does not necessarily imply a strictly “top-down” approach; a cooperative approach among all levels of government involved will ensure that plans are both consistent with regional needs and sensitive to local conditions. The recommendations also recognize that mandatory local planning and consistency, as required in many other states, may not be feasible in Massachusetts where local autonomy is so fiercely protected. Instead, local participation should be strongly encouraged through the use of strong incentives, in the form of local aid and property tax policies. While the recommendations immediately below focus on coordination across levels of government, the coordination of state policies is also critical, and is addressed in the next section of this strategy.

12) Formalize the Commonwealth Sustainable Development Principles and Objectives

The Commonwealth Sustainable Development Principles, developed under the Romney Administration and reaffirmed with modest changes under Governor Patrick, should be given the force of law. This would provide – across administrations and insulated from changing political contexts – the backbone for clear objectives that can guide planning and land use policy decisions and implementation statewide and locally. In doing so, the Administration should commit to supporting local and regional consistency, and to aligning state policy, programs, and investments (both discussed more fully below) with the Sustainable Development Principles.

The state should also develop specific objectives associated with the Sustainable Development Principles. These “Sustainable Development Objectives” would comprise numerical targets for development and preservation across the regions of the state. They would provide a common benchmark for regional planning, and are necessary if regional plans and local plans are expected to be consistent with the Principles in any measureable way. The Administration should convene a task force that comprises state, municipal, regional, developer, and other key interests in a collaborative effort to draft actionable objectives in regulation that

compromise neither the intent of the Principles nor good faith efforts on behalf of other stakeholders to define and pursue independent objectives.

12.a Legislature should establish the Sustainable Development Principles as the objectives of all planning and related implementation activity in the state

12.b Administration should convene a broad-based task force to develop specific, actionable Sustainable Development Objectives

13) Regularly update MetroFuture land use plan and objectives, consistent with State principles/objectives

Metro Boston is fortunate to have used a participatory process to establish a regional plan – MetroFuture – with objectives that fully reflect the Commonwealth’s Sustainable Development Principles. As such, MetroFuture applies state principles in a manner that is suitable to the unique communities and conditions of Metro Boston.

MAPC should update the MetroFuture land use plan (including population, housing, and employment projections) at least every 3 years to reflect ongoing development and adjustments necessary to accommodate local plans. This update should be designed to maintain the broad outlines of the MetroFuture scenario while ensuring that the plan adequately reflects existing conditions and opportunities for change. Such updates will be necessary to support other regional planning efforts such as the regional transportation plan, as well as local planning efforts.

13.a Legislature should provide significant funding for regular and ongoing regional planning efforts

13.b The Administration should dedicate staff and resources to actively facilitate both development of consistent regional plans and consistency determinations

14) Assess consistency of municipal plans and actions with MetroFuture objectives

To support the development of municipal plans and zoning consistent with MetroFuture, MAPC must develop a utilitarian framework for the development of such plans, and an objective and adaptable methodology for assessing consistency. A basic level of consistency will be easy to determine for a municipality that collaborates with MAPC on development of its comprehensive plan and adopts the MetroFuture growth and preservation targets (or some approved modification thereof) in that plan. Ongoing consistency with the objectives of MetroFuture requires additional municipal actions over time. Municipalities must adopt the zoning and policy changes recommended by the plan within some reasonable period of time; and they must actively work to make progress toward housing production and land preservation targets, among others.

Consistency review would provide an assessment of local consistency with MetroFuture on a variety of different dimensions. A ‘programmatic’ assessment would compare a municipality’s plans and policies to MetroFuture and the local comprehensive plan, and would provide a ‘grade,’ both overall and in specific categories (such as water conservation policies). A ‘progress’ assessment would evaluate actual development trends and other municipal indicators to help document improvements over time (such as an actual decrease in water demand). One particularly important component of the progress assessment would address the geographic distribution of growth and its relationship to land use plans (a mixed use development called for by the local plan might be scored as “consistent,” while commercial development in a designated preservation area would be scored as “inconsistent”). Another component would assess progress toward housing production targets (including affordable housing) and would include some consideration of regional market conditions so that municipalities are not sanctioned for slow production rates more properly attributed to a poor housing market.

Such a consistency assessment would constitute a logical evolution of the existing Commonwealth Capital program, with a multidimensional approach and a more detailed attention to progress indicators.

The scores derived from this consistency assessment would be important factors in a variety of programs described elsewhere in this strategy, such as grant programs or new local aid formulae. They will also help to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of specific recommendations, if they demonstrate that implementation of given policy is not followed by improved progress indicators.

14.a MAPC should develop a methodology for consistency assessments

15) Establish local aid formulas and tax sharing programs that promote plan consistency

Strong incentives for development of consistent municipal plans can be developed through targeted increases in state aid or structured flexibility with regard to property tax restrictions. Local aid increases should be discounted where significant new growth occurs inconsistent with the local and regional plan. Municipalities that choose to increase their Prop 2.5 cap (under a proposal in the Municipal Finance strategy) should have the new growth exemption limited to development consistent with the local and regional plan.

The dire fiscal conditions that plague many of the region’s cities and towns are a major driver for unsustainable land use decisions. Municipalities dependent on the property tax and constrained by Prop 2.5 will be more inclined to make decisions that seek to satisfy the short term bottom line, rather than the region’s long term sustainability.

Revisions to local aid and constraints on municipal revenue should be structured to create incentives for consistency with local and regional plans, which in turn helps to reduce unnecessary expenditures over time. Such revisions should reflect two broad approaches: First, municipalities should be protected from negative fiscal impacts associated with development consistent with local and regional plans (such as forgoing commercial development in preservation areas, or promoting increased affordable housing production) Second, municipalities that allow development inconsistent with local and regional plans should reap proportionally fewer benefits from revisions to local aid and constraints on municipal revenue.

The existing Partnership Aid proposal calls for increases in local aid to be allocated based on the “revenue gap” between the estimated cost of non-education services and the calculated capacity of the municipality to raise revenue. In order to promote smart growth consistent with both MetroFuture and the state’s Sustainable Development Principles, the revised aid formula should include elements that promote consistency with the regional plan. For example, new growth inconsistent with the local and regional plans would add to the municipal capacity, but associated costs would not be included in the formula. Conversely, tax revenue that municipalities forego due to regional tax sharing or transfer of development rights would not be counted as part of the municipal capacity and would therefore be reimbursed by the formula.

The Municipal Finance strategy recommends a new opt-in provision that would allow municipalities to set their own cap on property taxes. Such a provision should include a condition that the new growth exemption applies only to growth consistent with the local and regional plan. New tax revenue associated with growth inconsistent with those plans would be considered an increase on the existing levy, so the municipality might diversify its tax base but would not raise additional revenue over and above what would be allowed by the levy limit. This would create more flexibility for municipalities acting in alignment with local and regional plans, while reducing incentives associated with plan-inconsistent growth.

15.a MAPC and stakeholders should develop a proposal for a local aid formula based on “fiscal gap” that promotes consistency of local plans and MetroFuture

15.b Revise Prop 2.5 so that new growth exemption applies only to growth consistent with local and regional plan

D. Coordinate sustainable state policies and programs

The potential benefits of establishing consistency among plans and programs at different geographic scales are substantial, but only if state policies, programs, and priorities are also coordinated with each other under the umbrella of the Commonwealth’s Sustainable Development Principles. With direction from the Governor, all state agencies should adjust

funding, permitting, infrastructure, housing, and technical assistance programs to promote sustainable growth.

While the Sustainable Development Principles represent a powerful and progressive vision for the state, but they have not yet been fully integrated into the state's policies, programs, and priorities. Of greater concern, many state programs are not aligned with one another and often work at cross purposes.

Coordination of state policies must begin with executive leadership and clear, specific, and measurable expectations for program alignment. Ongoing self-evaluation and "third party" assessment will be necessary to ensure that these expectations are being met. Modifications to state policies should prioritize capital funding for designated growth areas and create mechanisms to discourage affordable housing developments in resource protection areas. Expansion of the Massachusetts Water Resource Authority service area should include strict conditions for water conservation and land use controls. Long-range permitting and capital facilities projects—such as the Water Management Act or the Massachusetts School Building Authority—should also reflect sustainable development patterns.

16) Ensure state policies and investments are consistent with the Sustainable Development Principles

To standardize decision making and ensure consistency with the Sustainable Development Principles, the administration should develop a sustainable development policy checklist that must be completed and submitted to the Governor's Office whenever a new program is contemplated. In addition, the Commonwealth needs to review all of its policies to ensure that the Sustainable Development Principles are being followed by programs currently in existence. These sustainable development consistency reviews should assess positive and negative sustainable development impact, and should be applied to any decision, program, or investment that is related to or affects areas covered by the Sustainable Development Principles.

This sustainable development consistency review cannot be completed by the Administration or by advocates alone. The Governor should name a panel to review current policies and recommend changes necessary to promote the Sustainable Development Principles. Membership should include representatives from his or her office and each related agency, appropriate legislative committees, the regional planning agencies, and nonprofits that represent a variety of perspectives.

16.a The Governor should issue an Executive Order mandating administration-wide application of the Sustainable Development Principles

16.b In coordination with the Governor's office, the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs should develop a Sustainable Development policy checklist

16.c In coordination with the Governor’s office, the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs should develop a Sustainable Development consistency review

17) Establish mechanisms for state accountability and consistency of Development Principles

It is essential that the state track and report on performance and progress in coordinating its policies and investments with the Sustainable Development Principles. This provides for evaluation of those policies and investments, the identification of approaches that are more and less successful, modifications as needed to either improve efficacy or to account for progress made, and the means for the public to hold their government accountable for acting in accordance with its commitments.

17.a The Governor should establish an annual assessment of state program consistency with the Sustainable Development Principles

17.b MAPC should work with the Massachusetts Smart Growth Alliance to regularly evaluate the state’s “sustainable development performance”

18) Target capital funding to proposals consistent with regional plan

The Commonwealth should make investments consistent with state objectives as reflected in local and regional plans, including its capital budget expenditures on infrastructure. State objectives should comprise the framework for all infrastructure investment. Any applicant for capital funds should specify how the project would advance state objectives and follow the applicable local and regional plans.

The Commonwealth Capital Program (Comm Cap) currently provides the state’s primary mechanism for promoting sustainable development principles through capital funding. Comm Cap prioritizes capital funding to municipalities that implement planning best practices, thereby reinforcing the positive impact of those best practices and encouraging more municipalities to follow suit. Minor modifications to the program might make it more effective: criteria need to reflect state objectives, recognize regional and community type distinctions, and evolve to keep challenging municipalities to advance while not overburdening them. More significant modifications might include increasing the relative importance of CommCap in project selection, and expanding the range of programs to which CommCap applies. Ultimately, the state should establish consistency with regional plans and the Sustainable Development Principles as a requirement for all capital funding programs.

The state should specifically target an expanded infrastructure improvement program on enabling critical infrastructure improvements that allow for compact growth consistent with local and regional plans. Infrastructure funds should be targeted for water, sewer, and transportation infrastructure to enable this growth in appropriate areas that lack adequate facilities (including those areas where

infrastructure exists but requires improvements, regardless of the level of new growth).

In conjunction with these recommendations, the Administration should seek to make coordinated and opportunistic investments where they can catalyze private sector investments in appropriate locations. For example, the revitalization of a targeted district within a Regional Urban Center could be catalyzed through coordinated investments of housing subsidies, historic rehabilitation tax credits, infrastructure financing (PWED), and parkland acquisition funds. This coordination might be facilitated by a state-level ombudsman charged with expediting grant review and contracting.

18.a EOEEA should modify Comm Cap to reflect differences in Community Types

18.b EOEEA should modify Comm Cap to recognize the consistency of local plans with local zoning and regional plans

18.c The state should target an expanded infrastructure improvement program

19) Adjust 40B regulations to promote both affordable housing production and plan consistency

The region can find ways to promote housing production, plan consistency, and natural resources protection through revisions to the regulations that implement the state's Comprehensive Permit law (MGL Chapter 40B). Any revisions must recognize two key principles: different types of growth are appropriate in different locations; and each municipality has a responsibility to make substantive progress toward expanding its affordable housing stock.

Housing developed through a comprehensive permit under MGL Chapter 40B has been a preeminent tool for the production of housing in Metro Boston, especially the production of affordable housing. However, comprehensive permit applications are not required to demonstrate consistency with Commonwealth's Sustainable Development Principles or regional land use plans. For example, MAPC found that only 12% of 40B projects approved from 2000 – 2006 are within ½ mile of an MBTA subway or commuter rail station. Continuation of these patterns may hamper efforts to focus growth near infrastructure and to preserve natural resources. Of equal concern, some communities cite 40B as a disincentive to comprehensive municipal planning, with the justification that high-quality planning provides no insulation from 40B developments.

There are currently three mechanisms through which municipalities have the authority to deny a Comprehensive Permit application:

- If 10% of the year-round housing stock is eligible to be included in the municipality's Subsidized Housing Inventory (SHI);
- If SHI-eligible housing occupies more than 1.5% of the municipality's land area; or
- If the municipality has a Housing Production Plan (HPP) approved by the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), and if DHCD certifies that annual production of SHI-eligible units meets a standard production target, equal to 0.5% of the year-round housing stock.

We believe that two modifications would help to make the 40B program and the resulting housing production more consistent with the Sustainable Development Principles and MetroFuture, and might encourage more municipalities to create comprehensive plans to address housing and other issues:

- Modify Housing Production Plan guidelines to require consistency with the Commonwealth's Sustainable Development Principles and the regional plan, in our case, MetroFuture; and
- Modify regulations to allow municipalities to deny 40B developments in designated natural resource protection areas, as long as they have developed a comprehensive plan, consistent with MetroFuture, which includes significant and viable districts and/or policies to encourage housing production, and as long as they have taken concrete steps to implement those plans.

It should also be noted that Strategy 8 (Access to Housing) also includes recommendations that relate to Housing Production Plans. Specifically, regulations might be modified to allow HPPs with annual production targets lower than 0.5% in low-density, slow-growing municipalities. That recommendation is distinct from, and complementary to, the suggestions here.

Housing Production Plan Consistency

Modifications to the Housing Production Plan guidelines are necessary to encourage housing production policies consistent with sustainable land use. Current HPP guidelines state that municipalities should “consider” the Commonwealth's Sustainable Development Principles when identifying “zoning districts or geographic areas in which the municipality proposes to modify current regulations for the purposes of creating SHI Eligible Housing.” As for specific sites where the municipality will encourage the filing of a comprehensive permit application, the guidelines are somewhat more definite, requiring that sites be consistent with the Sustainable Development Principles “to the greatest extent possible.”

However, HPP guidelines do not provide any specific criteria for determining such consistency. Nor does the review process provide for assessment of consistency by the regional planning agency, which is arguably in the best position to affirm that production districts and specific sites are consistent with the regional plan. As a result, there is no clear and consistent way to determine

whether recommended sites are appropriately sited with regard to natural resources, infrastructure, or neighboring municipalities, or whether they will provide residents of new development with adequate access to shops, services, and transportation. Furthermore, all SHI-eligible housing production counts toward the annual production target, regardless of whether it was developed in locations consistent with the HPP or the local land use plan.

MAPC and other regional planning agencies should work with DHCD, housing advocates, and the environmental community to develop Sustainable Development criteria for HPPs and to establish a review process that includes review and approval by the regional planning agency.

Resource Protection Denials

Modifications to 40B regulations are necessary to protect natural resource areas in any municipality that has a comprehensive plan for housing production, but which may not have met the annual production targets. Even with strong planning and community support, actual SHI-eligible production may lag behind the annual targets due to a slow housing market or financing woes that slow a particular development. As a result, municipalities that have 40R districts—complete with higher-density zoning and by-right permitting—may still find themselves without the capacity to prevent 40B developments in sensitive environmental areas. These uncertainties may discourage municipalities from investing in planning and production efforts.

In order to reduce uncertainty and reward proactive planning, the 40B regulations should establish a new class of “resource protection denials” whereby municipalities that meet certain criteria could deny comprehensive permits in designated natural resource protection areas, and have those denials upheld by the Housing Appeals Committee. This process would encourage municipalities to develop housing plans and designate locations for growth, while also providing for better protection of natural resources.

To be eligible, a municipality would have to develop a comprehensive plan to develop housing along with a reasonable list of areas needing protection from development. These plans should be determined by MAPC to be consistent with MetroFuture and the Commonwealth’s Sustainable Development Principles.

The comprehensive plan for housing production could be an HPP, a set of 40R districts, establishment of locations zoned for multi-family housing, or a combination of steps which, when taken together, would constitute a significant and viable effort to spur housing growth. Under any such plan, zoning should be in place to allow compact growth patterns and diverse housing types; should have sufficient capacity to accommodate 0.5% of the total year-round housing stock each year; and should incorporate mechanisms for prompt and predictable permitting. Criteria for natural resource districts would include specific environmental or historic values; and those districts would be limited to a percentage of the unprotected developable land in the municipality. (The percentage could be fixed or based on local conditions).

Municipalities meeting these criteria would be allowed to deny 40B applications in the natural resource protection districts only, even if they have failed to meet the 0.5% annual housing production target.

19.a MAPC and other regional planning agencies should work with DHCD, housing advocates, and the environmental community to develop Sustainable Development criteria for HPP and to establish a review process that includes review and approval by the regional planning agency

19.b MAPC and regional planning agencies should work with DHCD, housing advocates and the environmental community to develop a proposal for “Resource Protection Denials.”

20) Revise MWRA expansion policies to promote sustainable growth

MetroFuture recommends directing relatively more population and employment growth in the MWRA service area than might occur if Current Trends continue. It also recommends continued improvements in water conservation (MWRA water demand has declined over recent decades, even as population has increased), so that estimated 2030 MWRA water demand is lower than would occur if Current Trends continue.

Many of the region’s Maturing Suburbs outside of the MWRA service area would also see higher population growth; with increases in water conservation efforts, these municipalities might be able to accommodate the additional growth within the constraints of their existing Water Management Act permits. However, the physical availability of water, the cost of infrastructure upgrades, or the environmental impact of water withdrawals may cause more municipalities to seek new connections to the MWRA.

Under the right set of criteria, some targeted and judicious expansion of the MWRA could provide benefits to communities, the region, and the Commonwealth as a whole. If, on the other hand, expansion of the system is allowed to go forward indiscriminately to support development inconsistent with regional and local plans, MetroFuture’s efforts to promote smart growth and minimize sprawl could be undermined.

MAPC recommends that any expansion of the MWRA water or wastewater system occur under strict conditions that address land use, water conservation, and environmental concerns. Municipalities seeking to connect to the system should commit to take measures that will reduce water demand and preserve the capacity of the expanded infrastructure. Such commitments might include:

- land use plans and zoning consistent with the regional plan;
- establishment of service area boundaries and connection moratoria outside of designated growth areas;

- implementation of low impact development and water reuse as a condition for local permits;
- application of state of the art pricing, billing, regulatory, and educational mechanisms to conserve water and manage peak demand; and
- efforts to maximize recharge of existing aquifers.

With such conditions in place, there might be circumstances in which expansion of the system might provide significant benefits, by reducing the demand on overtaxed local water resources while minimizing impacts on MWRA source watersheds. In these circumstances, where critical environmental need is combined with strong municipal commitment to conservation and smart growth, the expansion of the system might be facilitated by subsidizing the “cost of entry” to the system.

One possible approach to evaluating these issues would be to establish a Special Procedure, which under the MEPA regulations would allow for a broad review of potential system expansion issues, and a streamlined review of individual communities that come in meeting pre-defined criteria. These criteria would assess the likelihood that introducing MWRA water would trigger unsustainable development in the given applicant municipality.

20.a MAPC should work with the MWRA, EOEEA, and other stakeholder groups to revise MWRA expansion policies

21) Modify MEPA reviews to encourage sustainable development

Just as our current system of land use regulation allows case-by-case decision to yield negative results in total, so too does the current Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) environmental impact reviews of certain projects requiring state agency action. Current reviews are limited to an individual project even if others are underway or planned nearby. This creates a situation in which cumulative impacts are underestimated, where the last developer in will more likely have the greatest apparent impact and the fewest mitigation options, and where municipalities adjacent to the host community experience impacts that cannot be addressed. Instead, the MEPA Office should take advantage of proximate projects to designate areas of critical planning concern and coordinate a multi-developer and multi-municipality impact review process in which cumulative impacts can be examined and mitigated more effectively and equitably.

Consistent comprehensive local plans also provide opportunity for a streamlined MEPA permitting process where the proposed project(s) are also consistent. Impact analysis would have been conducted during the planning process, essentially completing part of the MEPA process in advance and providing for faster permitting that does not compromise thorough evaluation. This would also inherently consider cumulative and multi-parcel impacts, and set the stage for a system of impact fees, offering more predictability and equity to developers.

22) Align school building assistance priorities with sustainable development patterns

The Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) must make its investments as cost effective as possible, due at least in part to its limited resources, the relative expense of school construction, and the relative infrequency with which the authority can revisit a previous decision. It is already expected to advance cost effectiveness by encouraging renovation and smart growth locations over new construction and locations that are more distant and therefore more expensive to serve.

The MSBA should further enhance the cost effectiveness of its investments by placing its decision making within the context of consistent local and regional plans. School enrollment projections should be consistent with the population targets that form the basis for a MetroFuture-consistent comprehensive plan. This also provides for greater municipal confidence that it has sufficient capacity for the anticipated school age population.

22.a MAPC and the Massachusetts Smart Growth Alliance should evaluate the MSBA's criteria for renovation, smart growth, and related criteria and make necessary recommendations

23) Incorporate sustainable growth projections in Water Management Act permitting

Population projections used for Water Management Act permitting should be consistent with Sustainable Development Principles and environmental capacity. State agencies responsible for preparing water demand forecasts should use MetroFuture projections for estimating future water demand, rather than using Current Trend projections.

23.a The Department of Conservation and Recreation should use MetroFuture projections for water needs forecasting

E. Foster private sector demand for sustainable development

The private sector will be ultimately responsible for much of the development that occurs in Metro Boston over the coming decades. Individuals and corporations can contribute to a more sustainable future through their decisions about where and how to build, and they need information and education that will support regionally-minded decisions. MAPC, other public agencies, and advocacy organizations can foster private sector demand for sustainable development by providing more information about the benefits of smart growth locations. Networking, corporate recognition, and social marketing campaigns would also help to increase familiarity with MetroFuture and its relevance to the broader rubric of sustainability.

24) Disseminate information regarding the economic and environmental costs of development alternatives

The private sector needs more useful and accessible information on the benefits and costs of different locations and types of development. This is a particular need for the residents and small business owners who do not otherwise have

access to such data. People and businesses periodically decide to relocate for a variety of reasons and with a variety of needs in mind. The search for a new location requires weighing different options in the absence of good, let alone complete, information. Factors that might lead to selection of a location and building type advocated by MetroFuture, such as commute time and cost, building energy costs, and nearby amenities such as grocery stores and nature trails, are often important but secondary considerations. They can fall by the wayside as energy and focus are consumed by factors, such as building cost and school quality, that are both more prominent and which are better addressed by more readily available indicators (such as asking price and MCAS scores).

An easy to use and readily accessed way to obtain clear and comparable information on such factors would help location decision makers, whether a prospective homeowner, renter, or business owner, choose among locations that may otherwise appear equivalent. This should lead more people to choose the kinds of locations and building types advocated by MetroFuture more often, since they are more likely to rise to the top when evaluated by these key secondary metrics.

24.a MAPC and allied organizations should develop a model that quantifies the “jobshed” for housing locations

24.b MAPC and allied organizations should develop a model that quantifies the “employeehed” for economic development locations

24.c MAPC and allied organizations organizations should create a walkability score for different locations and types of development

24.d MAPC and MassGIS should develop a model to estimate transportation-related GHG emissions of alternative locations

25) Foster corporate engagement through sustainability-oriented networking and recognition programs

Many developers are already champions of smart growth, building innovative projects and fueling a trend in which “smart growth” is becoming a marketing label (that is sometimes misapplied). Their interests could naturally align with MetroFuture’s goals, creating the opportunity for mutual-beneficial education, network building, and advocacy.

A recognition and investor relations program based on voluntary corporate reporting of smart growth / regional indicators could also help increase business decision making that is consistent with MetroFuture. The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) has shown that corporations will respond to investor and customer demand for sustainable practices via a voluntary reporting mechanism. Improvements in practices result, as investors compare the performance of different options and top performers receive recognition. MAPC should work with appropriate partners, such as GRI and/or locally-based affiliates, to develop and/or use existing GRI indicators in a reporting and recognition program

focused on encouraging and measuring performance related to MetroFuture's goals.

25.a MAPC and the Massachusetts Smart Growth Alliance should develop a MetroFuture reporting and recognition program

26) Pursue education and marketing to promote “regional-mindedness”

Beyond information and incentives intended for the “rational actor” making locational decisions, programs are also needed to address negative perceptions and myths about MetroFuture-consistent locations and increase their attractiveness

Ongoing dialogue among people, organizations, and businesses from different parts of the region and different backgrounds, was used to demonstrable effect through the development of MetroFuture. As with those events, implementation-oriented regional dialogue would recruit and intentionally mix a cross-section of people in discussion that fosters a greater understanding of each other, unexpected commonalities, and shared challenges and opportunities. Doing so while focusing on questions and needs related to MetroFuture implementation would provide a meaningful reason to participate while advancing MetroFuture's goals and objectives.

Conceptualized by Philip Kotler and Gerald Zaltman in the 1970s, social marketing differs from other areas of marketing only with respect to the objectives of the marketer and his or her organization. Social marketing seeks to influence social behaviors not to benefit the marketer, but to benefit the target audience and the general society. A social marketing campaign would build a sense that smart growth and sustainability are “hip,” and that a MetroFuture-consistent location is “the place to be.”

26.a MAPC should develop a program of implementation-oriented regional dialogue

26.b MAPC and allied organizations should create a social marketing campaign to promote MetroFuture-consistent decisions by individuals