



MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

March 19, 2008

MEMORANDUM

MCPB
Item #
3-27-2008

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board

FROM: Karl Moritz, Chief *KMM*
Research and Technology Division

Dan Hardy, Acting Transportation Planning Chief *DKH*
Countywide Planning Division

SUBJECT: Growth Policy Studies Update

This memorandum provides a status report on the Growth Policy studies underway per County Council direction. The key discussion item for the Planning Board on March 27 is our proposed process for staff coordination, public outreach, and Planning Board review for those studies due to the County Council by August 1, 2008 (studies F3 through F8).

Resolution 16-376 specifies twelve separate studies as included in Attachment A. We have established an interagency technical team with the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPWT) and County Council staff. The following five studies have Planning Board recommendations due to the County Council by August 1:

- F3: Alternatives to PAMR
- F4: Non-Auto Facilities
- F5: Development Activity Status Report
- F6: Design of Public Facilities
- F7: Transportation-Housing Affordability Index
- F8: Public Agency Signoff

Proposed Study Process and Outreach Strategy

The Design of Public Facilities study (F6) features the seminar series led by Roger Lewis and John Carter. This study has an independent public outreach process.

For the remaining studies in the series above, staff proposes the following public outreach process to meet the August 1 due date:

- Interagency coordination at the staff level to develop initial recommendations by the end of May. Staff will provide status reports similar to this one to the Board in April and May. Minutes of interagency coordination meetings will be posted on our Growth Policy website.
- Public outreach in early June, with one evening public meeting and one Saturday public meeting proposed
- Planning Board worksessions in July

Progress to date

F3 – Alternatives to PAMR: At a February 25 meeting interagency staff agreed on a list of Alternatives to PAMR to consider in study F3:

- A version of the Proportional Staging concept described in the May 21, 2007 Board report that considers correction factors of some sort to account for the fact that master plan buildout is a continuously evolving definition (the “fatal flaw” in our 2007 review)
- PAMR with a more intuitive and disaggregated evaluation of Relative Transit Mobility
- PAMR with no calculated Relative Transit Mobility (but with Relative Arterial Mobility standards defined by groups of policy areas using some other mechanism)
- Regional Accessibility Indices (i.e., number of jobs/housing units accessible in fixed time budgets from each policy area), with standards defined by policy area using a mechanism yet to be defined, and
- Mandatory Trip Reduction in lieu of PAMR (and perhaps LATR)

F4 – Non-Auto Facilities: We are beginning a literature review to examine logical vehicle-trip equivalencies for non-auto facilities in the LATR and PAMR Guidelines based on:

- the comparable capital cost to mitigate trips using auto-oriented techniques such as turn lanes,
- the estimated benefits in terms of estimated vehicle trip reduction, and
- information on what credits other jurisdictions allow.

We will also consider additional types of facilities to be added to the list. Candidate facilities include:

- Park trails
- On-road bicycle lanes
- Transit “queue jumper”
- Full transitway/busway construction

F6 – Design of Public Facilities: The first public meeting in the design seminar series was held March 12.

For delivery to the Council on or before February 1, 2008:

- **F1 Enhanced Intersection Data Collection:** The Planning Board must include in its recommended FY2009 budget a request for additional funds to expand its database of current traffic counts to allow a more comprehensive analysis of congestion conditions and verify developer-provided traffic counts.

For delivery to the Council on or before July 1, 2008:

- **F2 Impact tax implementing regulations** The Executive must submit revised implementing regulations for the transportation and school impact taxes to the Council under Method (2).

For delivery to the Council on or before August 1, 2008:

- **F3 Alternatives to PAMR:** The Planning Board, with the aid of the Executive, must evaluate alternatives to Policy Area Mobility Review (PAMR) as a policy area level transportation test. As part of this study, the Planning Board must evaluate alternative methods to calculate the key components of PAMR, relative arterial mobility and relative transit mobility, and options to replace PAMR and LATR in Metro station policy areas with a broad requirement for trip mitigation from new development.
- **F4: Guidelines for Non-Auto Facilities:** The Planning Board, with the aid of the Executive, must evaluate its guidelines for trip credits for non-automobile facilities, including the text and chart that appears on pages 26-29 of its *Local Area Transportation Review Guidelines*. In reviewing these credits and acceptable facilities, the Board must consider factors such as the likelihood of the action reducing peak hour auto trips and the approximate construction costs of each action, to allow some equivalency between actions. The Board must also evaluate its procedures to monitor the construction of facilities for which credits are given. The Board must submit any revisions of these trip credit guidelines to the Council for its review
- **F5 Development Activity Status Report:** The Planning Board must prepare a status report of development activity that has occurred since this Growth Policy took effect. The Board must report, to the extent that it is able, on the effect of Growth Policy and impact tax changes on development activity in Clarksburg relative to nearby areas inside and outside the County.
- **F6 Design of Public Facilities:** The Planning Board, with the aid of the Executive, must convene a "design summit" of public agencies involved in the design and development of public facilities and the review of private land development to develop a consensus and commitment to design excellence as a core value in all public and private projects and focus on how to improve design of public facilities and private development through various means, including better coordination among agencies.
- **F7 Transportation-Housing Affordability Index:** The Planning Board must conduct the necessary research and analysis to develop a transportation-housing affordability index for the County. The Board must develop the index as part of its FY08 work on a *Housing Policy Element of the General Plan* unless it concludes that the index is better developed as part of **F9 Sustainable Quality of Life Indicators**.
- **F8 Public agency signoff:** The Planning Board, after consulting Executive staff, must evaluate and submit a recommendation to the Council for any necessary changes to current law or policy

regarding the point or points in the development process when an agreement between an applicant and a public agency is required for an additional facility or program which would be a condition of development approval.

For delivery to the Council on or before October 1, 2008:

- **F9 Impact Tax Issues:** The County Executive, with the aid of the Planning Board and the Board of Education, must address impact tax issues noted in the long-term infrastructure financing recommendations in the Planning Board's *2007-2009 Growth Policy*, including further refinement of land use categories and consideration of charging impact taxes for additional public facilities or purposes or charging "linkage" fees to non-residential development for affordable housing. The Executive and the interagency working group must review credits granted under the impact tax and develop recommendations to retain, modify, or repeal the law's credit provisions.
- **F10 Sustainability Quality of Life Indicators Program:** The Planning Board, with the aid of the Executive and with broad public participation, must develop a set of sustainable quality of life indicators, addressing issues of environment, social equity, and economy. These indicators must be suitable to guide land use and other public policy decision-making, including capital programming and design of public facilities. An initial set of tracking indicators must be prepared in time to inform the 2009-2011 Growth Policy review.

To be included in the 2009-2011 Growth Policy:

- **F11 Biennial Growth Policy Report:** In accordance with County Code §33A-15, the Planning Board must submit its recommended Growth Policy to the County Council by June 1 of each odd-numbered year. Beginning in 2009, this biennial growth policy must include: an analysis of current and future pace and pattern of growth in the County and the factors affecting demand for public facilities in established communities; an update on the County's success in meeting a set of indicators as developed under F10; an implementation status report for each master plan and sector plan, including a review of how planned development is proceeding and whether the public actions/facilities in the plan are occurring in a timely way; the contents of the biennial Highway Mobility Report; and a comprehensive list of priority facilities that are recommended for addition to the Capital Improvements Program. The report may also recommend other public actions needed to achieve master plan objectives or improve the County's performance on its adopted indicators. The Board must also include recommendations for changing policy area boundaries to be consistent with adopted master plans or sector plans or changes to municipal boundaries.
- **F12 Special Studies:** The Planning Board must prepare the following studies to be included in the 2009-2011 Growth Policy:
 - **F12a:** With the aid of the Executive, a comprehensive parking management study, which must include recommendations to improve the use of parking as a travel demand management tool, particularly in Metro station policy areas.
 - **F12b:** With the aid of the Executive, a study of options to revise the local area transportation tests, including using proximity to various levels of transit service and pedestrian connectivity as a basis for mitigation requirements; developing a multi-modal quality of service requirement to provide a more seamless integration of pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and auto modes; considering feasible revisions of or alternatives to the

Critical Lane Volume method to measure intersection congestion; the duration of Transportation Mitigation Agreements; and identifying more pedestrian and transit-oriented urban areas, in addition to Metro Station Policy Areas, which may be eligible for different standards. The Planning Board must convene a technical working group, consisting of staff from the Planning Commission, the Department of Public Works and Transportation, the State Highway Administration, transportation consultants, and interest groups such as the Action Committee for Transit and Coalition for Smart Growth, to work with an independent consultant to consider and test various proposals and practices in other jurisdictions and recommend appropriate changes in approaches, standards, and measures used in the Growth Policy.

- **F12c:** A study of options to increase efficiency in allocating development capacity, including trading capacity among private developers.
- **F12d:** A study of the County's job-housing balance, including implications for housing affordability and traffic congestion.

This is a correct copy of Council action.



Linda M. Lauer, Clerk of the Council