



Subdivision Staging Policy – Draft Transportation Recommendations Related to Work of the Transportation Impact Study Technical Working Group

- EG Eric Graye, Supervisor, Functional Planning & Policy Division, eric.graye@montgomeryplanning.org, 301-495-4632
- PD Pamela Dunn, Chief, Functional Planning & Policy Division, pamela.dunn@montgomeryplanning.org, 301.605-5649
- Tom Autrey, Supervisor, Functional Planning & Policy Division, thomas.autrey@montgomeryplanning.org, 301-495-4533

Completed: 2/18/16

Description

A key element of the 2016 Subdivision Staging Policy (SSP) is the update and refinement of the Local Area Transportation Review (LATR) procedures used in support of subdivision regulation. Related to this effort, the Transportation Impact Study Technical Working Group (TISTWG) has been assembled to review the current LATR process and identify new transportation system performance metrics and regulatory procedures for consideration.

Today’s roundtable is a continuation of the Planning Board discussion held on July 9, 2015 regarding the **initial** LATR-related recommendations of the TISTWG. That discussion primarily focused on two topics on which the TISTWG has spent considerable effort:

- The development of additional “pro-rata share” districts (such as exists in White Flint and is under development in White Oak) wherein LATR and Transportation Policy Area Review (TPAR) would be replaced by a district-wide payment system, and
- The consideration of the Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) metric as an element within the LATR process.

Based on guidance received from the Planning Board, the TISTWG has continued to pursue these initiatives.

Today’s roundtable will focus on a discussion of a **refined** set of draft LATR-related recommendations developed by the TISTWG in support of the update of the *2013 LATR/TPAR Guidelines* and *2012 Subdivision Staging Policy*.

In addition, the Planning Board will be briefed on initial feedback received from the TISTWG regarding the Board’s recent discussions concerning new SSP frameworks for transportation adequacy testing. One example of this feedback is a **draft** concept developed by TISTWG member Dan Wilhelm that would link transportation mitigation requirements to the level of “premium” transit service which is planned or

implemented by policy area. This concept is described in the PowerPoint presentation provided as an attachment to this report.

Attachment: PowerPoint entitled “Subdivision Staging Policy: Alternative Ways Ahead”, February 8, 2016 Draft

EG/ PD/TA/aj

Subdivision Staging Policy

Alternative Ways Ahead

Feb 8, 2016 Draft

Subdivision Station Policy (SSP)

Ways Ahead: Three Alternatives

- Status Quo
- Refined Status Quo
 - LATR, continue use of CLV with updated data and transition to person generation tables. add pedestrian and bike tests; include assurance that NADMS requirements satisfied
 - TPAR
 - Impact Taxes
- Mitigation Payment
 - Four categories linked to premium transit (Metrorail, Purple, CCT and BRT)
 - Mitigation payment combines LATR, TPAR and Impact Tax
 - Provides better path to implement master plan identified transportation infrastructure
 - Improved focus on transit, pedestrian and bike infrastructure
 - Focus staff resources on large projects
 - Today small projects proceed thru LATR/TPAR process but generally no implementation action required
 - Manpower resources focused where needed

Alternative SSP Strategies

Test	Mode	Status Quo	Refine Status Quo	Mitigation Payment for many developments
LATR	Roads	Trip generation table; CLV test with different levels of acceptability	Change to person generation table & updated values; include NADMS	1. Large: varies by transit service category. Either existing process or collect data; use refined status alternative update 2. small: no data collection
LATR	Transit	none	none	none
LATR	Pedestrian	none	include on-site	1. Large: include on-site plan and data for off-site 2. small: none
LATR	Bike	none	include on-site	1. Large: include on-site plan and data for off-site 2. small: none
TPAR	Roads	Planning Dept Effort	Planning Dept Effort	1. Eliminate TPAR 2. Planning Dept focus on what and when infrastructure needed (with MCDOT); 3. Use metrics and modeling
TPAR	Transit	Planning Dept Effort	Planning Dept Effort	1. Eliminate TPAR 2. Planning Dept focus on what and when infrastructure (with MCDOT); 3. Use revised metrics
TPAR	Pedestrian	Planning Dept Effort	Planning Dept Effort	1. Eliminate TPAR 2. Planning Dept focus on what and when infrastructure needed bto interconnect projects (with MCDOT) 3. Use revised metrics
TPAR	Bike	Planning Dept Effort	Planning Dept Effort	1. Eliminate TPAR 2. Planning Dept focus on what and when infrastructure needed based upon bike master plan (with MCDOT); 3. Use revised metrics

Mitigation Payment Alternative Service Categories

- SSP requirements linked to degree to which premium transit planned and implemented for each Policy Area
 - Premium transit = Metrorail, Purple, CCT and BRT
 - Local Transit = Metrobus and Ride On
- Four categories
 - Premium transit operation
 - Premium transit under construction, planned but not funded, or design studies underway
 - Premium transit in transit master plan but design studies not funded
 - No premium transit
- Local bus, pedestrian and bike provided to complement premium transit
 - Limited or no local bus in non-premium transit planning areas
 - Limited pedestrian movement in non-premium areas
- TOD development around premium transit stations
 - TOD development not necessarily planned throughout each planning area

Service Categories (Planning Areas)

Operational Premium Transit

- Bethesda CBD
- Friendship Heights
- Rockville Town Center
- Glenmont
- Grosvenor
- Shady Grove
- Silver Spring CBD
- Takoma
- Twinbrook
- White Flint
- Wheaton CBD

Emerging Premium Transit

- Bethesda/Chevy Chase (1, 3)
- Burtonsville Crossing (3)
- Clarksburg (2, 3)
- Chevy Chase Lake (1)
- Colesville (3)
- Fairland (3)
- Four Corners (3)
- Gaithersburg (3)
- Germantown West & East (3)
- Montgomery Village (3)
- Long Branch (1)
- North Bethesda
- Rockville (3)
- R&D Village
- Silver Spring (1, 3)
- Takoma Langley (1, 3)
- Westbard
- White Oak Science Gateway (3)

Planned Premium Transit

- Aspen Hill
- Kemp Mill
- Kensington -Wheaton
- North Bethesda
- Olney

Local Transit and Traditional Development

- Boyds
- Cloverly
- Damascus
- Derwood
- MV/Airpark
- Potomac
- North Potomac
- Rural East
- Rural West
- Washington Grove

Premium Transit= MetroRail, Purple Line (1), CCT (2), or BRT (3)

Local Transit = MetroBus and Ride On

Four Service Categories

Element	Operational Premium Transit with TOD	Emerging Premium Transit with TOD	Planned Premium Transit with TOD	Limited Transit with Traditional Development
- Roads	1. Mitigation payment (large and small); used regionally 2. Few if any new infrastructure within planning area	1. Mitigation payment (both large and small) 2. Infrastructure as needed to support area around centers	1. Large projects: developer provides infrastructure but must be in keeping with premium transit concept 2. Small projects: Mitigation payment	1. Large projects: developer provided infrastructure to match development as currently 2. Small projects: Mitigation payment
- Transit	Mitigation payment	Mitigation payment	Mitigation payment	Mitigation payment
-- Premium	<u>Operational</u> 1. At centers 2. Connections to other centers	<u>In design , awaiting construction funding or under construction</u> 1. Premium Centers 2. Connections to other centers	<u>In Transit Master Plan, design studies not yet started</u>	None
-- Local	<u>Should exist; if not then plan, fund and implement</u> 1. Circulator buses 2. Connects to Centers	1. Planned during premium design 2. Funding and implementation at end of premium construction	1. Connects to premium centers 2. Connects to non-premium planning areas	1. Connects to premium centers 2. Connects to non-premium planning areas
- Pedestrian	1. TMD Should exist for TOD centers. Payment into TMD; if no TMD then make payment 2. Developer provides on site 3. If off-site doesn't exist, county to plan and implement	1. Mitigation payment 2. Developer provides on site 3. County provides remainder as needed to complete	1. Large projects: developer provides on site 2. Small projects: mitigation payment	1. Large projects: developer provides on site 2. Small: none
- Bike	1. Payment into TMD if it exists, otherwise mitigation payment 2. Developer provides on site 3. If off-site doesn't exist, county to plan and implement	1. Mitigation payment 2. Developer provides on site 3. County provides remainder as needed to complete	1. Large projects: developer provides on site 2. small projects: mitigation payment	1. Large projects: developer provides on site 2. small projects: mitigation payment

Mitigation Payments

- Mitigation plan solves four issues with existing LATR, TPAR, and Impact Tax procedure
 - Simplifies existing process by moving to single payment
 - Treats all development projects equally (currently later development would pay more than earlier development)
 - Adds NADMS provisions into the process
 - Designs optimized for area needs, not project needs
- Two basic structures possible
 - Set by planning area based upon pro-rata cost of infrastructure
 - Requires substantial analysis, design and costing as part master plan development or after approved
 - Development project needs may be different than envisioned
 - Updating cost could be labor intensive
 - County-wide fixed rate by service category and project size
 - Payment set independent of master plan and can be updated periodically
 - Developer knows cost up front
 - Analysis, design and costing can wait until significant amount of development approved
 - Better able to match infrastructure design to need
 - Combine payment by element into single number
- County could have developer rather than county make improvements
 - Makes sense if needed near-term to support development

Planning Department Focus Changed

- Master Plan
 - Premium Service Categories: more on TOD development at centers and all transportation modes
 - Limited Transit Category: unchanged
- Regulatory - transportation review
 - Premium service categories
 - No TPAR
 - Large Projects: focus on ensuring NADMS and getting data; still concerned about integration of project with surrounding area
 - Small projects: no effort
 - Limited Transit Category: unchanged
- Provision of infrastructure
 - Substantial increase for premium service categories
 - Develop plan of what infrastructure should be built and when
 - Developed annually with MCDOT
 - Based upon development approvals and metrics
 - MCDOT operator of transit so joint agreement mandatory
 - Use collected mitigation funds with supplemental public funding
 - Major projects often state (in some cases county) funding responsibility
 - Several catchall CIP items that would use mitigation funds
 - Update projects within catchall CIP items annually when construction needed and submit for council approval
 - Where needed for development, can have developer build