Subdivision Staging Policy

Alternative Ways Ahead

February 25, 2016

Dan Wilhelm

Subdivision Station Policy (SSP)
Ways Ahead: Three Alternatives

- Status Quo
- Refined Status Quo
  - LATR, continue use of CLV and transition to updated person generation tables. Add pedestrian and bike tests. Include assurance that NADMS requirements satisfied. Use improved measures/metrics.
  - TPAR
  - Impact Taxes
- Hybrid (Mitigation Payment)
  - Four categories linked to premium transit (Metrorail, Purple, CCT and BRT)
    - Process different for each category
  - Improves focus on transit, pedestrian and bike infrastructure
    - In-fill and redevelopment is major focus, not green field
  - Mitigation payment combines LATR, TPAR and Impact Tax
  - Improves path to implement transportation infrastructure
  - Eliminates TPAR for regulatory purposes, use tools to decide implementation (what/when)
    - Why impact tax revenues so low when rates are high (1.1M sq ft if 2015 was all office)
    - Viva White Oak impact tax example: $144M (60% exempt), 2015 County-wide: $15M
    - Impact tax provides credit for developer projects/payments that provide capacity (LATR & TPAR)

Hybrid (Mitigation Payment) Alternative Service Categories

- Link requirements to the 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

  1. <u>Operational</u> premium transit

  2. <u>Emerging</u> premium transit: under construction, designed but construction not funded, or design studies underway

  3. <u>Planned p</u>remium transit: in transit master plan but design studies not funded

  4. <u>No</u> premium transit: limited or no local 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
  - In master plan; development community decides when built
  - TOD development not necessarily throughout each planning area
    - For Example: White Oak has three TOD centers, but no TOD elsewhere

Service Categories
(Master Plans)

1. Operational Premium Transit
- Bethesda CBD
- Forest Glen
- Friendship Heights
- Rockville Town Center
- Glenmont
- Grosvenor
- Shady Grove
- Silver Spring CBD
- Twinbrook
- White Flint
- Wheaton CBD

2. Emerging Premium Transit
- Bethesda/Chevy Chase (3)
- Clarksburg Town Center (2,3)
- Burtonsville Crossing (3)
- Chevy Chase Lake (1)
- Fairland (3)
- Four Corners (3)
- Gaithersburg (3)
- Germantown West & East (2, 3)
- Great Seneca Science Ctr (2)
- Montgomery Village (3)
- Long Branch (1)
- Rockville (3)
- East Silver Spring (1)
- North Silver Spring (3)
- Takoma Langley (1)
- White Oak Science Gateway (3)

3. Planned Premium Transit
- Aspen Hill
- Colesville
- Kemp Mill
- Kensington -Wheaton
- North Bethesda
- Olney

4. Local Transit
- Boyds
- Clarksburg
- Cloverly
- Damascus
- Derwood
- Kensington
- Lytonsville
- Airpark
- Potomac
- North Potomac
- Rural East
- Rural West
- Sandy Spring/Ashton
- Washington Grove
- West Silver Spring
- Westbard

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 Teansit with TOD	Limited Transit withTraditonal 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	Operational 1. At centers 2. Connections to other centers	In design , awaiting construction funding or under construction 1. Premium Centers 2. Connections to other centers	In Transit Master Plan, design studies not yet started	None
-- Local	Should exist; if not then plan, fund and implement 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. Mitgation 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. Mitgation 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

- Payment solves four issues with existing LATR, TPAR, and Impact Tax process
  - Simplifies existing process by moving to single payment
  - Treats all development projects equally (currently later development often pays more)
  - Adds NADMS provisions into the process
  - Optimizes designs for area needs, not project needs
- Two basic payment structures possible
  - Set by planning area based upon pro-rata cost of infrastructure
    - Requires substantial analysis, design and costing as part of 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 mode into single number
- Typically County would make improvement but could have developer make
  - 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 address all transportation modes
  - Limited Transit Category: unchanged
- Regulatory - transportation review
  - No TPAR
  - Premium service categories
    - 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: local unchanged
- Provision of infrastructure
  - Substantially increased focus for premium service categories, with emphasis on emerging category
  - Develop plan of <u>what</u> infrastructure should be built and <u>when</u>
    - Based upon development approvals and metrics
    - Developed annually with MCDOT
    - MCDOT operates transit and implements other projects so joint agreement necessary
  - Use collected mitigation funds with supplemental public funding for county efforts
    - Major projects often state funding responsibility
    - Several catchall CIP items that would use mitigation funds
    - Update projects within catchall CIP items annually when construction needed - council approves
  - Where needed for development, can have developer build

Alternative SSP Strategies Summary

Test	Mode	Status Quo	Refine Status Quo	Hybrid (Mitigation Payment)
Local	Roads	Trip generation table; CLV test with different levels of acceptability	Change to person generation table & updated values; include NADMS; improved measures	1. Large: varies by transit service category. Either existing process or collect data; use refined status alternative update 2. small: no data collection
Local	Transit	none	Needs to fit into network. Transit stops integrated into development plan	Needs to fit into network. Transit stops integrated into development plan
Local	Pedestrian	none	Include on-site. To large extent needs to fit into network	1. Large: include on-site plan and data for off-site 2. small: none
Local	Bike	none	Include on-site. To large extent needs to fit into network per Bike Master Plan	1. Large: include on-site plan and data for off-site 2. small: none
Planning Area	all	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