

Subdivision Staging Policy Component	2012-16 SSP	Adopted 2016-20 SSP	Explanation
<b>Transportation Policy Areas</b>			
Policy Area Categories	Categorized into groups (urban, suburban and rural) based on the relative availability of Metrorail, Commuter Rail and local bus service.	Categorized into groups based on current land use patterns, prevalence of modes of travel other than single occupant vehicle and the planning vision for different parts of the County.	How trips are made varies by density, land use diversity, distance to regional core, and the travel options available.
New Policy Areas		Clarksburg Town Center (Orange) Burtonsville Town Center (Orange) Long Branch (Orange) Takoma/Langley (Orange) Chevy Chase Lake (Orange) Germantown Town Center – expanded (Orange)	Current plans in these areas envision either a transition to more intense land use as a maturing activity center supported in some cases by funded infrastructure improvements (e.g., the Purple Line).
<b>Policy Area Review Test</b>			
TPAR Roadway Adequacy	Based on roadway Level of Service Congestion Standards.	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Policy Area Test was eliminated altogether.</b> In lieu of TPAR, transportation impact tax rates were increased at a level to compensate for revenue estimated to be generated by the TPAR surcharge.
TPAR Transit Adequacy	Based on current Ride-On and Metro Bus operations (coverage, headway, span of service).	<b>N/A</b>	See comment above.

Subdivision Staging Policy Component	2012-16 SSP	Adopted 2016-20 SSP	Explanation
Mitigation	Payment required for roadway and transit inadequacy equal to 25% of impact tax.	N/A	See comment above.
Exemptions	Rural East and Rural West exempt from the Roadway Test; Metro Station Policy Areas (MSPAs) exempt from the Transit Test.	N/A	See comment above.
<b>Local Area Review Test</b>			
Scoping Threshold	30 Weekday Peak Hour Vehicle Trips.	<p>Red and Orange Policy Areas: 50 Weekday Peak Hour Person Trips</p> <p>Yellow and Green Policy Areas: 50 Weekday Peak Hour Person Trips and existing Critical Lane Volume (CLV) above 1350 CLV</p> <p>The 2016-2020 SSP includes updated and/or new trip generation rates for Vehicle Trips (expressed as a percentage adjustment to the Institute of Transportation Engineer (ITE) Manual rates) and default values for Transit and Non-Motorized Mode Share (bike, walking, etc.) by policy area.</p> <p>50 Vehicle, Pedestrian or Transit Trips requires a pedestrian (and bike, if site is proximate to bicycle trip generator) or transit study, respectively.</p>	Person Trips reflect a multimodal approach to impacts mitigation and facilitate TDM planning.

Subdivision Staging Policy Component	2012-16 SSP	Adopted 2016-20 SSP	Explanation
Type of Analysis	Vehicle: Critical Lane Volume (CLV), supplemented by Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) if CLV > 1600	<p>Vehicle: Operational analysis (based on HCM/vehicle delay) required per the screening thresholds noted above.</p> <p>Network analysis required if, in addition to the thresholds above, total future CLV is greater than 1600 CLV <b>or</b> is greater than 1450 CLV, future CLV increases by more than 10, <b>and</b> intersection is deemed congested per local/regional agency traffic congestion monitoring reports, <b>or</b> intersection spacing is less than 600'.</p>	<p>Considerable opposition to use of CLV alone as metric for intersection vehicle level of service. HCM thought to be more representative of level of service experienced by driver and passengers.</p> <p>HCM analysis for isolated intersections in some instances may not be representative of current or forecast conditions and therefore a more robust network analysis is needed.</p>
		<p>Transit: Peak Load of bus routes within 1000' of site boundary or nearest transfer point if slightly further, during peak hour.</p>	<p>Level of Service for non-auto modes needs to be evaluated and achieve LOS D (or made no worse) as result of development.</p>
		<p>Pedestrian: Pedestrian Crosswalk Delay</p>	<p>Achieve LOS D or better</p>
		<p>Bike: Condition of Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) 2 within 750' of site boundary.</p>	<p>Achieve site connection to low stress network</p>

Subdivision Staging Policy Component	2012-16 SSP	Adopted 2016-20 SSP	Explanation
Adequacy/mitigation	Future Critical Lane Volume (CLV) exceeds the policy area standard. Mitigation needs to improve CLV by 150% of impact.	Vehicle: Mitigation required if future vehicle traffic congestion exceeds the applicable average vehicle delay policy area standard for any analyzed intersections requiring study. Trips associated with a delay more than the standard or background (for intersections currently operating above the standard) must be mitigated.	Better approximation of conditions experienced by travelers. Operational analysis facilitates more multimodal analysis and operational solutions as contrasted to capacity solutions.
		Transit: Peak Load is a least Level of Service (LOS) D (less than 1.25 transit riders per seat during the peak period) at bus stops within 1,000 feet of the site, if not, applicant must fund improvements that would mitigate the trips exceeding the standard applicable to the development.	Project should participate in transit improvements necessary to maintain reasonable level of service and access via transit.
		Pedestrian: Ensure a minimum level of service (LOS D) for pedestrian delay; for intersections operating below LOS D, ensure no increase in pedestrian crossing time; fix or fund ADA non-compliance within 500' radius of site boundary.	Project increases exposure to safety concerns as defined by ADA. Project should participate in pedestrian access improvements to maintain reasonable level of access on foot.

Subdivision Staging Policy Component	2012-16 SSP	Adopted 2016-20 SSP	Explanation
		<p>Bike: Any proposed development within 0.25 miles of an existing educational institution or existing/planned bikeshare station must make improvements needed to provide a low Level of Traffic Stress (LTS-2) to any existing similar facility within 750 feet of the development’s boundary. An alternative is to provide a master planned improvement that provides an equivalent improvement in the level of traffic stress for cyclists.</p>	<p>Project should participate in necessary improvements to ensure low level of stress for cyclists in vicinity where cycling demand and/or infrastructure exists.</p>
Mitigation Priorities		<p>Non-auto mitigation prioritized over intersection improvements as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TDM</li> <li>2. Ped/bike improvements</li> <li>3. Transit improvement</li> <li>4. Intersection operational improvements</li> <li>5. Roadway capacity improvements</li> </ol>	<p>Projects should look to least capital-intensive solutions for both applicant initial cost and public sector maintenance, including starting with methods that that increase NADMS.</p>

<b>Subdivision Staging Policy Component</b>	<b>2012-16 SSP</b>	<b>Adopted 2016-20 SSP</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
Unified Mobility Programs	A version of a Unified Mobility Program (UMP) exists in White Flint and is under development in White Oak	Create a series of Unified Mobility Programs, similar to the one under development for the White Oak policy area as an eventual replacement to LATR countywide. In its simplest form, the White Oak UMP entails the development of (1) the forecast of new trips at master plan buildout for a sub-area and (2) the capital costs thought to be necessary to fund the supporting infrastructure over the same time period. Given that information, a cost per trip is identified and applied to proposed development within the area in question.	Approach would provide more predictability and transparency with respect to assumptions, capital costs and development of per trip fee(s). Focuses private sector participation on implementing planned improvements rather than developing ad hoc mitigation (which, if oriented towards auto capacity, may be inconsistent with the master plan guidance). Avoids issue of “last in” applicant having to bear disproportional share of cost.

Transportation Impact Tax	Transportation Impact Tax Effective Prior to March 1, 2017	Transportation Impact Tax Effective March 1, 2017	Explanation
Basis for tax rate	Based on 2006 CIP, Round 7.0 Cooperative Forecasts	Based on 2006 CIP, Round 7.0 Cooperative Forecasts <sup>1</sup>	Analysis of 2016 conditions found only a slight change from 2007 base for “countywide” rates.
Adjustments to the base rate	Four sets of rates apply: (1) General District, (2) MSPA discount, (3) MARC station area discount (4) Clarksburg surcharge.	<p>Four sets of rates apply: (1) Red Policy Area, (2) Orange Policy Area, (3) MARC station area discount, (4) Yellow and Green Policy areas</p> <p>The rates in the Red policy area category remain the same as those in the past when the same category was referred to as the Metro Station Policy Areas.</p> <p>Rates in the Orange policy area category are equivalent to the General District Rate, with no adjustment factor applied.</p> <p>Rates in the Yellow and Green policy areas are equivalent to the General District rate, adjusted by 125% to account for a proportionately higher transportation usage in these areas.</p> <p>Rates in the Orange, Yellow and Green policy areas have been increased to account in part for revenue loss associated with the elimination of the TPAR.</p>	New analysis of VMT and NADMS confirmed that retaining Red areas at 50% of the “countywide” rate was appropriate and that Yellow and Green areas should be higher than the countywide rate.

<sup>1</sup> Council chose not to use more current information in support of the development of updated transportation impact tax rates.

