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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. Operational premium transit
  2. Emerging premium transit: under construction, designed but construction not funded, or design studies underway
  3. Planned premium transit: in transit master plan but design studies not funded
  4. No 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Operational Premium Transit with TOD</th>
<th>Emerging Premium Transit with TOD</th>
<th>Planned Premium Transit with TOD</th>
<th>Limited Transit with Traditional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Roads</strong></td>
<td>1. Mitigation payment (large and small); used regionally 2. Few if any new infrastructure within planning area</td>
<td>1. Mitigation payment (both large and small) 2. Infrastructure as needed to support area around centers</td>
<td>1. Large projects: developer provides infrastructure but must be in keeping with premium transit concept 2. Small projects: Mitigation payment</td>
<td>1. Large projects: developer provided infrastructure to match development as currently planned 2. Small projects: Mitigation payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Transit</strong></td>
<td>Mitigation payment</td>
<td>Mitigation payment</td>
<td>Mitigation payment</td>
<td>Mitigation payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-- Premium</strong></td>
<td>Operational 1. At centers 2. Connections to other centers</td>
<td>In design, awaiting construction funding or under construction 1. Premium Centers 2. Connections to other centers</td>
<td>In Transit Master Plan, design studies not yet started</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-- Local</strong></td>
<td>Should exist; if not then plan, fund and implement 1. Circulator buses 2. Connects to Centers</td>
<td>1. Planned during premium design 2. Funding and implementation at end of premium construction</td>
<td>1. Connects to premium centers 2. Connects to non-premium planning areas</td>
<td>1. Connects to premium centers 2. Connects to non-premium planning areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Pedestrian</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
<td>1. Mitigation payment 2. Developer provides on site 3. County provides remainder as needed to complete</td>
<td>1. Large projects: developer provides on site 2. Small projects: mitigation payment</td>
<td>1. Large projects: developer provides on site 2. Small: none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Bike</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
<td>1. Mitigation payment 2. Developer provides on site 3. County provides remainder as needed to complete</td>
<td>1. Large projects: developer provides on site 2. Small projects: mitigation payment</td>
<td>1. Large projects: developer provides on site 2. Small projects: mitigation payment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 what infrastructure should be built and when
    • 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Refine Status Quo</th>
<th>Hybrid (Mitigation Payment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 |