Welcome!
Meeting Agenda

I. Welcome | 5 minutes
   a. Overview of Agenda
   b. Introductions
   c. Review Discussion Ground Rules
   d. Housekeeping

II. Circle Back on Previous Meetings | 30 minutes

III. Alternative Student Generation Rates | 60 minutes
   a. Summary of Alternative SGRs from Last Meeting
   b. Census-Based Rates
   c. Location-Based Rates
   d. Dwelling-Based Rates
   e. Attribute Aggregations

IV. Prep for STAT Meeting #4 | 25 minutes
   a. Annual School Test Procedures
Introductions

Please share…

• Your name

• Your organization/employer, if applicable
STAT Participant Ground Rules

1. Lean in. Lean out.

2. Listen to understand. Suspend your beliefs to hear someone else’s experience.

3. Speak for yourself, not a group, and use “I” statements.

4. Disagree with people without being disagreeable.
   • It's okay to disagree. We are not aiming to agree. You do not have to persuade each other.

5. We have a lot to cover every meeting, therefore:
   • Try not to repeat things that others have said, simply indicate your agreement with another person’s comments.
   • Stay on topic and be concise while still being a thoughtful, provocative and active participant.

6. You must have a microphone to talk.
STAT Observer Ground Rules

1. To stay on track with such a large group we ask that you do not participate directly in the STAT conversation, but rather observe and take notes.

2. Preferably, please submit comments or questions on the comment cards.
   - We will respond to you sometime after tonight’s meeting.
   - If applicable, we will share your comments with the STAT membership at the next meeting or share our responses to your questions.

3. Otherwise, feel free to catch us after the meeting to share your comments or ask your questions.
Housekeeping Items

- Meeting recordings have been uploaded to the STAT webpage.
- SSP discussion questionnaires – please encourage people to provide comments.
- Setting up briefings, discussions, workshops
  - Capitol View Park HOA
  - Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce
  - Bethesda Downtown Plan Implementation Advisory Committee
  - Montgomery County Civic Federation
Circle Back: Utilization Overlays
Maps with Utilization Overlays

• How can these be most useful?
  • Visually – which is easiest to understand/interpret or conveys the information best?
  • What should the overlay include?
    • Which data?
      • Preliminary 2019 utilization
      • Preliminary 2019 seat deficit/surplus
      • Projected 2025 utilization
      • Projected 2025 seat deficit/surplus
    • What geographies?
      • Elementary school, individual or cluster
      • Middle school, individual or cluster
      • High school
      • Full cluster
ES Seat Capacity & % HHs w/Children U18

ES Seat Capacity, 2018
- High Surplus (more than 100)
- Moderate Surplus (1 to 100)
- Moderate Deficit (-99 to 0)
- High Deficit (-100 or less)

% Households w/Own Children Under 18
- 20% or less
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%
- 40% - 50%
- More than 50%
ES Utilization Rate & % HHs w/Children U18

**ES Utilization Rate, 2018**
- High Underutilization (80% or less)
- Moderate Underutilization (80% - 100%)
- Moderate Overutilization (100% - 120%)
- High Overutilization (more than 120%)

**% Households w/Own Children Under 18**
- 20% or less
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%
- 40% - 50%
- More than 50%
Projected HS Seat Capacity & % HHs w/Children U18

Projected HS Seat Capacity, 2024
- High Surplus (more than 250)
- Moderate Surplus (1 to 250)
- Moderate Deficit (-249 to 0)
- High Deficit (-250 or less)

% Households w/Own Children Under 18
- 20% or less
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%
- 40% - 50%
- More than 50%
Enrollment Growth by Cluster & % HHs w/Children U18

Enrollment Growth by Cluster, 2015-2018
- Decrease
- Low Increase (0 - 250)
- Moderate Increase (250 - 500)
- High Increase (More than 500)

% Households w/Own Children Under 18
- 20% or less
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%
- 40% - 50%
- More than 50%
Circle Back: New Development vs. Neighborhood Turnover
New Development vs. Neighborhood Turnover

- Study looking at new units built in 2011 through 2015.
- Over 17,100 dwelling units built countywide over those five years.

Distribution of Countywide Housing Units Built 2011-2015

- SF Detached: 39%
- SF Attached: 21%
- MF Low-rise: 20%
- MF High-rise: 20%
Unit Mix for Highest Housing Growth Clusters

- **Gaithersburg**
  - SF Detached: 32%
  - SF Attached: 12%
  - MF Low-rise: 54%
  - MF High-rise: 2%

- **Walter Johnson**
  - SF Detached: 55%
  - SF Attached: 8%
  - MF Low-rise: 25%
  - MF High-rise: 12%

- **Clarksburg**
  - SF Detached: 57%
  - SF Attached: 19%
  - MF Low-rise: 24%

- **Bethesda-Chevy Chase**
  - SF Detached: 76%
  - SF Attached: 21%
  - MF Low-rise: 2%
  - MF High-rise: 1%

- **Montgomery Blair**
  - SF Detached: 87%
  - SF Attached: 11%
  - MF Low-rise: 2%

- **Albert Einstein**
  - SF Detached: 95%
  - SF Attached: 5%

Legend:
- Red: SF Detached
- Blue: SF Attached
- Green: MF Low-rise
- Brown: MF High-rise
Total Units Built by % Single Family
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STAT Meeting #3
New Development vs. Neighborhood Turnover

• From 2010 to 2015, countywide enrollment grew by 12,383 students.

• The 17,100+ new dwelling units built between 2011 and 2015 included 3,423 students in 2015, or 27.6% of the enrollment growth.

• From 2015 to 2018, countywide enrollment grew by an additional 6,233 students.

• The 17,100+ new dwelling units built between 2011 and 2015 included 1,322 more students in 2018, or 21.2% of the additional enrollment growth.
### New Development vs. Neighborhood Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>% of 2010 to 2015 Enrollment Growth Attributed to Units Built Between 2011 and 2015</th>
<th>2015 SGR for Units Built Between 2011 and 2015</th>
<th>2015 SGR for All Units</th>
<th>2015 SGR Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>-38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Low-rise</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>-76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily High-rise</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>-78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL UNITS</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>-51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>% of 2015 to 2018 Enrollment Growth Attributed to Units Built Between 2011 and 2015</th>
<th>2018 SGR for Units Built Between 2011 and 2015</th>
<th>2018 SGR for All Units</th>
<th>2018 SGR Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>0.679 (+28%)</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>0.428 (+43%)</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Low-rise</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.134 (+47%)</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>-66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily High-rise</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.062 (+100%)</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>-44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL UNITS</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>0.277 (+39%)</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Circle Back: Year Last Sold
Student Generation Rate by:
Year Last Sold (Single Family Detached only)

Source: SDAT
Student Generation Rate by:
Year Last Sold (Single Family Attached only)

Average (Last Sold Since 1998)
Student Generation Rate by:
Year Last Sold (All Single Family)

Source: SDAT
Histogram: Year Last Sold (All Single Family)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of Housing Stock...</th>
<th>SF Detached</th>
<th>SF Attached</th>
<th>All SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last Sold in Last 5 Years</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Sold in Last 10 Years</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Sold in Last 15 Years</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Sold in Last 20 Years</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SDAT
Circle Back: Moratorium Tracking
Alternative SGRs: Summary from Last Meeting
K-12 All Units SGR

- High positive correlation to:
  - % of Households with Children Under 18
  - % of Households that are Families
  - Average Family Size

- Positive correlation to:
  - % People of Color
  - % Hispanic
  - % Foreign Born
  - # and % of units SFD
  - # and % of units SFA

- Negative correlation to:
  - Population Density
  - Median Age
  - Median Family Income
  - % White non-Hispanic

- High negative correlation to:
  - # and % of units Multifamily High-rise
SGR with Strong Visual Relationships

Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:
% of Households w/Children Under 18 & Housing Type

Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:
% of K to 12 Students Enrolled in Public Schools & Housing Type

Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:
% Foreign-Born Population and Housing Type

Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:
% White Population (Non-Hispanic) and Housing Type

Student Generation Rate of Census Tracts by:
% People of Color and Housing Type

Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:
% Hispanic Population and Housing Type
SGR with Strong Visual Relationships

Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:
- Median Age and Housing Type
  - 35 or less
  - 35 - 40
  - 40 - 45
  - 45 - 50
  - More than 50

Student Generation Rate by:
- Inside/Outside Equity Emphasis Areas

Student Generation Rate by:
- Year Last Sold (Single Family Detached only)

Student Generation Rate by:
- Share of Affordable Housing
  - Affordable Housing: <20%
  - Affordable Housing: 20%-30%
  - Affordable Housing: Over 30%

Student Generation Rate by:
- Share of 3-Bedroom Units (Multifamily buildings only)
  - 0% Under 5%
  - 5%-10%
  - 10%-20%
  - 20%-30%
  - 30%-40%
  - 40%-50%
  - Over 50%
SGRs with Mixed Visual Relationships

Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:
Median Household Income and Housing Type

- $75K or less
- $75K - $125K
- $125K - $175K
- $175K - $225K
- More than $225K

Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:
Median Family Income (of Families w/Children U18)
& Housing Type

- $75K or less
- $75K - $125K
- $125K - $175K
- $175K - $225K
- More than $225K

Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:
Distance to Metro Stations

- Within 1/4 Mile
- Between 1/4 and 1/2 Mile
- Beyond 1/2 Mile

Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:
Inside/Outside the Beltway

- Inside Beltway
- Outside Beltway

Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:
Population Density and Housing Type

- 1,000 or less
- 1,000 - 2,000
- 2,000 - 3,000
- 3,000 - 4,000
- 4,000 - 5,000
- 5,000 - 6,000
- 6,000 - 7,000
- 7,000 - 8,000
- 8,000 - 9,000
- 9,000 - 10,000
- More than 10,000

Student Generation Rate for Census Tracts by:
% Black Population (Non-Hispanic) and Housing Type

- 10% or less
- 10% - 20%
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%
- 40% - 50%
- More than 50%

STAT Meeting #3
Alternative SGRs: Census-Based Rates
Householder Age
% 25 to 54 Years Old

- 40% or less
- 40% - 50%
- 50% - 60%
- 60% - 70%
- more than 70%
Householder Age
% 25 to 54 Years Old

[Bar Chart]

- All Housing Types: 40% or less, 40% - 50%, 50% - 60%
- Single Family Houses: 40% - 50%, 50% - 60%, 60% - 70%
- Townhouses: 50% - 60%, 60% - 70%, more than 70%
- Low-Rise Multi-Family Units: 40% - 50%, 50% - 60%, 60% - 70%
- High-Rise Multi-Family Units: 40% - 50%
Householder Age
% 65 Years Old and Up

- 10% or less
- 10% - 20%
- 20% - 30%
- 30% - 40%
- more than 40%

Count of Census Tracts

- ≤ 10%
- (10%, 20%]
- (20%, 30%]
- (30%, 40%]
- > 40%
Householder Age
% 65 Years Old and Up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>10% or less</th>
<th>10% - 20%</th>
<th>20% - 30%</th>
<th>30% - 40%</th>
<th>more than 40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Rise Multi-Family Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Rise Multi-Family Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative SGRs: Location-Based Rates
Distance to Nearest School: ¼ Mile and ½ Mile

Count of Dwelling Units

Inside ¼ Mile of a School
Between ¼ and ½ Mile of a School
Outside ½ Mile of a School
SGR by Distance to Nearest School
Inside and Outside ¼ Mile

![Bar chart showing SGR by distance to nearest school for Inside and Outside ¼ Mile]

Legend:
- Inside 1/4 Mile
- Outside 1/4 Mile
SGR by Distance to Nearest School
Inside and Outside ½ Mile
Title I and Focus schools are elementary schools most heavily impacted by poverty and language deficiency that receive staffing to reduce class sizes in the primary grades.
SGR by CSR Classification of ES Service Area

- K to 12
- ES
- MS
- HS

Legend:
- Non-Focus
- Focus
- Title I
Alternative SGRs: Dwelling-Based Rates
SFD Homes by Number of Students

Homes with students on average have **1.7 students** each.
Average Rent per Square Foot
Multifamily dwelling units

Count of Multifamily Units

Average Rent per Square Foot in a Building

- Under $1.49
- $1.5 - $1.75
- $1.75 - $2.00
- $2.00 - $2.25
- $2.25 - $2.50
- $2.50 - $2.75
- $2.75 - $3.00
- Above $3.00
SGR by Average Rent per Square Foot
Multifamily dwelling units

NOTE: These are not the SGRs for units at these rent levels. They are the SGRs for units in buildings where the average rent falls in these ranges.
Average Unit Square Footage
Multifamily dwelling units

Count of Multifamily Units

Average Unit Square Footage in a Building

- Under 500 sf
- 500 - 599 sf
- 600 - 699 sf
- 700 - 799 sf
- 800 - 899 sf
- 900 - 999 sf
- Above 1000 sf
SGR by Average Unit Square Footage
Multifamily dwelling units

NOTE: These are not the SGRs for units at these sizes. They are the SGRs for units in buildings where the average unit size falls in these ranges.
Lot Size
Single family detached units

Count of SF Detached Units

Legend
Average Lot Size by Census Tract
- 1/4-Acre and Under
- 1/4-Acre - 1/2-Acre
- 1/2-Acre - 3/4-Acre
- 3/4 Acre - 1-Acre
- Greater than 1-Acre

Count of SF Detached Units

Lot Size (acres)
- Up to 1/4
- 1/4 to 1/2
- 1/2 to 3/4
- 3/4 to 1
- Over 1 acre
SGR by Lot Size
Single family detached units

Lot Size (acres)

- Up to 1/4
- 1/4 to 1/2
- 1/2 to 3/4
- 3/4 to 1
- Over 1
SFD Unit Count by GFA and Share

- 500-999: 4.8%
- 1,000-1,499: 23.6%
- 1,500-1,999: 18.8%
- 2,000-2,499: 19.9%
- 2,500-2,999: 12.9%
- 3,000-3,499: 7.9%
- 3,500-3,999: 4.9%
- 4,000-4,499: 2.7%
- 4,500-4,999: 1.8%
- 5,000-5,499: 1.0%
- 5,500 and higher: 1.8%
SFD Unit Count by GFA and Number of Students

- 4 or more students
- 3 students
- 2 students
- 1 student
- 0 students

Gross Floor Area (sf)
- 500-999
- 1,000-1,499
- 1,500-1,999
- 2,000-2,499
- 2,500-2,999
- 3,000-3,499
- 3,500-3,999
- 4,000-4,499
- 4,500-4,999
- 5,000-5,499
- 5,500 and higher

Unit Count
- 500-999: 72.3%
- 1,000-1,499: 73.2%
- 1,500-1,999: 73.5%
- 2,000-2,499: 73.9%
- 2,500-2,999: 71.9%
- 3,000-3,499: 70.8%
- 3,500-3,999: 70.0%
- 4,000-4,499: 70.6%
- 4,500-4,999: 74.1%
- 5,000-5,499: 74.7%
- 5,500 and higher: 80.3%
SGR by Gross Floor Area
Single family detached units
SGR by Gross Floor Area
SFD units with GFAs below and above indicated GFA
SGR by Year Built and Dwelling Type

![Bar Chart of SGR by Year Built and Dwelling Type](chart.png)

Legend:
- Before 1901
- 1901-1910
- 1911-1920
- 1921-1930
- 1931-1940
- 1941-1950
- 1951-1960
- 1961-1970
- 1971-1980
- 1981-1990
- 1991-2000
- 2001-2010
- 2011-2018

- SFD
- SFA
- MF Low
- MF High
- All
Preview of STAT Meeting #4
STAT Meeting #4

• Scheduled for Tuesday, January 7 at 7:00 pm

• Topics:
  • Circle back on items from previous meetings
  • Update on review of growth management in other jurisdictions
  • SGR Aggregation Results

• Policy discussions:
  • Annual School Test methodology
  • School queue, pipeline and the MCPS enrollment projection process
  • Moratorium policy, its exceptions and potential alternatives
Questions for Future STAT Meetings

• How should we define adequacy? Is capacity utilization the only measure of adequacy? Should a school with sufficient capacity, but in need of a roof replacement, a new HVAC system, asbestos abatement or new security enhancement be considered adequate?

• How can the SSP better support the need for infrastructure?

• Does the moratorium policy bring needed attention to capacity needs? Could the SSP be used to better prioritize infrastructure investments?