2020 Subdivision Staging Policy Update

Roundtable Participant Prep
## Workshop/Roundtable Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kick-off Community Workshop</td>
<td>October 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Roundtable</td>
<td>January 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Student Roundtable</td>
<td>February 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upcounty Roundtable</td>
<td>February 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County Roundtable</td>
<td>February 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topics Covered

• History of the Subdivision Staging Policy (SSP)
• Overview of the Current SSP
• Overview of Impact Taxes
• 2020 SSP Update Process
• Review of Relevant Data
• Preview of the Roundtable Discussions
About the Subdivision Staging Policy
What is the Subdivision Staging Policy?

• The County’s Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO) became law in 1973:
  
  • “The [Planning] Board may only approve a preliminary plan when it finds that public facilities will be *adequate* to support and service the subdivision. Public facilities and services to be examined for adequacy include roads and transportation facilities, sewer and water service, schools, police stations, firehouses, and health clinics.” §50.4.3(J) of the County Code

• The SSP is the set of policy tools that administer the APFO, define infrastructure adequacy, and describe how adequacy is measured.
## History of the SSP and Impact Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Update to the General Plan</td>
<td>Council adopts the APFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>First “Annual Growth Policy”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>• Countywide Impact Tax introduced</td>
<td>• Impact Tax introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>• Policy Area test eliminated</td>
<td>• Facility Payments introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>• Impact taxes recalibrated</td>
<td>• Impact taxes recalibrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>• Policy Area test reintroduced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Multimodal Local Area test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Renamed “Subdivision Staging Policy”</td>
<td>• Unified Mobility Programs established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>• Impact taxes recalibrated</td>
<td>• Impact taxes recalibrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>• Policy Area test eliminated</td>
<td>• Individual school test introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>• Multimodal Local Area test</td>
<td>• School Facility Payments eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>• Unified Mobility Programs established</td>
<td>• Required biennial update to Student Generation Rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Updates to the Subdivision Staging Policy

• Policy is currently updated every four years

• Certain aspects of the policy are updated more frequently:
  • Student generation rates are updated biennially
  • School test results are updated annually

• 2016-2020 Subdivision Staging Policy
  • Adopted by Council Resolution 18-671 on November 15, 2016
  • Council Resolution 18-1087 on April 17, 2018
  • Council Resolution 19-147 on June 25, 2019
Transportation
What Does the SSP Do?

- Groups our 38 policy areas into **four policy area categories** based on:
  - Current land use patterns
  - The prevalence of different modes of travel
  - The planning vision for the policy area
What Does the SSP Do?

• Establishes a set of multi-modal Local Area Transportation Review (LATR) tests for determining transportation adequacy

  • Forecasts travel demand generated by existing, pipeline and proposed development and compares it to the capacity of existing and programmed roads and transit
What Does the SSP Do?

- **Unified Mobility Programs (UMPs)** include an area-wide analysis of needed transportation improvements
  - Applicants pay their proportion of the UMP cost
Schools
What Does the SSP Do?

• Requires the Planning Board to annually approve the results of a school test evaluating projected school capacity five years in the future
• Establishes the criteria for enacting development moratoria based on projected school capacity utilization
• Identifies exceptions to the moratoria
• Previously, established thresholds for school facility payments
Annual School Test Overview

The Annual School Test is a two-tiered test:

- **Cluster** level test of utilization
- **School** level test of utilization

**Cluster Test**
- Total ES utilization
- Total MS utilization
- HS utilization
## Moratorium Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Level</th>
<th>Moratorium Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>Projected <strong>cumulative utilization greater than 120%</strong> at any school level (elementary, middle or high school) across the entire cluster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Elementary School</td>
<td>Projected <strong>utilization greater than 120%</strong> and projected capacity <strong>deficit of 110 seats or more.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Middle School</td>
<td>Projected <strong>utilization greater than 120%</strong> and projected capacity <strong>deficit of 180 seats or more.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Moratorium Coverage
Current Moratorium Coverage

- Groveton Strathmore: 100%
- Forest Glen: 100%
- Greater Lyttonsville: 50%
- White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan: 83%
- Veirs Mill Corridor Master Plan: 58%
- Rock Spring Sector Plan: 99%
- White Flint Sector Plan: 77%
Exceptions to the Moratorium

- **Non-residential** projects
- **De minimis** projects of 3 units or less
- **Age-restricted** senior housing
- Certain projects that generate 10 or fewer students at any one school and meet other conditions related to the removal of a **condemned structure** or provide high quantities of **deeply affordable housing**
Impact Taxes
## Transportation Impact Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Red Policy Areas</th>
<th>Orange Policy Areas</th>
<th>Yellow Policy Areas</th>
<th>Green Policy Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential (per unit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>$7,838</td>
<td>$19,591</td>
<td>$24,490</td>
<td>$24,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>$6,413</td>
<td>$16,030</td>
<td>$20,038</td>
<td>$20,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Low-rise</td>
<td>$4,986</td>
<td>$12,465</td>
<td>$15,582</td>
<td>$15,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily High-rise</td>
<td>$3,561</td>
<td>$8,904</td>
<td>$11,130</td>
<td>$11,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Senior</td>
<td>$1,424</td>
<td>$3,562</td>
<td>$4,452</td>
<td>$4,452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Non-Residential (per square foot GFA)</strong></th>
<th>Red Policy Areas</th>
<th>Orange Policy Areas</th>
<th>Yellow Policy Areas</th>
<th>Green Policy Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$7.15</td>
<td>$17.90</td>
<td>$22.40</td>
<td>$22.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$3.60</td>
<td>$8.90</td>
<td>$11.20</td>
<td>$11.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioscience Facility</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>$6.35</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$19.95</td>
<td>$19.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Worship</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Elementary and Secondary School</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
<td>$1.85</td>
<td>$1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service Agency</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Residential</td>
<td>$3.60</td>
<td>$8.90</td>
<td>$11.20</td>
<td>$11.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schools Impact Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential (per unit)</th>
<th>Countywide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>$26,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>$27,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Low-rise</td>
<td>$21,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily High-rise</td>
<td>$6,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Senior</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Many Students Live There?! 

Student Generation Rates (SGRs) are an average of the number of students per type of dwelling unit.

### 2018 MCPS Student Generation Rates by Region and Housing Type

#### COUNTYWIDE STUDENT GENERATION RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countywide</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>K-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low to Med Rise</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Rise</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### REGIONAL STUDENT GENERATION RATES

**East**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blair, Einstein, Kennedy, Northwood, Wheaton, Blake, Paint Branch and Springbrook clusters</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>K-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low to Med Rise</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Rise</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Southwest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low to Med Rise</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Rise</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Upcounty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarksburg, Damascus, Gaithersburg, Magruder, Northwest, Poolesville, Quince Orchard, Seneca Valley, Shawano, and Watkins Mill clusters</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>K-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low to Med Rise</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Rise</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rates are calculated using Fall 2018 enrollment data from Montgomery County Public Schools. Of the nearly 163,000 students enrolled in MCPS schools in Fall 2018, Planning Staff were able to match 99.4% of the students to a housing type.
Impact Taxes Exemptions

• All moderately priced dwelling units (MPDUs) are exempt
• Any project that includes **25% or more MPDUs** (or other types of affordable units) are fully exempt on all units
• Any project in a current or former Enterprise Zone (including Downtown Silver Spring)
2020 Update Scope
Transportation: Focused Update

• Update of the transportation element is focused on two primary tasks:
  • Identifying opportunities to incorporate the County’s Vision Zero travel safety objectives into the Local Area Transportation Review process
  • Reintroducing a policy area transportation adequacy test for the purposes of evaluating master/sector plan balance
Transportation Impact Study Technical Working Group

• The TISTWG has met four times:
  • September 9
    • Overview of Project Scope
  • October 7
    • LATR Literature Review
    • Policy Area Test Options
  • November 4
    • LATR Beta Tests (reflecting Vision Zero objectives)
    • Policy Area Test Beta Tests
  • December 9
    • LATR Data Collection Requirements (reflecting Vision Zero objectives)
Schools: All Aspects Under Review

- The moratorium policy and its thresholds and exceptions
- The Annual School Test procedures
- Estimating enrollment impacts
- Development queue impacts
- Impacts of neighborhood turnover on enrollment
- Potential reintroduction of school facility payments
Schools: Seeking Innovative Solutions

• We are seeking an innovative set of policy tools that:
  • Better ensure school adequacy within the County’s current growth paradigm
  • Support the County’s other policy priorities
• Effort has entailed an extensive review of policies from other similar jurisdictions across the country
Schools Technical Advisory Team

• The STAT has met four times:
  • October 22
    • SSP and Impact Tax Overview
    • Growth Management in Similar Jurisdictions
    • Montgomery County Growth Trends
  • November 12
    • Alternative Student Generation Rates, Part 1
  • December 3
    • Alternative Student Generation Rates, Part 2
    • Initial Policy Discussion
  • January 16
    • The moratorium policy, its thresholds and its exception
Key SSP Update Deadlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 15</td>
<td>Planning Staff Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning staff must submit a working draft SSP to the County Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1</td>
<td>Planning Board Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Planning Board must approve and submit its recommended SSP to the County Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>Council Adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The County Council must adopt the new SSP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relevant Data
Slower growth in a maturing Montgomery County

Most populous county in Maryland with over 1 million people since 2012

38% population increase since 1990

Forecasting a 7.2% gain of 76,235 people between 2018 and 2030

Sources of Population Growth
1990-2018

Components of Population Growth

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimate Program, 3/2019
Housing Growth by Cluster, 2015-18

Number of Additional Dwelling Units

- Single Family Detached
- Single Family Attached
- Multifamily Low-rise
- Multifamily High-rise

Source: SDAT
Unit Mix for Highest Housing Growth Clusters (2011-15)
2018 SGRs for Units Built 2011-15
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Share of Students and Units by Dwelling Type

- K-12 Students
  - Single Family Houses: 55%
  - Townhouses: 22%
  - Low-Rise Multi-Family Units: 4%
  - High-Rise Multi-Family Units: 0%

- Dwelling Units
  - Single Family Houses: 47%
  - Townhouses: 21%
  - Low-Rise Multi-Family Units: 18%
  - High-Rise Multi-Family Units: 14%
SFD Homes by Number of Students

- 0 students: 72.9%
- 1 student: 12.9%
- 2 students: 2.9%
- 3 students: 1.1%
- 4 or more students: 10.1%

Homes with students on average have 1.7 students each.
K-12 SGR by Census Tract

- 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
Census Measures SGRs

- % of Households w/ Children Under 18
- % of Students (K-12) Enrolled in Public Schools
- % Foreign-Born Population
- % White Population
- % Black Population
- % People of Color
- % Hispanic

- Median Age of Population
- Median Household Income
- Median Family Income (for Families with Children Under 18)
- Population Density
Neighborhood Characteristics SGRs

• Inside/Outside Equity Emphasis Areas
• Inside/Outside Priority Funding Areas
• Inside/Outside the Capital Beltway
• Transportation Policy Area Category
• Distance to a School
• Distance to a Metro Station
Parcel/Structure Attributes SGRs

- Single Family Detached homes:
  - Age of Structure
  - Year Last Sold
  - Parcel Size

- Multifamily Structures
  - Age of Structure
  - Share of Affordable Housing
  - Share of 3-bedroom Units
  - Average Rent per Square Foot
  - Average Unit Square Footage
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.
SGR by Average Unit Square Footage
Multifamily dwelling units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Unit Square Footage in a Building</th>
<th>Average Number of Students per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 599 sf</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 - 699 sf</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 - 799 sf</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 - 899 sf</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 - 999 sf</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 1000sf</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
NOTE: These are not the SGRs for 3-bedroom units. They are the SGRs for all units in buildings where the share of 3-bedroom units falls into the indicated range.
SGR by Gross Floor Area
Single family detached units

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
SGR by Year Built and Dwelling Type
SGR by Year Last Sold (SFD only)

Source: SDAT
Preview of the Roundtables
Schools Questions

• Should school capacity standards and moratorium thresholds vary depending on the different development contexts across the county?

• How should school infrastructure adequacy be defined? Are there elements to physical adequacy beyond capacity?

• Should the residential development moratorium continue? If the moratorium policy were discontinued, how else could the county ensure school infrastructure keeps pace with enrollment growth?

• How can the SSP be responsive to enrollment pressures resulting from housing turnover?

• Should certain types of residential development projects be exempt from paying school impact taxes? If so, which types?

• Should developers be required to pay additional fees (beyond impact taxes) in areas meeting certain utilization thresholds?

• What is the appropriate timeframe for evaluating school adequacy? Should we continue to test based on utilization projections for five years in the future?

• Other than the dwelling type, are there other quantifiable factors you have observed that you think affect the likelihood a dwelling will generate students? How should we use these other factors?
Transportation Questions

• What steps can the County take to improve mobility and transportation systems?
• How can the County incorporate Vision Zero concepts in the Subdivision Staging Policy and evaluate the adequacy of travel safety conditions?
• What safety features need to be prioritized? What features would help improve the safety of our roads? (For example, buffers, protected intersections, crosswalk spacing, etc.)
• Are the current multimodal local area transportation review standards appropriate?
• How can the County increase the amount of funding available for transportation infrastructure?
• Given constrained budgets, how should the County prioritize different types of transportation infrastructure improvements?
• How should we plan differently given the growing use of ridesharing and micro-mobility options?
• What impact do you think autonomous vehicles will have on how we plan our communities and how we evaluate the adequacy of our transportation infrastructure?
For More Info…

Jason Sartori, Division Chief, Functional Planning & Policy
Jason.Sartori@MontgomeryPlanning.org
301.495.2172
montgomeryplanning.org/ssp