Montgomery County Healthy and Sustainable Communities Workshop June 26, 2008 Universities at Shady Grove, Rockville, MD

Goal and Indicators Break-Out Session: Draft Notes

Draft Goal: Smart Communities: Well-designed, energy-efficient housing of varied types and densities linked to jobs, transit, and services. Affordable and convenient transportation options should be enhanced to reduce our car-dependence, conserve resources, improve air quality, and reduce traffic congestion.

Draft Indicators: % of Housing within ½ mile of Metro and ¼ mile of Bus, Jobs to Housing Ratio, Montgomery County Residents Mean Travel Time to Work in Minutes

Participants: Andie Murtha, Ben Ross, Edward Graham, Jane Przygocki, Laurie Bricker, Marcia Rucker, Neil Weinstein, Ron Savage, Tracy Stanton, Andrea Sarzynski, Annette Rosenblum, Chuck Kines, David Richman, Demetrius Robinson, Devin Battley, Doug Horgan, Edward Godin, Erica Shingara, Heidi Sweetnam, Jan Walters, Jessica Nardi, Joe Davis, John Robinson, Judith McGuire, Katherine Holt, Marlis Janes, Om Sawardekar, Dr. Patricia Stephenson, Paul Emrath, Pilar Rivera, Susan Nickbarg, Susan Soderberg, Tim Boltz, Wayne Goldstein, Benjamin Stutz, Bill Wainger, Del. Bill Bronrott, Bruce Baker, Charles Dylan Reilly Cindy Powers, Corinne Rothblum, Eileen Emmet, Eric A. Aldrette, J. Daniel Pugh, Jennifer Russel, Jim Humphrey, Kristin O'Connor, Mark Ferrenz, Roselle George, Sebastian Johnson, Chris Loos, Christine Conn, Dave Heffernan, Judy Higgins, Karyn Miele, Lisa Rother, Maricela Rivera, Mark E. Friis, Marye Wells-Harley, Matthew J Leakan, Melanie Isis, Meredith Weisel, Peggy Schwartz, Trudi Bick, Virginia Sheard, Karen Boyd Williams, Peter Ensign, Tony Crane

Content Experts: Andrea Sarzynski, Senior Research Analyst, Brookings Institution, Parris

Glendening, President, Smart Growth America, Hal Wolman, George Washington University

Facilitator: Raj Chawla, Results Leadership Group

Documenter: Kate Briddell

Draft Goal: Smart Communities: Well-designed, energy-efficient housing of varied types and densities linked to jobs, transit, and services. Affordable and convenient transportation options should be enhanced to reduce our car-dependence, conserve resources, improve air quality, and reduce traffic congestion.

Proposed revised Goal: Smart Communities: Smart communities are affordable, healthy, energy-efficient communities with a sense of place.

Major Theme of Discussion on the Goal:

The goal, as written, is missing elements.

Comments Related to Major Theme #1:

• Some missing elements from the Goal Statement, as written, are:

- o "range of housing costs" affordable housing
- o some reference to smart growth communities being Healthy Communities walkable communities help deal with the obesity issue
- o Creating a "sense of place."
- Smart Communities lend themselves to economic competitiveness
- Smart Communities are energy sustainable
- Which ones of these specifics do we really want as goals, and which ones are means of getting to those specifics?
 - Varied types of housing
 - o Links to jobs, transit, and services
- Do these goals have to do with the built design or are they goals that relate to actual behavior?
 - You can design a community that will conserve resources & improve air quality, etc.
 Good design may have no impact on behavior.
- Affordable housing is an important goal
- Energy efficiency is not just about residential; need to expand to commercial sphere.
- Minimizing carbon footprint is an urgent priority
- Change "linked" to "proximity"
- Relevant transportation
- Mixed use
- Sense of place / ownership
- Affordability issue is missing
- Smart communities link jobs to housing
- Equal footing for walking, public transportation
 - o Bus routes need to be more understandable
- Principles of Place connect to nature; integrate schools and neighborhoods; availability of art
- Smart? How about using Successful?

Draft Indicators: % of Housing within ½ mile of Metro and ¼ mile of Bus, Jobs to Housing Ratio, Montgomery County Residents Mean Travel Time to Work in Minutes

Major Themes of Indicators Discussion:

- Indicators should be as close to a measurement of the goal as you can get & should measure progress
- Indicators chosen should reflect population changes
- These indicators are not that good.
- Indicators should be tied to policy
- Travel Time to Work has stayed constant over the years, so this doesn't really tell us anything. Travel time can be affected by too many different factors.

Suggested alternate indicators:

- % of new building permits that are LEED certified
- % of daily trips (people avg. 7 trips per day) are able to be done by walking or by transit?
- % of access to transit to where they want to go

- % of shopping trips (non-employment trips) by car
- Standard affordability indices
- Multi-worker households
 - o Destination / living space are connected via transit
- Availability of quality schools
- Housing/transportation index
- % of trips by different modes of transit and by type of trip (car travel to school, walking to school, bus to school, etc.)
- Does the community have a civic association? How often does it meet? How do they utilize it?
- % of income diversity as measured against the income diversity in the larger county
- Develop an index including accessibility to services, jobs, shopping, transportation, schools, etc.
- % of people within 20 minute walking distance of their normal everyday activities (groceries, libraries, open spaces, schools, cultural events, etc.)
- Per capita/household energy use home, transport; commercial/business indicators, as well
- Subsidy of different modes of travel relative cost of more sustainable travel choice
- "Happiness index"

Additional Question: With 70% of all residential land use in cul-de-sac communities, how do you apply Smart Growth?

Story Behind the Ability to Create "Smart Communities"

• Positive Factors:

Constantly changing county

• Negative Factors:

- Traditional financing methods
- Access to public wealth is a measure of a community members success
- 70% of people live in cul-de-sac communities
- Subsidies for highways
- Political pressure & economics changed the original intent of the community (satellite cities, not bedroom communities)
- Mansion-ization of communities
- Private sector perspective understood
- Externality costs don't just charge average costs
- Current state of public transit
- People's preferences not all people share this goal
- Cars are convenient
- Full price of goods are not used is subsidized
- Metro financing WMATA doesn't have a dedicated source of finance
- Subsidized sprawl
- Transportation policy favors road building
- Codes (building, zoning, electrical, etc.) need to be revised
- Divided government
- Existing building stock / land use patterns

Potential Action Strategies:

- Eliminate 2 of the 7 trips taken per day by car (land use Not by car)
- Prices change behavior (ex: triple the gasoline tax to decrease amount of car trips)
- People should pay the full cost of their choices
- Public education can change behavior
- Shift public policy from what we don't want to make it a level playing field
- Code revision
- Increase collaboration among government entities
- Increase people's choices in communities (cul-de-sac vs. urban/walkable)
- Build to code
- Financing (subsidize smart growth)
 - o Public financing (TIFs, etc.)
 - Creative
- More walk-able communities
- Rebuilding "the Commons"
- Make access more competitive
- Re-zone communities to higher densities to put in "missing pieces"
- Re-develop neighborhood shopping centers to include "missing pieces"
- Use \$ earmarked for the ICC to public transportation
- Financing additional modes of travel bike paths, etc.
- Re-develop big box store areas
- Align codes & policies toward Smart Growth
- Reduce parking requirements
- Improve public transit
- Eliminate the ICC
- Look at the greenhouse gas impact of proposed roads
- Improve accessibility do an accessibility audit of each community & respond to each communities needs