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Tonight’s Agenda

I. Welcome and Introductions
   • Casey Anderson, Planning Board Chair
   • Roger Berliner, Montgomery County Councilmember, District 1

II. Purpose of Tonight’s Meeting
   • Gwen Wright, Planning Director
   • Glenn Kreger, Area 2 Division Chief

III. Comprehensive (Master) Planning
   • N’kosi Yearwood, Area 2 Planner

IV. School Facility Planning
   • Bruce Crispell, Director, Montgomery County Public Schools Division of Long-Range Planning

V. Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO) and the Regulatory Environment
   • Pam Dunn, Functional Planning and Policy

VI. Comment Period

VII. Individual Conversations with Staff
   • Rock Spring Park (Don Zeigler and Mike Bello)
   • White Flint 2 (N’kosi Yearwood and Andrea Gilles)
   • Montgomery County Public Schools (Bruce Crispell)
   • APFO and the Regulatory Environment (Pam Dunn)

VIII. Wrap up and Next Steps
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Initial Public Comments

- School capacity is a significant concern in the Walter Johnson (WJ) cluster.
- People feel that schools are overcrowded and there are too many portables.
- Where is the County response?
- How can the County consider planning more development in this area?
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Ground Rules

 Please let us give our presentations.

 Please hold your questions until the end; there will be time for discussion.

 Respect and civility to all.
Mr. Nkosi Yearwood
Area 2 Planning Division
Montgomery Planning Department
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Planning Process

1. Plans are initiated via the County Council on the Planning Department’s Work Program.

2. Planners develop a Draft Plan with input from a variety of stakeholders, including residents, property owners and public agencies.

3. A Public Hearing will be held by the Planning Board.
   - The Planning Board will review the Draft Plan, including work sessions, and forward its recommendations to County Council. The Executive will conduct a fiscal impact on the Planning Board Draft.

4. A Public Hearing will be held by the County Council.
   - The Council, beginning with the Planning Housing and Economic Development (PHED) Committee, will review the Planning Board Draft Plan. The Full Council will vote on the Plan.
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Planning Process

Understanding the three planning processes is essential in order to influence the outcomes.

Comprehensive (Master) Planning
- Lead agency: Montgomery County Planning Department

School Facility Planning
- Lead agency: Montgomery County Public Schools

Regulatory Review
- Lead agency: Montgomery County Planning Department
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New Plans
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Plan Elements
All Master or Sector Plans have the following features:

- An overall concept
- Land use and zoning recommendations
- Sustainability
- Mobility
  - Transportation/Streets
  - Bikeways
- Community or Public Facilities
  - Public Parks
  - Public Schools
  - Public Safety
  - Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services
- Urban Design Guidelines, included in Plan or a separate document
- Implementation
  - Zoning
  - Staging, if applicable
  - Capital Improvements Program (CIP)
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Public Engagement

Table #4

VISION
White Flint will be a unique livable green community surrounded by established residential communities. Pedestrian access into the Metro Station area and across the rail tracks will increase connectivity and reduce the rail barrier between the residential neighborhoods and commercial uses. Land uses will consist of a mix of uses including increased residential density, commercial employment areas including light industrial and small business uses, high density mixed uses at the Metro Core, and a variety of green spaces.

CHARACTERISTICS
- Circulation
  - Provide transportation connectivity within and around White Flint
  - Expand connectivity
  - Maximize rail crossings
  - Use skywalks and bikeways
  - Make pedestrian friendly, convenient and safe with access to Metro and crossings MD 355
  - Provide grid or network of streets—alternate routes to MD 355
  - Maximize road crossing—reduce as pedestrian safety enhances
  - Provide for more usable green space—parks, walkways
  - Provide a People Mover / light rail option
  - Provide better connectivity between schools, residential development and Metro
  - Use MARC to better expand the transportation network relocate the Metro station to White Flint consider the light industrial areas and the area south near the residential neighborhoods
  - Construct a People Mover in North Bethesda
- Land Use and Density
  - Provide greater height and density at Metro—transition to lower densities and height near surrounding communities
  - Reconsider light industrial uses
  - Keep light industrial core
  - Increase density on residential edge to increase density
  - Protect and enhance existing communities
- Maximize existing infrastructure
- Need to consider urban schools that are 3-4 stories
- The Environment
  - Good Environment—green buildings, trees
  - Build good energy efficient buildings—use ventilation to make high-rise buildings more efficient
  - Green buildings
  - Use trees to protect buildings from the sun
- Tent building heights so that the greatest height is at the Metro and it transitions down to surrounding communities
- Provide for flexibility of boundaries
- Construct new buildings closer to streets
- Increase residential uses
- Retain some industrial uses
- Encourage road businesses
- Provide all varieties of parks—design parks a la Central Park with restaurants surrounding

WHITE FLINT SECTOR PLAN Table 4

NOT TO SCALE

White Flint Sector Plan Public Meeting (November 2006)
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Public Engagement

- Public meetings on individual topics, such as tonight.
- Public workshops.
- Meetings with civic and homeowners associations and PTAs.
- Property owners forum.
- Public agencies forum.
- Public hearing.
- Social media, websites, and other new media tools.
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Project Schedule

Staff Outreach, Analysis & Plan Development
- September 2015-June 2016

Planning Board Hearing and Plan Review
- July 2016-January 2017

Planning Board Draft Master Plan
- February 2017

County Executive Review & Council Hearing Noticing Period
- February 2017-March 2017

County Council Public Hearing
- April 2017

County Council Review
- May 2017-October 2017

Commission Adoption & Sectional Map Amendment
- November 2017-February 2018
Mr. Bruce Crispell, Director
Division of Long-range Planning
Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS)
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Walter Johnson School Cluster Articulation

Walter Johnson High School
- North Bethesda MS
- Tilden MS

North Bethesda Middle School
- Ashburton ES
- Kensington-Parkwood ES
- Wyngate ES

Tilden Middle School
- Farmland ES
- Garrett Park ES
- Luxmanor ES
Walter Johnson Cluster: Enrollment Growth

Walter Johnson Cluster Elementary Schools Enrollment 2007 to 2015 prelim.

- Ashburton ES
- Garrett Park ES
- Luxmanor ES
- Farmland ES
- Kensington-Parkwood ES
- Wyngate ES
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Walter Johnson Cluster: Enrollment Growth
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2007 to 2015 elementary enrollment increases:

- Ashburton ES: +335
- Farmland ES: +112
- Garrett Park ES: +361
- Kensington-Parkwood: +148
- Luxmanor: +92
- Wyngate: +194
- TOTAL ELEMENTARY INCREASE = +1,242

2007 to 2015 secondary enrollment increases:

- Walter Johnson HS: +339
- North Bethesda MS: +304
- Tilden MS: +160
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WJ Cluster CIP Projects to address growth

**Ashburton ES**
- Addition opens August 2020 and increases capacity from 629 to 881, opening August 2020

**Farmland ES**
- Revitalization/expansion opened in August 2011 and increased capacity from 617 to 728

**Garrett Park ES**
- Revitalization/expansion opened in January 2012 and increased capacity from 478 to 753
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WJ Cluster CIP Projects to address growth

Kensington-Parkwood ES
- Addition opens August 2018 and increases capacity from 472 to 746

Luxmanor ES
- Revitalization/expansion opens in January 2020 and increases capacity from 428 to 745

Wyngate ES
- Addition opened in August 2013 and increased capacity from 421 to 777
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WJ Cluster CIP Projects to address growth

**Walter Johnson HS**
- Feasibility study for addition underway. Capacity could increase from 2,335 to up to 3,200, pending recommendation in fall 2015 in FY 2017–2022 CIP.

**North Bethesda MS**
- Addition opens in August 2018 and increases capacity from 874 to 1,208.

**Tilden MS**
- Revitalization/expansion opens in August 2020 and increases capacity from 972 to 1,200. Project includes collocation with Rock Terrace School.
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WJ Cluster Enrollment Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Actual Enrollment</th>
<th>Projected Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton ES</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment Projection</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Space Available/Deficit</td>
<td>-263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland ES</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment Projection</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Space Available/Deficit</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Park ES</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment Projection</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Space Available/Deficit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be updated end of October, 2015
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### WJ Cluster Enrollment Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Actual Enrollment</th>
<th></th>
<th>Projected Enrollment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kensington-Parkwood ES</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment Projection</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Space Available/Deficit</td>
<td>-182</td>
<td>-170</td>
<td>-184</td>
<td>-174</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addition opens in August 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxmanor</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment Projection</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Space Available/Deficit</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-91</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revitalization/Expansion opens in January 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyngate ES</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment Projection</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Space Available/Deficit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To be updated end of October, 2015*
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**WJ Cluster Enrollment Projections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Actual Enrollment 2014-15</th>
<th>Projected Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walter Johnson HS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Projection</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Available/Deficit</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility study for addition in FY 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Bethesda MS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Projection</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>1,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Available/Deficit</td>
<td>-77</td>
<td>-157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tilden MS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Projection</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Available/Deficit</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tilden REV/EX includes collocation of Rock Terrace in August 2020.

To be updated end of October, 2015
Rock Spring Master Plan & White Flint 2 Sector Plan

Options for addressing additional enrollment increases

- Reopen a closed school in the cluster. Closed schools in public ownership include the former:
  - Alta Vista ES
  - Montrose ES
  - Arylawn ES
  - Kensington ES

- The former Grosvenor ES is not included since it is used as a elementary school holding school for schools undergoing revitalization/expansion.

- The former Woodward HS is not included since it will be used for a middle school holding center when Tilden MS vacates the building in August 2020.
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Options for addressing additional enrollment increases

- Construct a new school on a future school site. One future elementary school site and an alternative elementary site, are identified in the White Flint Sector Plan.

- Purchase land for a school.

- Consider nontraditional options, including those being studied by the Cross-agency Work Group on School Design.
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New Housing Development and Its Impact on Schools

- Most of the enrollment growth in the Walter Johnson cluster, and county, is due to turnover of existing housing. New housing adds additional students.

- Most new development in the Walter Johnson cluster is mid-rise and high-rise in nature.
Recently occupied, and older mid-rise and high-rise housing units in the Walter Johnson cluster are reviewed each year to determine how many public school students are residing in these units.

In addition to collecting information on the number of students in existing housing units, MCPS works with the Montgomery County Planning Department to determine average student generation rates for housing in sub-areas of the County.

This sub-area information is used in facility planning.
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### Student Generation Rates by Housing Type – Southwest Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Mid-rise (less than 5 floors)</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily High-rise (5 or more floors)</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Walter Johnson School Cluster

New Housing Development and Its Impact on Schools

The 2014-15 review of multi-family housing in the Walter Johnson cluster found the following numbers of students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mid-rise units (1,078 units in 4 mid-rise multi-family complexes)</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student generation rate</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avalon  No. Bethesda Market West  White Flint Station  Strathmore Court
The 2014-15 review of multi-family housing in the Walter Johnson cluster found the following numbers of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-rise units (4,934 units in 10 high-rise multi-family complexes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student generation rate</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grosvenor Park
The Grande
The Gallery
Wentworth

Inigo's Crossing
Meridian
The Sterling
The Monterey
Midtown
To assist enrollment forecasting, older and new multi-family housing is sampled each year to determine if changes are occurring in the number of school-age children residing in these units.

**PerSei (Pike & Rose)**
The recently completed and 95% occupied PerSei was reviewed this Fall. PerSei has 174 mid-rise multi-family apartment units. The following number of students are enrolled in MCPS from the PerSei:

- K – 5 students = 4 students  \((yield\ rate\ .023)\)
- 6 – 8 students = 0 students  \((yield\ rate\ 0)\)
- 9 – 12 students = 1 student  \((yield\ rate\ .006)\)
MCPS is engaged in master plans and sector plans through ongoing collaboration with Montgomery County planners.

The MCPS role includes:

- Providing Montgomery County planners with information on school projections and capital projects to address space deficits.

- Providing estimates of the number of students that would be generated by various housing scenarios developed by Montgomery County planners during the master plan process.

- Requesting a school site(s) be designated in plans when the number of students estimated is sufficiently large to justify this requirement.
MCPS also provides cluster enrollment projections and utilization levels for use in the Subdivision Staging Policy (SSP) Annual School Test.

The annual school test provides a mechanism for regulating housing approvals based on school utilization, and obtaining school facility payments to help construct new capacity.
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Adequacy Public Facilities Ordinance and the Regulatory Environment

Ms. Pamela Dunn, Acting Chief
Functional Planning & Policy Division
Montgomery Planning Department
Subdivision Staging Policy

- The Subdivision Staging Policy (SSP) defines school adequacy and sets the rules for conducting the Annual School Test.

- Subdivision Staging Policy is quadrennial – the next SSP will be adopted in 2016. Kick-off meeting on October 19th.

- Annual school test is conducted each fiscal year to evaluate projected enrollment and projected capacity for each school cluster at each school level.

- School adequacy is based on projected school capacity and projected enrollment.
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Subdivision Staging Policy

- Projected enrollment/projected capacity = utilization rate.

- School capacity is defined as MCPS program capacity, which is the number of students planned per classroom per school level based on curriculum standards.

- Planned school capacity is the capacity funded in the 6-year Capital Improvements Program.

- When utilization levels exceed 105% a payment is required for development to proceed. When utilization exceeds 120% a moratorium is imposed.
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Subdivision Staging Policy

- Student generation rates - NEW methodology developed in cooperation between Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) and Montgomery County Planning.

- Two major inputs:
  - Student addresses with grade-level information (confidential information removed)
  - Parcel file data with residential structure information
Subdivision Staging Policy

- New Student Generation Rate Calculation:
  - Student addresses were spatially mapped or geocoded.
  - Of the 149,238 student addresses only 2.4% were not geocoded.
  - Addresses were then matched to structure type information from the parcel file.
  
  - Structure types include:
    - single-family detached,
    - single-family attached,
    - mid-rise multi-family (four or fewer floors), and
    - high-rise multi-family (five or more floors).

  - Structures also had to meet the following conditions to be included:
    - single-family detached and attached units built in the last 10 years to reflect the demographics of new construction,
    - multi-family units built any year to better estimate this housing type’s impact over time.
New student generation rates:

Student addresses designated by housing type were separated by school level: elementary, middle, high. The student generation rate for each school level was then calculated by:

\[
\text{dividing the number of students by } \text{housing type } x \text{ units}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School (grades 9 to 12) Student Residence Type</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parcel File Count of Unit Type</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family High Rise (all periods)</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>50,675</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Low to Mid Rise (all periods)</td>
<td>5,917</td>
<td>76,915</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached (last ten years)</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>6,529</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached (last ten years)</td>
<td>1,971</td>
<td>10,361</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Subdivision Staging Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Sources:</th>
<th>New Method</th>
<th>2008 CUS Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual MCPS student address matched to parcel structure-type information</td>
<td>Household Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149,283 addresses, 97.6% geocoding success</td>
<td>22,500 CUS forms, 54% response rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Exceptions:</td>
<td>Single-family attached or detached units:</td>
<td>Households:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure built in the last ten years</td>
<td>Households moved within or into the County five years prior to the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Their associated generation rates better reflect the demographics associated with new single-family construction</td>
<td>Their associated generation rates reflect the demographics associated with new residential construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-family units:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structures built any year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Their associated generation rates better estimate of the full impact of this housing type over time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarities</td>
<td>The calculation deriving a student generation rate was the same in both approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determine the number of students by school level and housing type and then divide this sum by the corresponding number of housing units by type in the County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A development impact tax, set by the Montgomery County Council, is assessed on new residential and commercial buildings, and additions to commercial buildings in the County to fund, in part, the improvements necessary to increase the transportation or public school systems.

The Department of Permitting Services (DPS) is charged with collection of Development Impact Taxes. Development Impact Taxes must be paid before a building permit or use & occupancy permit is issued.

School Impact Tax represents 90% of the cost of a student seat generated by the new unit.

- Single-family detached $26,827
- Single-family attached $20,198
- Multifamily Mid-rise $12,765
- Multifamily High-rise $5,412
Subdivision Staging Policy

- School Facility Payment requires payment of an additional 60% of the cost of a student seat per unit for each school level over 105% utilization.

- The School Facility Payment and the School Impact Tax vary by school level based on the construction cost of a student seat for the applicable school type and by dwelling unit type based on the rate at which different unit types generate students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Cost per student</th>
<th>student generation rate/school level/unit type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single Family Detached [SFD]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Generation Rate x Cost of</td>
<td>$19,439</td>
<td>0.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Generation Rate x Cost of Seat</td>
<td>$21,250</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Generation Rate x Cost of Seat</td>
<td>$24,375</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES facilities payment</td>
<td>$6,940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS facilities payment</td>
<td>$3,251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS facilities payment</td>
<td>$4,631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities payment if 3 school levels are</td>
<td>$14,822</td>
<td>$8,657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Subdivision Staging Policy

- School Impact Tax – funds school CIP  
  (source Mont. Co. Department of Finance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Fiscal Year ended:</th>
<th>School Impact Tax Collections for School CIP Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$434,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$7,695,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$6,960,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$9,562,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$6,766,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$7,925,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$11,473,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$14,480,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$16,462,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$27,901,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$45,837,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$32,676,773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Facility Payment — (source Mont. Co. Department of Finance)

funds capital improvements within a specific school cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Fiscal Year Ended</th>
<th>School Facility Payments within the WJ Cluster</th>
<th>Total School Facility Payment Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$163,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$237,600</td>
<td>$2,008,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$577,684</td>
<td>$1,967,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rock Spring Master Plan & White Flint 2 Sector Plan

Summary

Montgomery County Public Schools/Board of Education

- Re-open closed school sites
- Build additions to schools capable of expansion
- Re-district school boundaries
- Construct new schools

Planning Department/Planning Board

- Recommend master plans that address long term development and school facility needs.
- Recommend modifications to the standards for approving new development set by the Subdivision Staging Policy.
- Approve only subdivisions and site plans that meet the adequacy standards set under the APFO.
- Recommend to the County Executive and County Council public facilities that should be prioritized for inclusion in the County’s CIP.

Montgomery County Council

- Approve master plans to guide future development.
- Establish standards through the Subdivision Staging Policy (SSP) for the MCPB to use in approving new development
- Program community facilities in the CIP.
- Raises $$ to fund capital projects (taxes; required developer contributions; State aid)
Rock Spring Master Plan & White Flint 2 Sector Plan

Next Steps

Master Plan Program
Pre-planning continues for Rock Spring and White Flint 2: data collection; meetings with stakeholders (e.g., civic groups, property owners, PTAs, MCPS, etc.); development of potential land use scenarios that will consider both traffic impacts and potential student generation. (Recommendations in the draft plans would address both impacts.)

Rock Spring Park Master Plan
- October 8: Planning Board reviews draft Rock Spring Scope of Work.
- October-December: Community meetings-Topics TBD

White Flint 2 Sector Plan
- October 14 (tentative): Community meeting - topics TBD
- November-December: Community meetings - topics TBD

School Facility Planning
- October/November: Superintendent's Recommended CIP for 2017-22

Regulatory/Adequate Public Facilities Test
- October 19: Kick-off meeting re: update to Subdivision Staging Policy (SSP)
Public Comments