Subdivision Staging Policy – Transportation Elements

Transportation Community Meeting
March 15, 2016
PROPOSED CHANGES TO TRANSPORTATION ADEQUACY TESTS

Staff proposes several changes and revisions pertaining to the application of the Transportation Policy Area Review (TPAR) and Local Area Transportation Policy Area Review (LATR) tests to better incentivize efficient growth, encourage multi-modal mobility solutions and streamline the development review process.
Using Three Metrics to Group Places

Note: Relevant data for Germantown TC & Shady Grove MSPA unavailable.
Example Grouping of Policy Areas

Core, or Corridor with Metrorail

Friendship Heights
Silver Spring CBD
Bethesda CBD
Twinbrook
White Flint

Corridor with Metrorail, Purple Line, or CCT

Grosvenor
Wheaton CBD
Rockville Town Center
Chevy Chase Lake
Glenmont
R&D Village
Long Branch
Takoma Langley

Silver Spring / Takoma
North Bethesda
Bethesda / Chevy Chase
Kensington / Wheaton
Germantown Town Center
Study Grove MSIA

Emerging TOD Area, with planned CCT
Clarksburg TC

Residential Communities

Rockville City
Derwood
Aspen Hill
White Oak
MV/Airpark
Gaithersburg City
Cloverly
Potomac
Germantown West
North Potomac
Fairland Colesville
Clarksburg
Germantown East
Olney
Damascus

Rural Communities

Rural East
Rural West
Comparing Example Grouping with 1993 General Plan Refinement

Example Grouping of Policy Areas

1993 General Plan Refinement

Map Produced by the Montgomery County Planning Department
Information Technology & Innovation Division (IT)
March 10, 2016
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## Framework

### Core, or Corridor with Metrorail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Test</th>
<th>Area Payment</th>
<th>Local Test</th>
<th>Local Payment</th>
<th>Impact Tax</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All or Portion of Impact Tax Allocated to Policy Area?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1,800) – Denotes current CLV standard

- Friendship Heights (1,800)
- Silver Spring CBD (1,800)
- Bethesda CBD (1,800)
- Twinbrook (1,800)
- White Flint (1,800)
## Corridor with Metrorail, Purple Line, or CCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>Screen</th>
<th>Evaluate</th>
<th>Mitigate</th>
<th>Impact Tax</th>
<th>Mitigation Payment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grosvenor (1,800)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Spring / Takoma (1,600)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton CBD (1,800)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bethesda (1,550)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockville Town Center (1,800)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda / Chevy Chase (1,600)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevy Chase Lake (1,600)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington / Wheaton (1,600)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenmont (1,800)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D Village (1,450)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Branch (1,600)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoma Langley (1,600)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germantown Town Center (1,600)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Grove (1,800)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Type &gt;&gt;</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Trips</td>
<td>1600 clv or 1800 clv for mspa</td>
<td>Job Access by Transit</td>
<td>25% of Impact Tax</td>
<td>25% of Impact Tax</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1,800) – Denotes current CLV standard
Emerging TOD, with planned CCT

Clarksburg TC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Type &gt;&gt;</th>
<th>Screen</th>
<th>Evaluate</th>
<th>Mitigate</th>
<th>Impact Tax</th>
<th>Mitigation Payment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Trips</td>
<td>1500 clv Job Access by Transit</td>
<td>25% of Impact Tax</td>
<td>25% of Impact Tax</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Residential Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Type &gt;&gt;</th>
<th>Screen</th>
<th>Evaluate</th>
<th>Mitigate</th>
<th>Impact Tax</th>
<th>Mitigation Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local Area</td>
<td>Mitigate Unless Road Code Area where design standards to promote ped/bike travel apply (25% of Impact Tax)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No – Unless Road Code Area where design standards to promote ped/bike travel apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Trips</td>
<td>1500 clv Job Access by Transit</td>
<td>Mitigate Unless Road Code Area where design standards to promote ped/bike travel apply (25% of Impact Tax)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mitigation Payment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1,500) – Denotes current CLV standard

* Retain @ 1600 CLV per prevailing County Policy

** Retain @ 1425 CLV to distinguish from proposed Clarksburg TC Policy area
### Example of how different metrics can be applied ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Measurement Tool</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Potential Application in Planning Department</th>
<th>CIP – programming guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility - Jobs &amp; Person Trips Accessible within 45 Minutes by Mode</td>
<td>Travel/4 (for all modes) &amp; GIS based analysis for transit, walk, &amp; bike</td>
<td>Under Development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Roadway &amp; Transit Mobility – TPAR</td>
<td>Travel/4 (for all modes) &amp; Post Processing</td>
<td>Refinement Underway</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Delay - Person Delay by Mode</td>
<td>CLV/Synchro/HCM</td>
<td>Application Under Development</td>
<td>Yes - Major Projects Only?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLV Level</td>
<td>CLV/Synchro</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes – In Specific Areas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Setting a Threshold for Job Accessibility as the Area Test

One Potential Approach (Example Only)

Policy Area Average/Group Average + Policy Area Average/ County Average = Job Access Composite

Job Access Composite > 2 = Policy Area that Passes Area Test Until Next Assessment (every 2 Years)

Variable is jobs in region within 45 minutes via transit (including walk access)

Theoretically, more Policy Areas pass as more high quality transit comes on line and/or more jobs locate in more transit accessible areas.

Another Potential Approach (Example Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>30 Min</th>
<th>45 Min</th>
<th>60 Min</th>
<th>90 Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable is minimum % of jobs in region accessible in X time by transit.

Policy Area has to exceed all four thresholds to “pass”
Area-Wide Transportation Test

Current Process:
Transportation Policy Area Review (Disaggregation by Individual Roadways)

Adequacy of the Main Roads
County-wide Summary (TPAR 12-3A2):
2022 Development Forecasts with
2018 CIP/CTP + "Conditional Transit Hdyw"

Guidance to reviewers to help better understand these Charts

Note 1: The bars show the range of PM Peak Period Congested Speed relative to "Free Flow Speed" for arterial segments in the Policy Area:
(1) averaged by direction of flow, and
(2) weighted by the Vehicle-Miles-Traveled.

Note 2: Bottom-of-Bar is the average for the Peak Flow Direction, while the Top-of-Bar is the average for the Non-Peak Flow Direction

Note 3: Policy Area sequence left-to-right is in order of their increasing 2010 transit "Coverage"
**Adequacy of the Main Roads in Fairland White Oak (FWO) (TPAR12-3A): 2022 Development Forecasts with 2018 CIP/CTP + “Conditional Transit Hdwy”**

**Proposed Policy Area Adequacy Standard**

**Note 1:** The bars show the range of PM Peak Period Congested Speed relative to “Free Flow Speed” for arterial segments in the Policy Area: (1) averaged by direction of flow, and (2) weighted by the Vehicle-Miles-Traveled.

**Note 2:** Bottom-of-Bar is the average for the Peak Flow Direction, while the Top-of-Bar is the average for the Non-Peak Flow Direction.

**Note 3:** Roadway sequence left-to-right is in order of their increasing peak-flow avg. congestion.

**Analysis Combinations**

- Dev. Forecast
- Network
- F12-2022
- T12-2022-06
- -
- -

**Guidance to reviewers to help better understand these Charts**
AREA-WIDE TRANSPORTATION TEST

Proposed Process:
Transit Accessibility to Jobs