

**MEMORANDUM**

September 23, 2021

TO: Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee

FROM: Glenn Orlin, Senior Analyst

SUBJECT: Thrive Montgomery 2050<sup>1</sup>

PURPOSE: Worksession to review the Fiscal Impact Statement

**Councilmembers may wish to bring their copy of Thrive to the meeting.**

This is the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee's fifth worksession on the Planning Board's Thrive Montgomery 2050 Draft Plan. During this worksession the Committee will be reviewing the Fiscal Impact Statement (FIS) prepared by the Office of Management and Budget with significant input from several Executive Branch offices and departments. There is no action to be taken by the Committee on the FIS. It attempts to provide a fiscal context to the recommendations contained in Thrive.

The FIS is on ©1-38. The Planning Director's comments on the semi-final draft of the FIS is on ©39-41. The worksession will start with a briefing by OMB on its FIS. The Planning Board Chair and Director likely will want to comment on it. Council staff's summary and comments are provided below.

Summary and Comments

The FIS attempts to show the net fiscal effect of the recommendations in Thrive compared to the aggregate recommendations in master and sector plans approved to date. Given the general nature of many of Thrive's recommendations, and the fact that precise cost estimates are not available, OMB and the Executive Branch departments needed to base their calculations on very rough assumptions, most of which are described in the FIS. Typically, such figures underestimate the true cost.

OMB calculates the net additional County capital cost attributable to Thrive to be \$8,187.4 million, and total net added capital cost (including State and private costs) to be \$8,915.5 million. Net additional annual operating cost to the County is \$426.5 million; including State and private costs the increase in annual operating expenses would be \$596.4 million.

---

<sup>1</sup> Key words: #General Plan, Thrive.

There are some elements of the FIS which Council staff believes should not be included:

- *Bus service in the Agricultural Reserve.* Chapter 1 of Thrive has this recommendation: “Improve access to the Agricultural Reserve for the public to experience and directly benefit from this valuable resource for locally grown food, outdoor recreation, and tourism” (p. 33). The Department of Transportation (DOT) interpreted “improve access” to mean to provide bus service to the Reserve with 8 additional routes and a depot to house and maintain the buses. The Planning Director clarified that the Board was not literally recommending better physical access, but to increase public awareness and enjoyment through better communication/marketing and education in the Reserve.

Therefore, the FIS should delete \$123.6 million in County capital costs and \$15.9 million in County annual operating costs. To avoid confusion, the start of the last bullet on page 33 could be revised to read: “Improve awareness of [and access to] the Agricultural Reserve ...”

- *Bus rapid transit service.* The map on Page 31 includes three Growth Corridors that do not have existing or planned high quality transit, i.e., Metrorail, light rail, or bus rapid transit: River Road between the District of Columbia and Potomac Village, Connecticut Avenue between the District of Columbia and Georgia Avenue in Aspen Hill, and University Boulevard between Veirs Mill Road in Wheaton and Connecticut Avenue in Kensington. DOT assumed BRT service on these routes as a recommendation of Thrive.

However, the PHED Committee’s recommendation is to curtail the River Road Growth Corridor at the Beltway. DOT estimates that the County’s and State’s capital cost should be reduced by \$99.1 million each (DOT assumes the capital cost would be split 50/50) and the County’s annual operating cost should be reduced by \$3.2 million.

The FIS also includes \$115.4 million—also split evenly between the County and State—to reconstruct US 29 to include a dedicated bus lane in most sections between Burtonsville and Silver Spring. (This study for this next phase of the US 29 FLASH service has been programmed the CIP.) However, since the Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan (adopted 2013) calls for such a facility, it is not a new recommendation in Thrive. Therefore, the County and State net capital costs due to Thrive should each be reduced by \$57.7 million, and the County’s annual operating expense associated with this improvement (\$1.8 million) should be also be deleted.

- *New roads and widenings.* Chapter 4 of Thrive recommends: “Stop planning or constructing new highways and major road widenings” (p. 80). The FIS displays master-planned but unbuilt new County and State highways and road widenings in Appendix A2 (©31-33). The savings from not building these improvements is shown as \$1,304.7 million and \$4,547.9 million in County and State capital costs, respectively, and \$3.1 million each in County and State annual maintenance costs. However, DOT interpreted that “major road widenings” do not include widening a 2- or 3-lane road to 4 lanes, so those costs were not deducted. If they were instead to be considered as major road widenings, then there would

be a further reduction of \$1,516.0 million and \$1,035.4 million in County and State capital costs, respectively, and \$2.5 million and \$1.7 million in County and State annual maintenance costs, respectively.

A summary of Council staff's calculation of Thrive's fiscal impact is shown below (\$ millions):

	Capital Cost				Annual Operating Cost			
	County	State	Private	Total	County	State	Private	Total
<i>Executive Branch's FIS</i>	8187.4	-1190.6	1918.7	8915.5	426.5	81.7	88.2	596.4
Bus Service to Ag Reserve	-123.6	0	0	-123.6	-15.9	0	0	-15.9
BRT Service	-156.8	-156.8	0	-313.6	-5.0	0	0	-5.0
<b>Revised FIS</b>	<b>7907.0</b>	<b>-1347.4</b>	<b>1918.7</b>	<b>8478.3</b>	<b>405.6</b>	<b>81.7</b>	<b>88.2</b>	<b>575.5</b>
No widenings to 4 lanes	-1516.0	-1035.4	0	-2551.4	-2.5	-1.7	0	-4.2
<b>Revised FIS, no 4-lane widening</b>	<b>6391.0</b>	<b>-2382.8</b>	<b>1918.7</b>	<b>5926.9</b>	<b>403.1</b>	<b>80.0</b>	<b>88.2</b>	<b>571.3</b>

Most of the FIS estimates for non-transportation elements of Thrive are calculated based on the assumption that of the 200,000 new households that are projected, 10% of them represent a net increase in new households that would occur due to Thrive. There is likely enough countywide zoning capacity to accommodate 200,000 new households but Thrive posits that much of it is in the wrong place, not concentrated in centers that are (or will be) well served by high-quality transit service. If the future master and sector plans were to be downzoned equal to the amount the centers would be upzoned, then it is likely that there would be little of no fiscal impact, and possibly even a positive fiscal effect. On the other hand, if significantly more housing is to occur in and around the centers without offsetting it with a similar reduction in development capacity elsewhere, then a negative fiscal much impact much greater is likely than was calculated using OMB's assumption. Without more information, Council staff believes OMB's 10% assumption is as appropriate as any.

The net additional amount of housing added is important because, with few exceptions (high rise, senior housing, and "McMansions"), housing increases the cost of County services more than County revenue generated from them to pay for those services. The largest cost County service per household is for public schools, of course, but the costs for Montgomery College, police and fire services, parks and recreation, libraries and cultural centers, health and human services, and other County services also contribute. For example, an economic impact analysis of the Glenmont Sector Plan in 2013 showed that adding about 7,900 more dwelling units there would generate \$5 million more in annual operating costs than the revenue generated from those units. Furthermore, the fiscal impact statement for the Glenmont Plan identified about \$23 million more in capital costs for parks and local area transportation improvements.

**Conclusion.** Assuming the lowest cost scenario noted above, Thrive would increase the County's capital costs by about \$6.4 billion over the next 29 years. Spread evenly between now and 2050, this translates to an additional fiscal burden of about \$220 million annually (in 2021 dollars), not including debt service. The total increased burden, including the increase in net operating costs, would be \$623 million annually, which is equal to raising the County's annual budget by about 12%. As heavy a lift as this would be, it will be even heavier, since it is unlikely that the aggregate recommendations in *current* master plans are sustainable. In transportation

alone, current master plans call for multiple billions to build out the master-planned BRT system (even with the optimistic assumption that the State will pay half), and a \$6.5 billion investment in the County's bikeway network.

Some Councilmembers have expressed the need to render the County's capital improvements sustainable over the longer term. Over past decades there has been little attention paid to the fiscal viability of master plan recommendations. They are examined briefly as each plan comes before the Council, but there has been no accounting of how large the aggregate burden has become. A starting point would be to conduct a similar analysis of the aggregate economic impact of approved master and sector plans.

## **Thrive Montgomery 2050 General Plan Fiscal Impact Statement**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The Thrive Montgomery 2050 general plan is “a comprehensive framework for guiding physical development and managing limited resources in Montgomery County, Maryland. It is a policy document whose concepts are general in nature. As the County's longest-range and most visionary document, it provides a broad image of how the County will evolve in the future and establishes a frame of reference for decisions to make that vision become a reality.”<sup>1</sup>

Thrive Montgomery defines the basic land use setting for all public and private actions in the County. This plan outlines issues and ways to address them but does not include zoning recommendations or other specific land use guidance in targeted geographic areas or discrete subjects such as transportation networks.”<sup>2</sup> As such, the document provides mostly a conceptual framework as opposed to specific recommendations which makes it challenging to provide a meaningful fiscal analysis.

To determine the fiscal impact of the proposed Thrive plan, the Office of Management and Budget considered several factors:

- A detailed analysis of the component recommendations of the Thrive plan and the related action plan to determine, where possible, what kinds of fiscal impacts would be implied.
- Data provided by the Police Department, Fire and Rescue Service, the Department of Transportation, Libraries, Recreation, the Office on Agriculture, and the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission;
- Complete community service gaps for County libraries and recreation facilities;
- The number and size of parks within a one-mile radius from the centers of activity; and
- Fiscal factors related to the ability to accommodate the projected growth in County population.

Due to the vague, conceptual nature of the plan language, it is not possible to provide a traditional fiscal analysis, but we can provide examples of potential cost ranges and the direction of potential fiscal impacts. The most concrete Thrive plan recommendations related to providing transportation connections and community gathering spaces such as parks and recreation centers to facilitate the concept of “15-minute living” and complete communities. As such, OMB worked with these departments to consider fiscal analysis case studies in Silver Spring and Aspen Hill. However, even this activity was difficult since there was a question of whether the

---

<sup>1</sup> See page 4, Approved and Adopted General Plan Refinement of the Goals & Objectives for Montgomery County, December 1993. 300-2 ([montgomeryplanning.org](http://montgomeryplanning.org))

<sup>2</sup> See page 4, Thrive Montgomery 2050, Planning Board Draft, April 2021. [Thrive-PlanningBoard-Draft-web.pdf](http://Thrive-PlanningBoard-Draft-web.pdf) ([montgomeryplanning.org](http://montgomeryplanning.org))

analysis should consider only the centers of activity (yet to be clearly defined) or the whole planning area.

To provide any fiscal estimates, it is necessary to make a considerable number of assumptions which are referenced below. For example, as in most master plan fiscal impact analyses, no costs for land or right of way purchases have been included. Transportation project costs are based on average costs for similar projects or assets<sup>3</sup> (i.e. per bus, per lane mile, etc.) times an assumed quantity, with a relatively small allowance for utility relocations assumed. All cost and revenue estimates are in current dollars since it is unknown when various changes will occur. Operating costs reflect only an annual cost to operate. There were also a number of instances where the type of work cited seemed consistent with a department or agency's core work – just with a slightly different focus. In those cases, we estimated that there would be no fiscal impact to complete those functions. The Office of Management and Budget can provide additional analyses if the County Council would like OMB to consider the fiscal impacts of alternative assumptions or Council plan amendments.

In many cases, excessive speculative assumptions would be required to provide fiscal impacts. For instance, there will undoubtedly be many additional costs to provide complete communities throughout the County as opposed to just in the Aspen Hill and Silver Spring areas focused on in the case studies. Likewise, if more housing and commercial property is developed, property taxes will increase – but without knowing the type of new development it would be difficult to predict how property values will change. Similarly, many of the standards needed to implement this plan are yet to be determined. Specific guidance is unavailable as to whether the “complete communities” standard will apply only in centers of activity or throughout most of the County. As a result, it is clear that we are understating the costs and revenues implied in the Thrive plan.

## **FISCAL ANALYSIS OF THRIVE PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTION PLAN**

OMB, in consultation with County department and agency staff, evaluated each of the plan's recommendations and action plan items to develop Countywide estimates of Thrive related cost increases or savings. As previously noted, there were many items that were not able to be estimated due to a lack of clear assumptions – so it is reasonable to assume that these figures are understated. In particular, the Thrive plan's recommendations related to complete communities would have required extensive work to provide an estimate for the full County. To approximate potential Countywide impacts, we have assumed that similar costs would be incurred in small, medium, and large centers of activity without recently updated master plans. To provide an indication of the likely direction and magnitude of Thrive related costs and savings, OMB instead prepared a case study for the Silver Spring and Aspen Hill centers of activity. A number of the recommendations stated similar concepts in multiple sections of the plan. In those cases, an effort was made to account for those costs or savings only in one place to avoid double counting. An effort was also made to reflect only the incremental costs of the Thrive plan (i.e. Pedestrian projects already included in approved master plans were not

---

<sup>3</sup> The per unit costs used by the Department of Transportation are included in Appendix A.

considered costs of the Thrive plan.) With that said, the costs to achieve the full Thrive vision would also require unbuilt but already approved master plan elements to be funded. The Thrive plan also assumed that the Climate Action Plan (CAP) would be integrated into Thrive. This fiscal impact statement excludes costs for Thrive plan recommendations that are also part of the CAP, consistent with our approach to costs related to recommendations that are also included in already approved master plans.

As this fiscal impact statement was being prepared, OMB received comments regarding the possibility of having savings related to concentrating development more densely. The most significant savings OMB identified related to eliminating plans to build major highways and/or to widen roadways as itemized later. Costs for water and sewer were proposed as another area where savings might be possible. In general, this fiscal impact statement includes information regarding the County's costs related to the plan; however, water and sewer costs are typically borne by developers. In addition, it is not always true that more dense, infill development is cheaper than sprawl infrastructure. For example, in more densely developed areas, there may be additional costs for more expensive right of way, utility relocations, and investments needed to increase water and sewer capacity. The specific economics would need to be considered on a case by case basis. A suggestion was also made that current stormwater management problems that exist may be addressed at no cost to the County through the development spurred by the Thrive general plan. This may be true – but as noted in the population growth section below – it is difficult to say what portion of the development would occur due to Thrive plan changes and how that correlates to addressing existing drainage problems.

In summary, the one-time net Countywide costs of the Thrive plan recommendations that could be assessed are approximately \$8.16 billion. (See Appendix A1 for an itemization of possible cost estimates.) These costs would be much higher (over \$2 billion) if it were not for savings related to assumed cancellation of highway construction and road widening projects. State and Federal Aid is estimated to decrease overall by \$4.1 billion primarily related to an estimated \$4.5 billion in reduced funding for highway construction and road widening, offset partially by increased support for transit projects (\$429.8 million). Private funding of \$120 million is also assumed. Ongoing, annual plan costs expressed in current dollars are estimated to be \$333.8 million. These net operating costs reflect savings of \$3.1 million related to road projects that will not occur.

Many of the action plan items were assumed to be part of the routine agency and department's work efforts. This was particularly true for M-NCPPC, the agency that would be leading the vast majority of the action plan items. One-time costs related to the action plan are estimated to be \$31,750,000 – with \$30 million of these costs related to expanding MARC Brunswick capacity and Shady Grove and White Flint station locations. Ongoing costs for this MARC service would be funded by the State.

Issues worth pointing out include:

- Detailed Countywide Complete Community costs are not included in these figures due to the lack of clarity on specific standards to be applied and the level of effort

required to do this analysis. The Thrive plan is clearest in describing transportation and park goals. A lack of specificity made it more difficult – or impossible – to estimate Thrive related costs for other community factors.

- Savings related to cancelling construction of new master planned roads or road widenings (\$1.3 billion in one-time savings and \$3.1 million in annual operating savings) provide a significant offset to increased costs in other areas. The net plan costs listed above are net of these cost savings. (A list of road projects presumed for estimating purposes to be cancelled is provided in Appendix A2).
- One-time costs for Transit improvements (\$1,845.1 million) with ongoing costs of \$326.1 million.
- One-time costs for microgrid capabilities in support of non-polluting transit vehicles is \$300 million, with the potential for private partnerships, and ongoing costs of \$8.4 million.
- The theme of creating walkable communities with preference for pedestrians and rollers was captured in a number of recommendations. Case study analyses of the cost of these recommendations in Aspen Hill (\$827 million) and Silver Spring (nearly \$200 million) were significant. In consultation with Council staff, if these costs are extrapolated out to reflect similar costs in other areas of the County with older master plans, costs for these improvements could be \$1 billion, \$3.3 billion, and \$3.3 billion, respectively, in large, medium and small centers of activity.
- At an annual cost of \$3.1 million a larger and more proactive traffic calming program was presumed to be ten times the scale of the existing program, though this may be underestimating the true scale of needs toward achieving roads that self-enforce slower speeds.

The summary of a more detailed analysis provided to Council staff is attached in Appendix A1.

## **COMPLETE COMMUNITIES ANALYSIS**

A major component of the Thrive plan is the creation of complete, compact communities with mixed residential and commercial uses, allowing residents to be connected to retail and other services. Sometimes identified as 15-minute living, these communities will allow access to basic, day-to-day services within a 15-minute walk, bike, or roll. As presented in the draft report (on page 31), Thrive Montgomery shows a list of 32 potential centers of activity and classifies these centers of activity into four groups: large centers, medium centers, small centers, and villages. The centers of activity shown in the report are not exhaustive of all existing or potential centers. The Thrive plan provides that these centers will be developed consistent with their relative sizes and with their location on the Growth map. As noted earlier, the FIS does not attempt to provide financial estimates for all Complete Communities countywide.

To conduct a fiscal analysis of the Thrive plan as it relates to the whole County would have been costly and speculative given the limited specifics provided in the plan. In consultation with M-NCPPC, Council and Executive staff, the Office of Management and Budget undertook an analysis of two of the plan's centers of activity as case studies of the kinds of fiscal impacts



that could result from adoption of the plan. Aspen Hill (small center) and Silver Spring (large center) were chosen for the case studies since they represented different size centers, the master plans for these areas had not been significantly updated recently, and they reflected the diverse demographic trend that the County has experienced.

To analyze the cost of complete communities, OMB worked with departments and M-NCPPC staff to do case studies of the Aspen Hill and Silver Spring centers of activity. OMB had assumed the case studies would include the whole planning areas, but as we worked on the Aspen Hill analysis with M-NCPPC, their analysis focused much more narrowly on the area immediately around the Minor Master Plan amendment area. Through these discussions, it was clear that more clarity will be needed to understand to what extent the Complete Community standards vary throughout the County.

### **Silver Spring**

- Transportation –
  - o To ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings and supported by a public realm that is supportive of walk/bike/rolling and social interaction, DOT estimates that nearly \$200 million will be needed to reconstruct various roadways in the Silver Spring area. The estimated capital investment from the County is likely to leverage \$38.3 million from the State and \$14.3 million from Federal funds. These amounts account for expanded art & recreational opportunities along transportation facilities, which may notably expand the scope of DOT facilities.
- Montgomery Parks –
  - o Two additional parks (Site #8 and 11) could be included to achieve the complete community goal. Park location #8 is 1.62 acres and location #11 is 1.7 acres.
  - o Parks staff estimates capital costs at approximately \$3,000,000 per acre (\$62.02 per sf). Under this scenario, the total capital cost for constructing these two parks would be roughly \$10,000,000, and the operating costs would be approximately \$46,200 per year.
  - o The cost estimate does not include land acquisition, demolition, or developer contributions/improvements.
  - o Existing parks will likely be further developed with additional facilities and multi-functioning facilities (i.e., multi-use court) to serve the daily needs (i.e., a dog park) of the people who live in a complete community.
- Police –
  - o The current Silver Spring CBD Sector Plan was adopted in 2000 and much growth and development in the CBD area has since been achieved, including the relocation of the police station from Sligo Avenue to White Oak and the construction of a new fire station on Georgia Avenue.
  - o Police services are currently delivered through the 3<sup>rd</sup> District station in White Oak, and to better serve the needs of the growing CBD community, there is also a small police facility within Fire Station #1 on Georgia Avenue.
  - o To meet the goals of the growth and development projections of the Thrive Montgomery plan, Silver Spring would need a substation-sized facility,

approximately 15,000 sq ft., with 70 personnel. Assuming construction costs of \$400/square foot, a rudimentary cost estimates for a substation would be \$6 million. Four stations (1, 2, 16, 19) currently serve the Silver Spring business district.

- o If the growth rate of the area population and total call volume continues as it has over the past two decades, MCFRS would need a 24/7 BLS transport at Station 19 and a peak-time BLS transport at Station 1 for the next 30 years based on EMS unit availability and reliability.
- o The one-time costs for the BLS transport at both stations are estimated at \$1,800,000 and the annual operating costs are estimated to be \$1,240,000.
- Public Libraries –
  - o MCPL currently has a relatively new library located in the Silver Spring CBD.

## Aspen Hill

- Transportation --
  - o DOT estimates \$827 million to be needed in the Aspen Hill Planning Area to reconstruct several major roadways (i.e., Bel Pre Road, Sunflower Drive, Aspen Hill Road, Parkland Drive, Russet Road, and others) for complete communities to be integrated into the surroundings and to support walk/bike/rolling and social interaction. County investments are expected to leverage \$331 million from the State and nearly \$205 million from Federal funds. These amounts account for expanded art & recreational opportunities along transportation facilities, which may notably expand the scope of DOT facilities.
  - o These costs could be partially offset if the plan recommendations to stop planning or constructing new highways or major road widenings is adopted. These costs are included in the Countywide cost analysis but the Aspen Hill Road project and smaller portions of the Montrose Parkway and Layhill Road projects would be impacted.
  - o Montgomery Parks reports that the Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment area (limited to the 10 acre town center area) is well served by existing parks. A privately owned public open space at this location will contribute to the complete community goals.
  - o Outside the minor sector plan area in Aspen Hill there may be remaining service gaps which are not reflected here. Further analysis is needed to determine if the service gap can be resolved by various strategies, such as activating existing parks, connecting existing parks with bike/ped facilities, renovating or repurposing of existing parks. If not, a decision may be made to develop or create new parks through acquisition.
- Police –
  - o The approved Aspen Hill Master Plan from 1994 noted that while the Aspen Hill Planning Area did not have a dedicated police facility, services were provided through a joint effort of both Rockville and Glenmont district stations.
  - o The Rockville District Station covered the portion of the planning area between Norbeck and Muncaster Mill Roads and the Glenmont District Station provided service to the remainder of the planning area. The Master Plan also stated that the

Police Department did not have plans to increase the number of stations in the area, but the plan supported the use of smaller facilities if a future need should arise.

- o Police does not believe there is a need for a facility in the Aspen Hill area.
- Fire and Rescue Service –
  - o Two stations (21, 25) provide service to the Aspen Hill Planning Area. Station 25 is the second busiest station in the County due to the concentration of seniors living in the area, and it was recently renovated to accommodate service improvements.
  - o Service expansion or a new station 38 in the Norbeck Road corridor is under evaluation to accommodate growth in the area.
  - o If Station 38 is constructed, the capital budget costs are estimated at \$43,000,000, including a paramedic engine, chase unit, and two ambulances. The annual operating costs for this service level would be approximately \$7,300,000.
- Public Libraries –
  - o MCPL has a library facility in the Aspen Hill area.

The estimated costs of reconstructing streets for the Silver Spring CBD (\$200M) and the Aspen Hill Planning Area (\$827M) for Complete Communities were \$200M and \$827M respectively. Based on that, OMB attempted to estimate the potential costs that could apply countywide. After consultation with Council staff, we used the following assumptions:

- Costs attributed to the Thrive Plan are not related to decisions that have been made in current master plans. Most master plans in the past decade have included elements of complete communities but only the most recent plans have the more aggressive actions contemplated by Thrive.
- Cost estimates for the Silver Spring CBD have been used as a proxy for the cost for Large Centers while applying the estimated cost of the Aspen Hill Planning Area for Medium and Small Centers.
- No costs are assumed for transportation work within municipalities (i.e., Gaithersburg, Rockville, Poolesville) as they have their own planning and zoning authority.

The rough costs of reconstructing streets countywide for different sized Centers of Activity are estimated as follows:

- Large Centers are estimated at \$1 billion. Five large areas - Friendship Heights, White Flint, Great Seneca Science Corridor, Glenmont, and Twinbrook – have not had their master plans updated in the past decade. None of those areas have bike lanes or pedestrian projects identified. Except for the White Flint and Great Seneca Science Corridor, other areas are physically smaller than Silver Spring so there would be fewer lengths of street to reconstruct. We assumed increasing the Silver Spring CBD costs (\$200M) by fourfold would be a reasonable estimate to cover the costs for the remaining Large Centers (\$800M).
- Medium Centers are estimated at \$3.3 billion. Three medium centers – Clarksburg, Germantown, and Olney – have not had their plans updated over the past decade. Those

areas are equal to or larger than Aspen Hill, so there would be proportionately longer lengths of street to complete. Thus, we assumed multiplying the Aspen Hill costs (\$827M) by four would be a reasonable estimate to cover the costs of reconstructing streets for medium centers countywide.

- Smaller Centers are estimated at \$3.3 billion. Three small centers of activity – Damascus, Kensington, and Montgomery Village –have not had their plans updated since 2010. As their geographic size is comparable to Aspen Hill, we assumed a reasonable estimate for complete streets in all smaller centers would be four times the Aspen Hill cost, totaling \$3.3 billion.

#### Gaps Analysis for Libraries, Recreation Facilities, and Parks

The Complete Communities concept focused a great deal on having adequate recreation and community gathering spaces. As another way to look at the fiscal impacts of the Thrive plan, OMB worked with Public Libraries, Recreation and Parks department staff to consider to what extent we had these facilities in or near the 32 activity centers listed in the plan (See Appendix B, C and D). The distance to the facilities has been estimated using Google maps.

The Thrive plan did not provide a clear definition of “15 minute living” - making it hard to assess whether access to the current library, recreation and park facilities is sufficient. The concept of the “15-minute city” defined by the Congress for New Urbanism suggests an ideal setting in which basic services and needs may be accessed by walking or biking within a one-mile radius. The distance can be extended up to 10 miles if other types of transportation modes, like electric vehicles or cars, are utilized<sup>4</sup>.

Based on the list of current recreation, libraries and park facilities in and around the 32 identified activities centers, the following points can be made:

- All nine large centers of activity have recreation facilities or community gathering spaces, such as parks and libraries, located within a one-mile distance. While only a few medium or small centers have these types of facilities located within one mile, many of these facilities are accessible by public transit or car.
- Currently there are 21 brick and mortar library branches throughout the County. In the next 5 years, one additional library location is planned, and another is under consideration. Most library branches are less than 5 miles away from each other.
- More than 350 parks are currently located within one mile of the 32 centers of activity. Of these parks, nearly half of them are “urban parks” located in the nine large centers of activity.

#### THRIVE PLAN POPULATION GROWTH RELATED IMPACTS

The Council of Government population growth estimates for the County have been touted as a reason to urgently increase housing production in the County. And, although the Thrive plan indicates that sufficient development capacity already exists and has relatively little

---

<sup>4</sup> See “Defining the 15-minute city” from <https://www.cnu.org/publicsquare/2021/02/08/defining-15-minute-city>.

undeveloped land left in the County to accommodate the estimated 200,000 increase in population, the plan talks about constrained development options, the need to reconsider sites previously considered unsuitable for development, and the need to make room for new residents in a way that makes it seem that Thrive is somehow necessary to achieve the anticipated growth in housing units.

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments has projected that the County's population will increase by approximately 200,000 people over the next 30 years. The future population growth rate is projected to be lower compared to the rate of growth over the previous three decades, during which the County gained about 293,300 people (an increase of 38%) between 1990 and 2017<sup>5</sup>. The trend of slower growth is expected as the County becomes more developed and populous while developable land and resources to sustain rapid growth are diminishing.

The development of housing trends over the past 30 years was not in sync with the rate of population growth that was concentrated in areas along the I-270 corridor and near metro stations. Planning's study pointed out that the total housing units in the County increased only by 95,000 (or 32%) over that period, lower than the 50% increase in housing supply in the Washington metropolitan region. The study indicated that the housing shortage trend was impacted by the recession, a decrease in federal spending, and a decline in developable land. However, the demand for homes or rental units strongly favors urban locations with strong public transit connectivity and walkability to community amenities.

The Thrive plan attempts to address the housing shortage that would result from this increased demand and limited land availability through a combination of zoning changes and concentration of new residential and transit-oriented, mixed-use development and redevelopment of existing properties along major corridors and in locations where additional housing can assist in the development of complete communities in 32 designated centers of activity that fall under four different categories related to activity center size and population. If the land near transit centers is rezoned to meet the needs of an increased population, we can anticipate fiscal impacts related to costs for schools, public safety, affordable housing, and in County revenues.

It is clear that housing units will be required to accommodate the additional population. After all, people will not move to the County if there is not a home to move into. What is not clear is to what degree increased population is attributable to Thrive. Will Thrive truly increase the County's ability to absorb a larger population – or will Thrive just change where people live in the County? Can current zoning accommodate the projected population increases – or will the zoning envisioned in Thrive be necessary?

The information below was prepared by asking departments to indicate what the likely fiscal impacts would be from a population increase of 200,000. OMB has then applied a 10 percent factor to those costs to give Council an idea of what the fiscal impact would be if the

---

<sup>5</sup> Planning reports that the County's annual growth rate is projected to drop from 0.74% in 2010 to 0.48% between 2035 and 2045. See "Montgomery County Trends: A Look at People, Housing and Jobs since 1990", released January 2019, page 10-11. [MP\\_TrendsReport\\_final.pdf \(montgomeryplanning.org\)](#)

Thrive plan results in a 20,000 increase in population. As conversations unfold at Council about the goals and expected benefits of the Thrive plan, we can understand better the likely magnitude of Thrive-related population increase costs and revenues.

#### Public Schools

Based on the projected increase in population by 2045, enrollment in public schools could increase by approximately 27,500 students. The average cost in current dollars to construct elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools is \$34 million, \$56.7 million, and \$126.8 million, respectively. Assuming a similar mix of students by grade level as we currently experience, that would require approximately \$1.33 billion in current dollars to construct additional school facilities. Based on current dollars and Maintenance of Effort requirements, annual operating costs would increase by approximately \$307.4 million in current dollars to accommodate the additional students. If ten percent of estimated population growth is related to the Thrive plan, these costs would be approximately \$133 million for one time school construction costs and \$30.7 million in annual operating costs.

#### Public Safety

Resource deployment and service levels for the Department of Fire and Rescue Services (MCFRS) are tied directly to risk, which is assessed on several factors, including structure types, population, demographics, etc. Considering the overall impact that the Thrive 2050 projected population increase would have on MCFRS, the department projects a 20% increase, approximately \$12.7 million, in annual operating budget over the next 30 years for support areas which includes Support Services, Human Resources, Office of the Fire Chief, Volunteer Services and Fiscal Management. This increase coincides with the 20% projected increase in population. If only ten percent of the population growth was directly attributable to the Thrive plan, that annual cost would be approximately \$1.3 million.

The department has identified a high priority need for four additional stations to be located in Shady Grove, East County, Norbeck and Montgomery Village, each of which would likely be equipped with a paramedic engine, ALS chase unit, and two ambulances, at an estimated one-time cost of \$173.8 million and an estimated annual cost of \$30.4 million. This cost could vary depending upon the availability of land upon which to build stations. The addition of new stations would also require MCFRS to reconfigure the County into six battalions to ensure that no chief supervises more than seven stations. The creation of an additional battalion would require a one-time cost of approximately \$267,000 and additional annual expenses of \$859,000. MCFRS also anticipates a \$9.6 million one-time increase and \$9.4 million in ongoing costs due to the increase in EMS-related calls for additional ALS chase units to accompany BLS transport units during peak hours and additional EMS duty officers. The need to replace or expand existing stations to accommodate adjusted or new resource development based on growth has to be considered and is estimated at a one-time cost of \$120 million. If ten percent of population growth is attributable to the Thrive plan, this would require approximately \$30 million for one-time costs and \$4 million for annual operating costs. Additionally, zoning changes, street networks, connectivity and transit will impact the resources

required by fire and rescue services based on population growth and response time impacts. Unable to predict the fiscal impact of such goals with certainty, the department also includes a 20% increase, approximately \$1.7 million annually, in the capital budget apparatus replacement plan to cover the cost of replacement costs and additional fire and rescue vehicles. Ten percent of these annual costs would be approximately \$170,000.

The Police Department believes that large centers in the County should have some type of police facility located within those centers to enable the establishment of a 15-minute walkable community as envisioned in the Thrive Montgomery plan. Medium centers, small centers, and villages may have services provided through neighboring district stations, as described below for the Aspen Hill area. Additional facilities may be necessary to accommodate future growth and development in all four categories of the centers discussed in the Thrive report. The location(s) will be determined after taking the service needs of the entire county into consideration. Since police officers routinely provide services in the community, the physical location of the police station is less critical than the location of fire stations which need to consider proximity and traffic impacts on response time.

#### Affordable Housing

Montgomery Planning's Housing Needs Assessment study reports that household growth in the County has been concentrated in the lowest (less than \$25,000) and highest (\$125,000 or more) ends of the County income distribution over the past decade. Of particular note, more than half of all new households earn less than \$50,000 annually. This has inevitably resulted in an increased number of housing cost-burdened renter households, growing by nearly 18% between 2010 and 2018. In 2018, the County faced a gap of almost 48,000 units affordable to households with incomes at or below 50% of area median income (AMI). The gap has worsened for deeply low-income households (i.e., incomes at or below 30% of AMI) - that now represent roughly a quarter of all renter households. The study estimates that the County will add over 63,000 new households between 2020 and 2040. The projections show that higher income households will remain the largest group, but the percent of households with incomes below \$50,000 will increase. It is expected that 9.3% of new households will be extremely low-income, with incomes below 30% of AMI, and another 16.6% of low-income households will have incomes between 30 % and 50% AMI. Based on the household composition and household income, the study estimates over half of new housing will be multi-family rentals, followed by 27.4% of new households (27.4%) needing multifamily owner housing (i.e., condos or townhomes).

From a fiscal analysis perspective, it is likely that the private sector will incur most of the costs of building and operating these housing units – although it is clear that additional public subsidies will be needed to achieve affordability for the increased low-income and very low-income households that are likely to live in the County. Based on Planning's data, approximately 31,110 new households over the next twenty years would have incomes in the \$25,000 to \$75,000 range and would likely be eligible for the County's affordable housing. If we assume 50% of those units (or 15,555 units) will have a public financing subsidy consistent with current per unit Housing Initiative Fund (HIF) program subsidies (\$54,100/unit based on DHCA's direct

investment reported on June 2020), then \$42 million in subsidies per year over 20 years would be required. Note that this number represents only the County's direct investment which is often paired with other financing and leverages as high as 4 to 5 times non-County funding in affordable housing transactions. If ten percent of these costs are attributable to the Thrive plan, the annual costs would be \$4.2 million.

Furthermore, the County supports the reduction of housing cost burdens with rental assistance paid to reduce tenant rent burdens. DHCA reports that more than \$20.3 million in rental assistance was provided for 5,325 affordable housing units in FY20, representing 1.4% of the total 391,000 housing units. Assuming a similar percentage for new households, which represents an additional 44 households each year to be eligible for rental assistance ( $= 63,000 * 1.4\%/20$ ), the need for additional rental assistance is likely to increase by \$211,200 each year if current annual subsidies are implied. (Currently subsidies are \$200/month but the amount will be increased to \$400/month for HHS's clients effective in August 2021). This estimate does not include those deed restricted multifamily units (estimated at 13% of total rental units in the County) which HOC manages that have project-based subsidies and covenant/deed restrictions tied to affordable housing financing. If ten percent of these costs are attributable to the Thrive plan provisions, annual costs will likely increase by \$42,240 (if based on the new rate of \$400/month).

#### Public Libraries

Most of the Montgomery County Public Libraries (MCPL) branches are less than five miles away from each other – raising the question of whether it is economically feasible or environmentally sound to continue to build new locations. The construction cost for a small 20,000 square foot library is approximately \$18,000,000, and the operating costs (both personnel and a startup collection) would be approximately \$1,000,000 per year. In the next five years, MCPL plans to add one additional library location, and another library is under consideration. When considering the proposed “15 minute” living standard, MCPL indicated that additional services could be added to the community without building more locations by 1) increasing community engagement at current locations 2) sharing space with existing county agencies 3) establishing new partnerships 4) using technology to improve branch and other access and 5) adding 24/7 library kiosks to areas that lack a branch within a five-mile radius.

#### County Revenues

More residents will lead to higher income tax revenues. Based on an analysis from the Department of Finance, annual average income tax revenues might increase by \$2.07 billion between 2020 and 2050. The estimate is based on the historical 10-year average ratio (50.8%) of taxpayers to the population in the labor force (age 16 and over) times an expected per taxpayer increase in income taxes. Based on a historical average annual growth rate discounted for inflation (2.2%), each individual taxpayer would see their annual income tax increase by \$3,450 from 2020 (\$3,571) to 2050 (\$7,202). Note that Finance's estimate is based on constant dollars and does not include inflation to be consistent with other fiscal impact variables. Many other factors (i.e., fiscal and monetary policies, the economy, etc.) that could also impact the estimate of income tax revenues are not considered. If ten percent of these increases are attributable to



the Thrive plan and other population patterns continue, annual income tax revenues could grow by \$207 million.

While other revenues – particularly property taxes, State Aid for schools and college, and recordation taxes, will increase, we cannot estimate that increase due to a lack of necessary information.

# APPENDIX A. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PER UNIT COST ASSUMPTIONS

Cost Type	Unit Capital Cost	Unit Annual O&M Cost	Other
BRT - Major	\$ 51,900,000		
BRT - Regular	\$ 32,900,000		
BRT - Minor	\$ 10,200,000		
BRT - Long		\$ 2,050,000	
BRT - Mid		\$ 1,650,000	
BRT - Short		\$ 1,580,000	
Bus	\$ 800,000	\$ 414,194	3 sets
Bus Depot	\$ 700,000		
Sidepath	\$ 1,478,400	\$ 3,400	per mi
Two-lane Reconstruction	\$ 13,200,000		per mi
New Two-lane Road	\$ 15,840,000		per mi
Widen Two-lane to Four-lane	\$ 21,120,000		per mi
Four-lane Reconstruction	\$ 22,000,000		per mi
New Four-lane Road	\$ 26,400,000		per mi
New Six-lane Road	\$ 33,950,617		per mi
Shared Street Reconstruction	\$ 26,400,000		per mi
Road Maintenance per Lane		\$ 32,055	per mi
Grade Separation	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 24,284	ea

Contingency	Amount
Overall	40%
Overhead	15%
PDNS	25%
Utilities	5%

Action #		Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	Plan Items Action Items	Countywide						Notes
						Capital Costs			Annual Operating Costs			
						County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	
					\$8,155,600,000 \$ 31,750,000	\$(1,190,600,000)	\$1,918,700,000	\$425,255,000 \$ 1,200,000	\$ 81,721,000	\$ 88,160,000		
					DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	
p32-1a	Main		Amend land use, design, zoning regs to remove regulatory barriers & permit corridor-focused compact development	DPS, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Part of core agency work
p32-1b	Main		Improve enviro sustainability of growth by encouraging infill & redevelopment	DPS, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Part of core agency work
p32-2a	Main		Adopt new methods of financing infrastructure	DOT, OMB, Finance	Develop new financing methods (likely revenue-neutral, or revenue generating)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Part of annual workplan; no additional costs until financing methods are known
p32-2b	Main		Establish high-quality transit along growth corridors	DOT	BRT along River Road	\$211,800,000	\$211,800,000	\$ -	\$ 6,732,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes reconstructing streets. Potential cost savings if reposing lanes.
p32-2b	Main		Establish high-quality transit along growth corridors	DOT	BRT along MD 355	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27,399,000	\$ -	\$ -	Already in master plan
p32-2b	Main		Establish high-quality transit along growth corridors	DOT	North Bethesda Transitway	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,363,000	\$ -	\$ -	Already in master plan
p32-2b	Main		Establish high-quality transit along growth corridors	DOT	BRT along Connecticut Avenue	\$136,600,000	\$136,600,000	\$ -	\$ 6,848,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes reconstructing streets. Potential cost savings if reposing lanes.
p32-2b	Main		Establish high-quality transit along growth corridors	DOT	BRT along Georgia Avenue	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,002,000	\$ -	\$ -	Already in master plan
p32-2b	Main		Establish high-quality transit along growth corridors	DOT	Improve BRT along US 29	\$ 57,700,000	\$ 57,700,000	\$ -	\$ 1,832,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes reconstructing streets. Potential cost savings if reposing lanes.
p32-2b	Main		Establish high-quality transit along growth corridors	DOT	BRT along New Hampshire Avenue	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,988,000	\$ -	\$ -	Already in master plan
p32-2b	Main		Establish high-quality transit along growth corridors	DOT	BRT along Veirs Mill Rd	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,033,000	\$ -	\$ -	Already in master plan
p32-2b	Main		Establish high-quality transit along growth corridors	DOT	BRT along Randolph Rd	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,567,000	\$ -	\$ -	Already in master plan
p32-2b	Main		Establish high-quality transit along growth corridors	DOT	Extend BRT along University Blvd to Kensington	\$ 23,700,000	\$ 23,700,000	\$ -	\$ 5,718,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes reconstructing streets. Potential cost savings if reposing lanes.
p32-2c	Main		Leverage Fed/State/Local incentive programs, and public land & land investment opportunities for infill & redevelopment	DGS, UGR, OMB, DHCA	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Not estimated due to undefined scope of work

Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p33-3a	Main	Sustainably manage land outside growth corridors & Complete Communities	DEP, OAG	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Not costed - core department work
p33-4a	Main	Maximize benefits of Ag Reserve	OAG	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Not costed - core department work
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Improved bus to Poolesville, Whites Ferry	\$ 12,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,071,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes 12 min headways, 14 hrs./day, 0% farebox recovery. If service is weekend only: capital costs are likely to be zero.
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Bus to Dickerson	\$ 21,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,728,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes 12 min headways, 14 hrs./day, 0% farebox recovery. If service is weekend only: capital costs are likely to be zero.
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Bus on MD 109, Poolesville to Hyatt town	\$ 12,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,071,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes 12 min headways, 14 hrs./day, 0% farebox recovery. If service is weekend only: capital costs are likely to be zero.
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Improved bus to Damascus (MD 27)	\$ 4,800,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 829,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes 12 min headways, 14 hrs./day, 0% farebox recovery. If service is weekend only: capital costs are likely to be zero.
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Improved bus to Damascus (MD 124)	\$ 7,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,243,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes 12 min headways, 14 hrs./day, 0% farebox recovery. If service is weekend only: capital costs are likely to be zero.
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Improved bus to Laytonville	\$ 3,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 622,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes 12 min headways, 14 hrs./day, 0% farebox recovery. If service is weekend only: capital costs are likely to be zero.
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Bus on MD 650, ICC to Damascus	\$ 24,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,142,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes 12 min headways, 14 hrs./day, 0% farebox recovery. If service is weekend only: capital costs are likely to be zero.
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Bus on 97, Olney to Sunshine	\$ 3,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,243,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes 12 min headways, 14 hrs./day, 0% farebox recovery. If service is weekend only: capital costs are likely to be zero.
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Depot space for Ag Reserve buses	\$ 35,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Based on per bus depot costs

Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Poolesville Flex Transit	\$ 16,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,911,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes 3 sets of 36 12-seat buses at \$150K/ea., operating at 14 hrs./day & assuming 0% farebox recovery.
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Dickerson-Barnesville-Beallsville Flex Transit	\$ 16,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,911,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes 3 sets of 36 12-seat buses at \$150K/ea., operating at 14 hrs./day & assuming 0% farebox recovery.
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Hyatt town-Clarksburg-Damascus Flex Transit	\$ 16,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,911,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes 3 sets of 36 12-seat buses at \$150K/ea., operating at 14 hrs./day & assuming 0% farebox recovery.
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Olney Flex Transit	\$ 16,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,911,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes 3 sets of 36 12-seat buses at \$150K/ea., operating at 14 hrs./day & assuming 0% farebox recovery.
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Burtonsville-Colesville Flex Transit	\$ 16,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,911,000	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes 3 sets of 36 12-seat buses at \$150K/ea., operating at 14 hrs./day & assuming 0% farebox recovery.
p33-4b	Main	Improve access to Ag Reserve	DOT, OAG	Depot space for Flex Transit	\$ 94,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Scales Depot Cost per Bus by vehicle size (so reducing 25%, as 30' shuttles vs 40' buses). This may be an imperfect assumption (it's likely to be less of a reduction), but for the scale of Thrive this value should be the proper order of magnitude.
p45-1a	Main	Update zoning allocations & standards to encourage varied uses, types, lot sizes	MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Not costed - assumed part of annual work program
p45-1b	Main	Flexibly accommodate infill & redevelopment that promotes access to amenities, active transportation, parks, open spaces, variety of housing	DPS, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p45-1c	Main	Prioritize neighborhood-level land use planning	MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Not costed - core agency work
p45-1d	Main	Allow sufficient densities to make a variety of uses economically viable.	MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Not costed - core agency work

Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS, MNCPPC	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	Accounted for by Priority Corridor BRT estimate (p32-2b)	Accounted for by Priority Corridor BRT estimate (p32-2b)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (720,000)	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS, MNCPPC	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	Accounted for by Priority Corridor BRT estimate (p32-2b)	Accounted for by Priority Corridor BRT estimate (p32-2b)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1,656,000)	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS, MNCPPC	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	Accounted for by Priority Corridor BRT estimate (p32-2b)	Accounted for by Priority Corridor BRT estimate (p32-2b)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (808,000)	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 118,500,000	\$ 736,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 140,500,000	\$ 1,628,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 523,100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 807,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.

Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 172,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 87,300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 228,900,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 603,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 61,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 118,400,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 193,400,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.

Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 362,900,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 130,300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 26,000,000	\$ 284,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 136,200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 192,300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 237,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 237,100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.



Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 108,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 128,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 476,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 107,900,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 161,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 69,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 142,600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.

Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 266,800,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 29,500,000	\$ -	Presumed Developer Built	\$ -	\$ -	Presumed Developer Built	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities are integrated into surroundings & supported by public realm supportive of walk/bike/rolling + social interaction	DOT, DHCA, DGS	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 12,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Cost estimates only reflect DOT costs.
p45-1f	Main	Prioritize providing Complete Communities	DPS, DGS	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Not costed - would be part of agency/dept core work
p46-1a	Main	Provide walk/bike/roll/transit facilities to extend utility of public facilities into neighborhoods	DOT	See Area Estimates	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Will vary by location (see Aspen Hill/Silver Spring as examples). As new public facilities are built, these costs may be incorporated into the project cost.
p46-1b	Main	Develop standards for colocation of public facilities	DGS	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: DGS, MCPS, MNCPPC, & MC are already coordinating these efforts
p46-2a	Main	Ensure employment uses in economic clusters develop in mixed use format	DPS, EDC, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p46-2b	Main	Allow creation of co-located subsidized housing w/ industries with many employees	DPS, EDC, DHCA, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p46-2c	Main	Encourage higher density economic/housing cooperatives	EDC, DHCA, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p64-1a	Main	Ensure arch/landscape designs define streets & public places that promote social interaction	DOT, DGS, MNCPPC	See Area Estimates	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	
p64-1b	Main	Link individual architecture projects to surroundings.	DGS, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Costs not added - core agency/dept work

Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p64-1c	Main	Design buildings, streets, parking to prioritize pedestrian scale; encourage walking/biking. Narrower streets, buffered bike lanes/sidewalks, minimized surface parking.	DOT, DGS	See Area Estimates	Accounted for by p45-1e	Accounted for by p45-1e	\$ -	Accounted for by p45-1e	Accounted for by p45-1e	\$ -	
p64-1c	Main	Smaller blocks; grid of streets	DOT	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$1,646,200,000	\$ -	\$1,710,700,000	\$ 3,466,000	\$ -	\$ 160,000	Based on identifying new streets to break up large blocks, using draft Complete Streets on max spacing between crossings as a guide. Assumes mix of new streets & sidepath connections.
p64-1c	Main	Additional crossings	DOT	See Area Estimates	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	
p64-1c	Main	Slow Speeds	DOT, MCPD	Proactive traffic calming program	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,100,000	\$ -	\$ -	
p64-1d	Main	Accommodate new development w/ context-sensitive architecture & landscape design	DPS, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Costs not added - core agency work
p64-1e	Main	Integrate gov & private development sites into surrounding neighborhoods	DGS, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Costs not added - core agency/dept work
p64-1f	Main	Preserve, renew, reuse existing & historic buildings, districts, landscapes	DGS	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Site specific
p65-1a	Main	Replace vague concepts w/ clear standards. Adopt rules for missing middle housing types. Amend regulations to remove regulatory barriers.	MNCPPC, DHCA	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p65-1b	Main	Update Zoning Ordinance to integrate form-based code & flexibility	MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Costs not added - assumed part of work program
p65-2a	Main	Encourage state-of-the-practice sustainability features in public/private building design	DGS, DPS, DEP	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Costs not added - assumed part of agency/dept work
p65-2b	Main	Promote cost-effective infill & adaptive reuse design strategies	DGS, DPS	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Costs not added - assumed part of dept work
p65-2c	Main	Incentivize reuse of historic & existing structures	DPS, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Assuming some of this is part of agency/dept work. Financial incentives would add costs
p65-2d	Main	Establish standards for public facilities that align w/ infill/redevelopment strategies	DGS	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Costs not added - assumed part of dept work

Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p65-2e	Main	Implement policies to ensure new buildings & parking structures are adaptable to changing tech & market preference, & can mitigate effects of climate change	DOT, DGS, DPS	Develop policies	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Costs not added - assumed part of dept work
p65-3a	Main	Create inclusive arts & culture plans	AHCMC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p65-3b	Main	Improve access for artists & arts groups to living, working, presentation spaces	AHCMC, DHCA	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p65-3c	Main	Promote public art, cultural spaces, cultural hubs along corridors & in Complete Communities	AHCMC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p65-3d	Main	Eliminate regulatory barriers to small scale art-making & creative businesses	DPS, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Assumed costs were part of regular dept work
p65-3e	Main	Enable all residents to experience public art daily by incorporating into buildings, streets, infrastructure, public spaces	DOT, DGS, OMB, MNCPPC	See Area Estimates - Countywide estimates represent 5 Large, 4 Medium & 4 Small Centers w/o updating master plans in the past decade	\$ 88,000,000	\$ 88,000,000	\$ 88,000,000	\$ 88,000,000	\$ 88,000,000	\$ 88,000,000	Assumes an additional 1% of project costs
p65-3f	Main	Use new public facilities to demonstrate principles of architecture as a civic art	DGS	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Assumed costs were part of regular dept work
p65-3g	Main	Encourage property owners, non-profit orgs, gov agencies to maximize use of parks & public spaces for artistic & cultural programming, activation, placemaking. Maintain annual calendar of events	REC, AHCMC, CEC, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: County costs will vary depending on scope and frequency of programming.
p66-1a	Main	Strengthen data collection about investments & better align arts/culture related policies w/ Thrive	AHCMC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p80-1a	Main	Expand street grid in downtowns, town centers, transit corridors, and suburban activity centers to create shorter blocks	DOT	Smaller blocks; new grid streets	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	Accounted for by p64-1c	

Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p80-1b	Main	Stop planning/constructing new highways / major road widenings	DOT	Eliminate master planned widenings	\$ (1,304,700,000)	\$ (4,547,900,000)	\$ -	\$ (3,107,000)	\$ (3,095,000)	\$ -	Presumes all planned widenings to 4+ lanes are eliminated. User costs are not considered, as this presumes transportation adequacy is otherwise achieved as per applicable growth policies (such as through the provision of convenient & effective ped/bike/transit alternatives)
p80-1c	Main	Convert existing traffic lanes & on-street parking to walkways, bikeways, street buffers	DOT	Reconstruct all streets	Accounted for by p45-1e	Accounted for by p45-1e	\$ -	Accounted for by p45-1e	Accounted for by p45-1e	\$ -	
p80-1d	Main	Prioritize provision of comfortable sidewalks, bikeways, crossings, etc.	DOT	Prioritize these items	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: No cost - part of dept operations
p80-1e	Main	Transform road network by incorporating Complete Streets design principles, eliminating transportation-related fatalities & severe injuries, supporting more livable communities	DOT	Reconstruct all streets	Accounted for by p45-1e	Accounted for by p45-1e	\$ -	Accounted for by p45-1e	Accounted for by p45-1e	\$ -	
p80-2a	Main	Build network of rail, BRT, local bus infrastructure & services that are fast, convenient, reliable	DOT	Double the size of our bus fleet	\$ 864,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 149,110,000	\$ -	\$ -	
p80-2a	Main	Build network of rail, BRT, local bus infrastructure & services that are fast, convenient, reliable	DOT	Depot space for additional buses	\$ 252,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Based on cost/bus (\$700k/bus) is directly derived from EMTOC costs. It does not include land, utility costs. Assumes the bus fleet is doubled.
p80-2b	Main	Convert existing general purpose traffic lanes to dedicated transit lanes	DOT	Reconstruct all streets	Accounted for by p45-1e	Accounted for by p45-1e	\$ -	Accounted for by p45-1e	Accounted for by p45-1e	\$ -	
p80-2c	Main	Connect disadvantaged people/areas by prioritizing investments in increasing access to frequent & reliable all-day transit service	DOT	Prioritize investments	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p80-2d	Main	Ensure safe & comfortable access to transit stations via walking, rolling, bicycling	DOT	Smaller blocks; new grid streets; reconstruct all streets	Accounted for by p45-1c and p64-1c	Accounted for by p45-1c and p64-1c	Accounted for by p45-1c and p64-1c	Accounted for by p45-1c and p64-1c	Accounted for by p45-1c and p64-1c	Accounted for by p45-1c and p64-1c	OMB: Countywide figures are too difficult to estimate.

Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p80-3a	Main	Employ pricing mechanisms to support walking, rolling, bicycling, transit	DOT	Undefined; variables are too considerable to estimate, but this would be revenue positive	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Could result in revenues but costs could be incurred if areas were cordoned off.
p80-3b	Main	Manage parking efficiently by charging market rates, reducing supply of public/private spaces	DOT MNCPPC	Minimal cost; likely a revenue gain for PLDs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (700,000)	\$ -	\$ -	Assumes ~\$1.00 more on high occupancy blocks, and rates otherwise unchanged. Monthly/Long-Term rates already approximately market rate.
p80-3c	Main	Encourage non-polluting vehicles by upgrading gov fleets	DOT, DGS, MNCPPC	Costs presumed as part of regular vehicle turnover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p80-3c	Main	Encourage non-polluting vehicles by requiring appropriate infrastructure	DOT, DGS, DPS, MNCPPC	Microgrid Capabilities	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,400,000	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Assumed to be private but may require public incentives. \$180M in County costs are assumed to be related to CAP.
p80-4a	Main	Facilitate construction of high-speed fiber optic & wireless infrastructure	DOT, DTS	Enable DTS efforts	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p80-4b	Main	Focus investment in comms infrastructure & services to connect people / areas lacking convenient access to jobs & education	DOT, DTS	Enable DTS efforts	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p80-4c	Main	Support telework by accelerating deployment of info & comms tech	DOT, DTS	Enable DTS efforts	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p80-4c	Main	Support telework by making work from home easier by facilitating Complete Communities	DOT, DHCA, DPS, DGS	Reconstruct streets, densify grid & connections to parks, increase transit	Accounted for by p45-1e and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e and p80-2a	References to P.45-1e and p. 80-2a relate only to DOT work regarding ped/bike reconstructions and additional transit.
p99-1a	Main	Expand opportunities to increase residential density	DHCA, DGS, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: No costs - part of dept work
p99-1b	Main	Increase number of income-restricted affordable housing units	DHCA	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p99-1c	Main	Develop strategies to build deeply affordable housing & provide permanent supportive housing	DHCA	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: No cost - part of dept work.
p99-1d	Main	Reform building codes to reduce costs; enable innovative construction methods & materials	DPS	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Part of dept work funded through permitting fees.

Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p99-1e	Main	Prioritize use of public land for colocation of housing & other uses	DGS, DHCA	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: No costs - part of dept work
p99-1f	Main	Increase regulatory flexibility to incentivize infill, redevelopment, repositioning of office parks, shopping malls, and other underutilized properties	DPS, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: No costs - part of agency/dept work
p99-1g	Main	Provide financial incentives to increase housing production in targeted locations near high-capacity transit	DHCA, FIN, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p100-1a	Main	Facilitate development of a variety of housing types	DPS, DHCA, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: No costs - part of agency/dept work
p100-1b	Main	Support creative housing options	DPS, DHCA, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: No costs - part of agency/dept work
p100-1c	Main	Encourage provision of multi-bedroom units	DPS, DHCA, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: No costs - part of agency/dept work
p100-1d	Main	Integrate people w/ disabilities, people transitioning from homelessness, and older adults into attainable housing w/ appropriate amenities & services	DHCA, HHIS	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: No costs due to wide variability based on different assumptions
p101-1a	Main	Calibrate MPDU program & other affordable housing programs to provide units for deeply affordable & workforce	DHCA	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p101-1b	Main	Develop strategies to minimize gentrification/displacement & concentration of poverty, while promoting integration	MNCPPC, DHCA, HHIS	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p101-1c	Main	Refine regulatory tools & incentives to avoid net loss of market rate & income restricted housing stock w/o adding disincentives for construction of additional units	DHCA, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p101-1d	Main	Identify & allocate additional revenue for the Housing Initiative Fund (HIF) to meet needs of low-income households	DHCA	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	

Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p101-1e	Main	Expand existing programs toward increasing accessing to homeownership, especially among low-income, people of color, & young residents. Create new programs toward maintaining long-term affordable homeownership opportunities	DHCA, HOC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p101-1f	Main	Improve data collection on neighborhood change metrics	MNCPPC; DHCA	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p116-1a	Main	Prioritize acquiring land for parks in highly developed area	REC, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Assumed covered through MNCPPC Legacy Urban Space project and other developer-funded funding sources - but may not be realistic if this plan implies significant increase in purchases.
p116-1b	Main	Offer programs in urban parks to encourage use & make centers of activity	REC, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p116-1c	Main	Implement EPS Plan to ensure densely populated areas have walkable access to range of park experiences	REC, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p116-1d	Main	Strengthen role of Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS) to perform as public spaces & leverage private investment	DPS, REC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Unclear about level of effort required
p116-1e	Main	Ensure Complete Communities have access to a range of park types through a combo of public & private facilities	DPS, REC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Data not yet available Countywide. Standards for proximity for various types of activity centers have not been established. MNCPPC is reevaluating what types of parks experiences are being provided and what should be provided. Parks evaluated only a small area around Aspen Hill in determining sufficiency of current parks resources.
p118-1a	Main	Include active recreation as integral elements of park planning/design	DPS, REC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: No costs - part of agency work



Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p118-1b	Main	Encourage active recreation as key component in POPS	REC, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p118-1c	Main	Provide park/rec facilities & programs designed to encourage residents of all ages to engage in vigorous physical activity	REC, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p118-1d	Main	Integrate park trails & paths into transportation planning & better use to connect residents, jobs, & centers of activity	DOT	Reconstruct streets, density grid & connections to parks, increase transit	Accounted for by p45-1e, p64-1c, and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e, p64-1c, and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e, p64-1c, and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e, p64-1c, and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e, p64-1c, and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e, p64-1c, and p80-2a	
p120-1a	Main	Amend EPS Plan study area to incorporate more refined equity analysis	MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Assumed part of annual work program
p120-1b	Main	Use equity measures in developing capital budgets for parks/rec facilities	REC, OMB, County Council, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Assumed part of dept/agency work
p120-1c	Main	Gather data on & address barriers to participation in parks/rec programs	REC, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
p120-1d	Main	Improve accessibility of parks/rec facilities via walking, biking, transit	DOT, MNCPPC	Reconstruct streets, density grid & connections to parks, increase transit	Accounted for by p45-1e, p64-1c, and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e, p64-1c, and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e, p64-1c, and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e, p64-1c, and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e, p64-1c, and p80-2a	Accounted for by p45-1e, p64-1c, and p80-2a	
p120-2a	Main	Design parks/rec & related infrastructure/services around building community, increasing interaction	DOT, REC, MNCPPC	Reconstruct streets	Accounted for by p45-1e	Accounted for by p45-1e	Accounted for by p45-1e	Accounted for by p45-1e	Accounted for by p45-1e	Accounted for by p45-1e	OMB: Assumed part of dept/agency work
p120-2b	Main	Connect neighborhoods & people to parks w/ world-class trail system	DOT	Reconstruct streets, density grid & connections to parks	Accounted for by p45-1e and p64-1c	Accounted for by p45-1e and p64-1c	Accounted for by p45-1e and p64-1c	Accounted for by p45-1e and p64-1c	Accounted for by p45-1e and p64-1c	Accounted for by p45-1e and p64-1c	
p120-2c	Main	Enhance food/drink opportunities among parks/rec	REC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Could be provided by private vendors
p120-2d	Main	Provide park amenities that appeal to visitors w/ different interests/abilities	REC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Assume part of agency work. Without specifics regarding the types of amenities, cost estimates can not be provided.
p122-1a	Main	Reaffirm commitment to resource conservation, stewardship, sustainability	MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Part of core agency missions.

Action #	Document	Action Item	Agency Involved	DOT Action	County Cost	State/Fed Cost	Private Cost	County Cost2	State/Fed Cost2	Private Cost2	Notes
p122-1b	Main	Selectively acquire land to protect sensitive natural resources, improve water quality, increase tree cover, enhance wildlife corridors, curb invasive species, achieve other enviro goals	DEP	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Assumed funded through existing Parks Acquisition CIP projects
p122-1c	Main	Create climate change resiliency plan for parks/rec facilities	REC, DEP, DGS, MNCPPC	None	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	OMB: Assumed to be part of future agency work

# APPENDIX A2. LIST OF ROAD WIDENING/CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS TO BE CANCELLED AND RELATED SAVINGS

LOCAL ROAD NAME	FROM LOCATION	TO LOCATION	EXISTING LANES	PLANNED LANES	LANES NEEDED	OWNER	MILES	CAPITAL	O&M
Airpark Rd	Montgomery County Airpark	Woodfield Rd	2	4	2	County	0.51	\$0	\$0
Aspen Hill Rd	Connecticut Ave	Veirs Mill Rd	2	4	2	County	1.62	\$0	\$0
Beechcraft Ave	400' west of Bonanza Way	200' east of Mooney Dr	2	4	2	County	0.52	\$0	\$0
Blackwell Rd	685' west of Shady Grove Rd	Shady Grove Rd	0	4	4	County	0.13	\$6,336,250	\$16,635
Blackwell Rd Extended	Broschart Rd	685' west of Shady Grove Rd	0	4	4	County	0.34	\$16,618,550	\$43,629
Boland Farm Rd	Frederick Rd	Observation Dr	2	4	2	County	0.28	\$0	\$0
Bonanza Way	Snouffer School Rd	Beechcraft Ave	2	4	2	County	0.11	\$0	\$0
Bradley Blvd (MD 191)	Goldsboro Rd	Capital Beltway (I-495)	2	4	2	State	3.53	\$0	\$0
Briggs Chaney Rd	ICC	Prince George's County Line	2	4	2	County	0.63	\$0	\$0
Brink Rd	Frederick Rd	Midcounty Hwy	2	4	2	County	1.07	\$0	\$0
Broadbitch Dr	Cherry Hill Rd	Tech Rd	2	4	2	County	0.68	\$0	\$0
Broadway Ave	Little Seneca Pkwy	West Old Baltimore Rd	2	4	2	County	0.23	\$0	\$0
Burtonsville Blvd	South of Spencerville Rd	Dustin Rd	4	6	2	County	1.14	\$44,542,080	\$73,085
Calverton Blvd	Cherry Hill Rd	Prince George's County Line	2	4	2	County	0.59	\$0	\$0
Capital Beltway	Northwest Branch	Prince George's County Line	8	10	2	State	1.24	\$48,449,280	\$79,496
Centerway Rd	Goshen Rd	Snouffer School Rd	2	4	2	County	0.77	\$0	\$0
Century Blvd	Crystal Rock Dr	Dorsey Mill Rd	2	4	2	County	0.28	\$0	\$0
Cessna Ave	Airpark Rd	1100' west	2	4	2	County	0.21	\$0	\$0
Clopper Rd	Great Seneca Hwy	Great Seneca Creek	2	6	4	State	1.42	\$69,352,800	\$182,072
Clopper Rd	Germantown Road	Great Seneca Hwy	2	6	4	State	0.48	\$23,443,200	\$61,546
Clopper Rd	Longdraft Rd	Great Seneca Creek	2	6	4	State	0.78	\$38,095,200	\$100,012
Clopper Rd	Little Seneca Creek	Germantown Rd	2	6	4	State	1.28	\$62,515,200	\$164,122
Clopper Rd	Clarksburg Rd	Little Seneca Creek	2	6	4	State	1.00	\$48,840,000	\$128,220
Colesville Rd (US 29)	Fenton St	Georgia Ave (MD 97)	5	6	1	BRT	0.12	\$4,688,640	\$3,847
Colesville Rd (US 29)	Sligo Creek Pkwy	Fenton St	5	6	1	BRT	0.80	\$31,257,600	\$25,644
Crystal Rock Dr	Century Blvd	Crystal Rock Trail	2	4	2	County	0.26	\$0	\$0
Crystal Rock Dr	Waters Landing Dr/Kinster Dr	Father Hurley Blvd	2	4	2	County	0.31	\$0	\$0
Crystal Rock Dr	Crystal Rock Trail	Waters Landing Dr/Kinster Dr	2	4	2	County	0.30	\$0	\$0
Dairymaid Dr	Great Seneca Hwy	Mateny Rd	2	4	2	County	0.62	\$0	\$0
Darnestown Rd	Muddy Branch Rd	Key West Ave	4	6	2	State	0.42	\$16,410,240	\$26,926
Decoverly Dr	Johns Hopkins Dr	930' east of Johns Hopkins Dr	0	4	4	County	0.18	\$8,602,500	\$22,584
Decoverly Dr	930' east of Johns Hopkins Dr	Great Seneca Hwy (MD 119)	0	4	4	County	0.09	\$4,584,300	\$12,035
Decoverly Dr	930' east of Johns Hopkins Dr	Johns Hopkins Dr	0	4	4	County	0.18	\$8,602,500	\$22,584
Decoverly Dr Extended	Muddy Branch Rd	Johns Hopkins Dr	2	4	2	County	0.47	\$0	\$0
Dixon Ave Extended	Ripley St	Silver Spring Ave	2	4	2	County	0.12	\$0	\$0
Dorsey Mill Rd	Observation Dr	Milestone Center Dr	2	4	2	County	0.18	\$0	\$0
Dorsey Mill Rd (Proposed)	Milestone Center Dr	Crystal Rock Dr	2	4	2	County	0.28	\$0	\$0
East-West Hwy (MD 410)	Waverly St	Pearl St	3	4	1	State	0.09	\$0	\$0
East-West Hwy (MD 410)	Pearl St	Georgetown Branch ROW	2	4	2	State	0.32	\$0	\$0
East-West Hwy (MD 410)	Blair Mill Rd	Georgia Ave	2	4	2	State	0.21	\$0	\$0
Executive Blvd Extended	Woodglen Dr	Rockville Pike (MD 355)	0	4	4	County	0.12	\$5,860,800	\$15,386
Executive Blvd Extended	Woodglen Dr	Nebel St Extended	0	4	4	County	0.33	\$16,117,200	\$42,313
Fairland Rd	East Randolph Rd	Columbia Pike	2	4	2	County	2.30	\$0	\$0
Fairland Rd	Columbia Pike	Prince George's County Line	2	4	2	County	1.24	\$0	\$0
Father Hurley Blvd	Crystal Rock Dr	CSX Tracks	4	6	2	County	1.36	\$53,137,920	\$87,190
Fields Rd	150' West of Omega Dr	Omega Dr	2	4	2	County	0.03	\$0	\$0
Fields Rd	Decoverly Dr	675' West of Washingtonian Blvd	2	4	2	County	0.24	\$0	\$0
Frederick Ave (MD 355)	Gaithersburg City Limits (500' north of I-370)	S Westland Dr	4	6	2	BRT	0.23	\$8,803,040	\$14,444
Frederick Ave (MD 355)	S Westland Dr	Gaithersburg City Limits (N Westland Dr)	4	6	2	BRT	0.19	\$7,423,680	\$12,181
Frederick Rd (MD 355)	Roberts Tavern Dr	Little Seneca Pkwy	2	4	2	BRT	0.96	\$0	\$0
Gaither Rd	Shady Grove Rd	City of Gaithersburg	2	4	2	County	0.50	\$0	\$0
Georgia Ave (MD 97)	Emory Ln	Norbeck Rd (MD 28)	2	6	4	BRT	1.17	\$57,142,800	\$150,017
Georgia Ave (MD 97)	Olney-Laytonville Rd/Olney-Sandy Spring	Prince Philip Rd (North)	2	6	4	BRT	0.45	\$21,978,000	\$57,699
Germantown Rd	Great Seneca Creek (Southern Branch)	Great Seneca Creek (Northern Branch)	2	4	2	State	1.11	\$0	\$0
Germantown Rd	Great Seneca Creek (Northern Branch)	Riffle Ford Rd	2	4	2	State	0.48	\$0	\$0
Germantown Rd	Riffle Ford Rd	Richter Farm Rd	2	4	2	State	0.47	\$0	\$0
Germantown Rd	Darnestown Rd	Great Seneca Creek (Southern Branch)	2	4	2	State	1.28	\$0	\$0
Germantown Rd	Richter Farm Rd	Clopper Rd	2	6	4	State	0.64	\$31,257,600	\$82,061
Goldsboro Rd (MD 614)	Massachusetts Ave	River Rd	2	4	2	State	0.57	\$0	\$0
Goshen Rd	Odendhal Ave	Warfield Rd	2	4	2	County	2.98	\$0	\$0
Gracefield Service Rd	Gracefield Rd	Prince George's County Line	2	4	2	County	0.22	\$0	\$0
Great Seneca Hwy (MD 119)	Dawson Farm Rd	Great Seneca Creek	4	6	2	State	2.07	\$80,879,040	\$132,708
Greencastle Rd	Columbia Pike	Prince George's County Line	2	4	2	County	1.56	\$0	\$0
Hopkins Rd	Clopper Rd	Father Hurley Blvd	2	4	2	County	0.58	\$0	\$0
I-270	Frederick County Line	Clarksburg Rd/Stringtown Rd	4	6	2	State	4.08	\$239,120,640	\$261,569
I-270	Clarksburg/Stringtown Rd	Little Seneca Creek	6	8	2	State	1.89	\$110,769,120	\$121,168
I-270	Great Seneca Creek	Quince Orchard Rd/Montgomery Village Ave	8	12	4	State	1.22	\$89,377,200	\$156,428
I-270	Diamond Ave	I-370	10	12	2	State	1.53	\$89,670,240	\$98,088
I-270	Little Seneca Creek	Great Seneca Creek	8	12	4	State	3.83	\$280,585,800	\$491,083
I-270	Great Seneca Creek	W Diamond Ave	10	12	2	State	1.82	\$106,666,560	\$116,680
Industrial Pkwy	Tech Rd	Approx. 560' south of Tech Rd	2	4	2	County	0.11	\$0	\$0
Industrial Pkwy	Columbia Pike (US 29)	Tech Rd	2	4	2	County	0.26	\$0	\$0
Industrial Pkwy Extended	Approx. 560' south of Tech Rd	FDA Blvd	0	4	4	County	0.61	\$29,984,800	\$78,719
Johns Hopkins Dr	Key West Ave	Decoverly Dr	2	4	2	County	0.12	\$0	\$0
Key West Ave (MD 28)	Darnestown Rd (MD 28)	Shady Grove Rd	6	8	2	State	1.33	\$51,965,760	\$85,266

LOCAL ROAD NAME	FROM LOCATION	TO LOCATION	EXISTING LANES	PLANNED LANES	LANES NEEDED	OWNER	MILES	CAPITAL	O&M
Layhill Rd (MD 182)	Ednor Rd	Norbeck Rd (MD 28)	2	4	2	State	0.48	\$0	\$0
Layhill Rd (MD 182)	Norbeck Rd (MD 28)	230' north of Park Vista Dr	2	4	2	State	1.40	\$0	\$0
Leaman Farm Rd	Kingsview Village Ave	Germantown Rd	2	4	2	County	0.24	\$0	\$0
Leaman Farm Rd	Richter Farm Rd	Schaeffer Rd	2	4	2	County	0.54	\$0	\$0
Leaman Farm Rd Extended	Schaeffer Rd	Germantown Rd	0	4	4	County	0.24	\$11,721,600	\$30,773
Little Seneca Pkwy Extended	I-270	Observation Dr Extended	0	4	4	County	0.44	\$21,489,600	\$56,417
Little Seneca Pkwy Extended	A-307 (Proposed)	I-270	0	4	4	County	0.41	\$20,024,400	\$52,570
Little Seneca Pkwy Extended	Observation Dr Extended	Fairgarden Ln	0	4	4	County	0.13	\$6,349,200	\$16,669
Locbury Dr	Waters Landing Dr	Middlebrook Rd	2	4	2	County	0.64	\$0	\$0
Massachusetts Ave (MD 396)	Sangamore Rd	Goldsboro Rd	2	4	2	State	0.70	\$0	\$0
Mateny Rd	Great Seneca Hwy northeast	Dairymaid Dr	2	4	2	County	0.62	\$0	\$0
Medical Center Way	Shady Grove Rd	Medical Center Dr	2	4	2	County	0.07	\$0	\$0
Mid County Hwy	Shady Grove Rd	Goshen Rd	4	6	2	County	2.50	\$97,680,000	\$160,275
Mid County Hwy	Goshen Rd	Montgomery Village Ave	4	6	2	County	0.56	\$21,880,320	\$35,902
Mid County Hwy (Proposed)	650' west of Watkins Mill Rd	Ridge Rd	0	6	6	County	4.52	\$283,895,062	\$869,332
Mid County Hwy (Proposed)	Shady Grove Rd	Redland Rd	0	6	6	County	0.46	\$28,891,975	\$88,472
Mid County Hwy (Proposed)	Redland Rd	Intercountry Connector (MD 200)	0	6	6	County	1.26	\$79,138,889	\$242,336
Mid County Hwy (Proposed)	Montgomery Village Ave	1700' west of Montgomery Village Ave	0	6	6	County	0.32	\$20,222,479	\$61,924
Mid County Hwy (Proposed)	1200' east of Watkins Mill Rd	Watkins Mill Rd	0	6	6	County	0.23	\$14,274,691	\$43,711
Mid County Hwy (Proposed)	1700' west of Montgomery Village Ave	1200' east of Watkins Mill Rd	0	6	6	County	0.25	\$15,749,743	\$48,228
Mid County Hwy (Proposed)	Watkins Mill Rd	650' west of Watkins Mill Rd	0	6	6	County	0.12	\$7,732,124	\$23,677
Middlebrook Rd	Frederick Rd	Midcounty Hwy	2	6	4	County	0.82	\$40,048,800	\$105,140
Mid-Pike Spine St	Marinelli Rd	Old Georgetown Rd	2	4	2	County	0.34	\$0	\$0
Montrose Pkwy (Proposed)	Montrose Rd	Veirs Mill Rd	0	4	4	County	1.71	\$145,144,000	\$219,256
Montrose Rd	Seven Locks Rd	I-270	4	6	2	Both	0.39	\$15,238,080	\$25,003
Mooney Dr	Snouffer School Rd	Beechcraft Ave	2	4	2	County	0.17	\$0	\$0
Muddy Branch Rd	Decoverly Dr Extended	Darnestown Rd (City of Gaithersburg)	4	6	2	County	0.13	\$5,079,360	\$8,334
Muddy Branch Rd	West Diamond Ave (MD 117)	Great Seneca Hwy (MD 119)	4	6	2	County	2.28	\$89,084,160	\$146,171
Muddy Branch Rd	Great Seneca Hwy (MD 119)	Decoverly Dr Extended	4	6	2	County	0.42	\$16,410,240	\$26,926
Muncaster Mill Rd (MD 115)	Woodfield Rd	Redland Rd	2	4	2	State	1.30	\$0	\$0
Nebel St	Nicholson Ln	Randolph Rd	2	4	2	County	0.66	\$0	\$0
Nebel St Extended	Rockville Pike (MD 355)	Nicholson Ln	0	3	3	County	0.55	\$0	\$0
Norbeck Rd (MD 28)	Layhill Rd	New Hampshire Ave	2	4	2	State	2.50	\$0	\$0
Norbeck Rd (MD 28)	Georgia Ave	Layhill Rd	2	4	2	State	2.52	\$0	\$0
Norwood Rd	New Hampshire Ave	Ednor Rd/Layhill Rd	2	4	2	County	1.97	\$0	\$0
Oakmont Ave	Oakmont St	Washington Grove Ave	0	4	4	County	0.34	\$16,605,600	\$43,595
Observation Dr	Woodcutter Dr	Little Seneca Creek	0	4	4	County	0.20	\$9,768,000	\$25,644
Observation Dr	Germantown Rd	Goldenrod Ln	0	4	4	County	0.47	\$22,954,800	\$60,263
Observation Dr Extended	Little Seneca Creek	West Old Baltimore Rd	0	4	4	County	0.39	\$19,047,600	\$50,006
Observation Dr Extended	West Old Baltimore Rd	Roberts Tavern Dr	0	4	4	County	1.47	\$71,794,800	\$188,483
Observation Dr Extended	Roberts Tavern Dr	Stringtown Rd	2	4	2	County	0.21	\$0	\$0
Observation Dr Extended	Stringtown Rd	Clarksburg Rd	0	4	4	County	0.19	\$9,279,600	\$24,362
Old Georgetown Rd (MD 187)	Wisconsin Ave	Moorland Ln	3	4	1	State	0.20	\$0	\$0
Old Georgetown Rd (MD 187)	Wilson Ln	Cordell Ave	3	4	1	State	0.05	\$0	\$0
Old Georgetown Rd (MD 187)	Nebel St	Rockville Pike	2	4	2	State	0.31	\$0	\$0
Old Georgetown Rd (MD 187)	Moorland Ln	Wilson Ln	3	4	1	State	0.11	\$0	\$0
Olney-Laytonsville Rd (MD 108)	Approx. 250' south of Maple Road Dr (Laytonsville south boundary)	Approx. 250' north of Olney Mill Rd	2	4	2	State	4.26	\$0	\$0
Omega Dr	Fields Rd	Key West Ave	2	4	2	County	0.49	\$0	\$0
Plum Orchard Dr	Cherry Hill Rd	Gracefield Rd	2	4	2	County	0.13	\$0	\$0
Prosperity Dr	Industrial Pkwy	Cherry Hill Rd	2	4	2	County	0.73	\$0	\$0
Quince Orchard Rd	Darnestown Rd	Longdraft Rd	4	6	2	State	0.79	\$30,866,880	\$50,647
Quince Orchard Rd	Twin Lakes Dr	Gaithersburg City Limit	4	6	2	State	0.19	\$7,423,680	\$12,181
Redland Rd	Needwood Rd	Crabbs Branch Way	2	4	2	County	0.30	\$0	\$0
Ridge Rd	Mid County Hwy (Proposed)	Brink Rd	2	6	4	State	0.38	\$18,559,200	\$48,724
Ridge Rd	Skylark Rd	Mid County Hwy (Proposed)	2	4	2	State	1.25	\$0	\$0
Riffle Ford Rd	700' north of Woodsboro Dr	220' east of Hallman Ct	2	4	2	County	0.76	\$0	\$0
Riffle Ford Rd	Great Seneca Creek	700' north of Woodsboro Dr	2	4	2	County	0.52	\$0	\$0
Riffle Ford Rd	220' east of Hallman Ct	Darnestown Rd (MD28)	2	4	2	County	0.10	\$0	\$0
River Rd (MD 190)	Little Falls Pkwy	Western Ave (D.C. Line)	4	6	2	BRT	0.69	\$26,959,680	\$44,236
River Rd (MD 190)	Seven Locks Rd	Capital Beltway (I-495)	2	4	2	BRT	0.26	\$0	\$0
River Rd (MD 190)	Capital Beltway (I-495)	Ridgefield Rd	4	8	4	BRT	3.31	\$161,660,400	\$424,408
Roberts Tavern Dr	Latrobe Ln	Observation Dr Extended (A-19)	2	4	2	Both	0.08	\$0	\$0
Roberts Tavern Dr (extended)	Frederick Rd	Latrobe Ln	0	4	4	Both	0.20	\$9,768,000	\$25,644
Scenery Dr	Frederick Rd	Middlebrook Rd	2	4	2	County	0.69	\$0	\$0
Scenery Dr	Middlebrook Rd	Germantown Rd	2	4	2	County	0.75	\$0	\$0
Shady Grove Rd	Mid County Hwy	Muncaster Mill Rd	4	6	2	County	0.60	\$23,443,200	\$38,466
Shakespeare Blvd	Frederick Rd	Germantown Rd	2	4	2	County	0.64	\$0	\$0
Snouffer School Rd	Goshen Rd	Ridge Heights Dr	2	4	2	County	0.77	\$0	\$0
Southlawn Ln	E Gude Dr	Incinerator Ln	2	4	2	County	0.50	\$0	\$0
Southlawn Ln	Incinerator Ln	Avery Rd	2	4	2	County	0.76	\$0	\$0
Spencerville Rd	New Hampshire Ave	Thompson Rd	2	4	2	State	1.11	\$0	\$0
Spencerville Rd	Thompson Rd	360' east of Batson Rd	2	4	2	State	0.23	\$0	\$0
Spencerville Rd	360' east of Batson Rd	Old Columbia Pike	2	4	2	State	1.78	\$0	\$0
Spring St	830' west of Second Ave	First Ave	2	4	2	County	0.21	\$0	\$0
Spring St	Fairview Rd	Cameron St	2	4	2	County	0.08	\$0	\$0
Spring St	Cameron St	Colesville Rd	2	4	2	County	0.10	\$0	\$0

LOCAL ROAD NAME	FROM LOCATION	TO LOCATION	EXISTING LANES	PLANNED LANES	LANES NEEDED	OWNER	MILES	CAPITAL	O&M
Stringtown Rd	Frederick Rd	Overlook Park Dr	2	4	2	County	0.29	\$0	\$0
Stringtown Rd	Overlook Park Dr	Piedmont Rd (Future A-305)	2	4	2	County	0.61	\$0	\$0
Tech Rd	Columbia Pike (US 29)	Industrial Pkwy	2	4	2	County	0.38	\$0	\$0
Towne Rd	Rockville Pike (MD 355)	Executive Blvd / Old Georgetown Rd	2	4	2	Both	0.42	\$0	\$0
Waring Station Rd	Middlebrook Rd	Summer Oak Dr	2	4	2	County	0.80	\$0	\$0
Waring Station Rd	Summer Oak Dr	Wisteria Dr	2	4	2	County	0.39	\$0	\$0
Waring Station Rd	Wisteria Dr	Clopper Rd	2	4	2	County	0.61	\$0	\$0
Watkins Mill Rd	Windbrooke Dr	Watkins Mill Dr	2	4	2	County	0.23	\$0	\$0
West Diamond Ave (MD 117)	Quince Orchard Rd	Muddy Branch Rd	4	6	2	State	0.89	\$34,774,080	\$57,058
Westlake Dr	Westlake Terr	Tuckerman Ln	2	4	2	County	0.70	\$0	\$0
Wisteria Dr	Crystal Rock Dr	Great Seneca Hwy	2	4	2	County	0.32	\$0	\$0
Wisteria Dr	Great Seneca Hwy	Waring Station Rd	2	4	2	County	1.05	\$0	\$0
Woodfield Rd (MD 124)	Fieldcrest Rd	Warfield Rd	2	6	4	State	0.68	\$33,211,200	\$87,190
Woodfield Rd (MD 124)	Lindbergh Dr (N)	Muncaster Mill Rd	4	6	2	State	0.74	\$28,913,280	\$47,441
Woodfield Rd (MD 124)	Muncaster Mill Rd	Emory Grove Rd	2	6	4	State	0.70	\$34,188,000	\$89,754
Grade Separation	US 29	Stewart La				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	US 29	Tech Rd / Industrial Pkwy				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	US 29	Fairland Rd / Musgrove Rd				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	MD 97	MD 28				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	MD 355	Cedar Dr				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	MD 355	Gude Dr				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	MD 28	Shady Grove Rd				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	MD 119	Sam Eig Hwy				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	MD 119	Muddy Branch Rd				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	MD 119	MD 124				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	I-270	Westlake Terr				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	I-270	Wootton Pkwy				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	I-270	Gude Dr				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	I-270	Dorsey Mill Rd				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	I-270	Newcut Rd				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284
Grade Separation	MD 586	Randolph Rd				State		\$185,000,000	\$24,284

**APPENDIX B. List of Community Recreation Centers, Aquatic Centers, and Senior Centers Served by Department of Recreation**

	<b>Rec Center(s) Serving Location</b>	<b>Aquatic Center</b>	<b>Senior Center</b>
<b>Large Center</b>			
Friendship Heights	Jane E. Lawton Community Recreation Center (2.1 mi), Wisconsin Place Community Center (0.4 mi)		
Bethesda	Jane E. Lawton Community Recreation Center (.7 mi), Wisconsin Place Community Center (1.9 mi)	Bethesda Outdoor Pool (1 mi)	
White Flint	Twinbrook Community Recreation Center (City of Rockville)(2.0 mi) ; planned combined recreation-aquatic center which is not currently funded (0.3 mi)	Kennedy Shriver Aquatic Center (0.3 mi)	
Rockville	Bauer Drive Community Recreation Center (2.8 mi); Nancy H. Dacek North Potomac Community Center (5 mi), Twinbrook Community Recreation Center (2.6 mi)	Rockville Municipal Pool (City of Rockville)(0.7 mi)	
Gaithersburg/Shady Grove	Upper County Community Recreation Center (2.3 mi), Plum Gar Community Center (3.2 mi)	Upper County Outdoor Pool (2.2 mi)	
Silver Spring	Gwendolyn E. Coffield Community Recreation Center (Rosemary Hills Community)(1.8 mi), Long Branch Community Recreation Center (1.8 mi)	Piney Branch Swim Center, Long Branch Outdoor Pool (1.8 mi), Silver Spring Regional Recreation and Aquatic Center (under construction, open in Spring 2023)	Margaret Schweinhaut Senior Center (2.3 mi)
Wheaton	Wheaton Community Recreation Center (0.5mi), Mid-County Community Recreation Center (3.4 mi)	Sergeant Hector I. Ayala Wheaton/Glenmont Outdoor Pool (1.8 mi)	Holiday Park Senior Center (1.9 mi)
Glenmont	Mid-County Community Recreation Center (2.2 mi)	Sergeant Hector I. Ayala Wheaton/Glenmont Outdoor Pool, Olney Swim Center (0.9 mi)	Holiday Park Senior Center (2.1 mi)
White Oak	White Oak Community Recreation Center (1.3 mi)	Martin Luther King Jr. Indoor/Outdoor Swim Center (1.6 mi)	
<b>Medium Center</b>			

Grosvenor/Strathmore	Wheaton Community Recreation Center (4.7 mi), Lawton Community Center (5.1 mi)	Kennedy Shriver Aquatic Center (1.9 mi)	
Twinbrook	Twinbrook Community Recreation Center (City of Rockville)(0.4 mi)	Rockville Municipal Pool (City of Rockville)(2.9 mi)	
Rock Spring	Coffield Community Center (6.9 mi)	Kennedy Shriver Aquatic Center (2 mi)	
Germantown	Germantown Community Recreation Center (1.4 mi), Plum Gar Community Recreation Center (2.8 mi)	Germantown Indoor Swim Center (2.7 mi)	
Clarksburg	Germantown Community Recreation Center (7.4 mi), Plum Gar Community Recreation Center (6.7 mi)	Germantown Indoor Swim Center (8.4 mi)	
Olney	Olney Swim Center (1.8 mi), Longwood Community Center (1.7 mi)	Olney Swim Center (1.8 mi)	
Burtonsville	Marilyn J. Praisner Community Recreation Center (1.3 mi)	Martin Luther King Jr. Indoor/Outdoor Swim Center (6.1 mi)	
<b>Small Center</b>			
Forest Glen	South County Regional Recreation and Aquatic Center (under construction, open in Spring 2023)	South County Regional Recreation and Aquatic Center (under construction, open in Spring 2023)	Margaret Schweinhaut Senior Center (1.0 mi)
Kensington	Leonard D. Jackson Ken Gar Center (0.6 mi)	Kennedy Shriver Aquatic Center (3.1 mi)	
Aspen Hill	Bauer Drive Community Recreation Center (2.7 mi)	Olney Swim Center (3.5 mi)	
Montgomery Village	Upper County Community Center (3 mi), Plum Gar Community Center (3.2 mi)	Upper County Outdoor Pool (2.9 mi)	
Poolesville	Currently in facility planning for Poolesville. The closest Rec Centers include the Germantown Community Center (11.7 mi), Plum Gar (15.2 mi) or Damascus (17.4 mi), which all within 20 miles of the community.	Sarah E. Auer Western County Outdoor Pool (0.4 mi)	
Damascus	Damascus Community Recreation Center (3.7 mi)		
Hillandale	White Oak Community Recreation Center (2.6 mi)	Martin Luther King Jr. Indoor/Outdoor Swim Center (3 mi)	
<b>Villages and Neighborhood Center</b>			
Potomac Village	Potomac Community Recreation Center (2 mi), Bette Carol		

	Thompson Scotland Neighborhood Recreation Center (3.7 mi)		
Darnestown	Nancy H. Dacek North Potomac Community Center (4.4 mi)	Germantown Indoor Swim Center (4.1 mi)	
Cabin John	Clara Barton Neighborhood Recreation Center (0.4 mi)	Bethesda Outdoor Pool (4 mi)	
Sandy Spring	Ross Boddy Neighborhood Recreation Center (1.1 mi), Longwood Community Center (3.9 mi)	Olney Swim Center (3.4 mi)	
Ashton	Ross Boddy Neighborhood Recreation Center (2.1 mi), Longwood Community Center (4.5 mi)	Olney Swim Center (4.4 mi)	
Cloverly	Good Hope Neighborhood Recreation Center (1.4 mi), East County Community Recreation Center (4 mi), Marilyn J Praisner Community Recreation Center (4.5 mi)	Martin Luther King Jr. Indoor/Outdoor Swim Center (4.6 mi)	
Colesville	East County Community Recreation Center (4 mi), Good Hope Neighborhood Recreation Center (1.9 mi)	Martin Luther King Jr. Indoor/Outdoor Swim Center (2 mi)	
Layhill	Mid-County Community Recreation Center (0.4 mi), Wheaton Community Recreation Center (3.3 mi)	Martin Luther King Jr. Indoor/Outdoor Swim Center (5.7 mi)	
Redland	Upper County Community Recreation Center (1.8 mi)	Olney Swim Center (5 mi)	



# APPENDIX C. List of Montgomery County Public Libraries near Centers of Activity

Centers of Activity	Library(ies) Serving Location
<b>Large Center</b>	
Friendship Heights	Connie Morella Library (2.3 mi)
Bethesda	Connie Morella Library (0.3 mi)
White Flint	Kensington Park Library (2.4 mi), Davis Library (2.1 mi)
Rockville	Rockville Memorial Library (0.3 mi)
Gaithersburg/Shady Grove	Gaithersburg Library (1.5 mi)
Silver Spring	Long Branch Library (1.8 mi), Silver Spring Library (0 mi)
Wheaton	Wheaton Library (0.5 mi)
Glenmont	Wheaton Library (1.7 mi)
White Oak	White Oak Library (0.8 mi)
<b>Medium Centers</b>	
Grosvenor/Strathmore	Kensington Park Library (2 mi)
Twinbrook	Twinbrook Library (0.1 mi)
Rock Spring	Davis Library (0.7 mi)
Germantown	Germantown Library (0.8 mi)
Clarksburg	Germantown Library (6.8 mi), Clarksburg Library (slated for construction in 2026)
Olney	Olney Library (0.1 mi)
Burtonsville	Marilyn Praisner Library (1.2 mi)
<b>Small Centers</b>	
Forest Glen	Silver Spring Library (1.8 mi)
Kensington	Kensington Park Library (0.5 mi)
Aspen Hill	Aspen Hill Library (0.9 mi)
Montgomery Village	Gaithersburg Library (1.2 mi)
Poolesville	Maggie Nightingale (Poolesville Library) (0.4 mi)
Damascus	Damascus Library (0.2 mi)
Hillandale	White Oak Library (2.2 mi), Long Branch Library (3.2 mi)
<b>Villages and Neighborhood Centers</b>	
Potomac Village	Potomac Library (0.1 mi)
Darnestown	Quince Orchard Library (2.7 mi)
Cabin John	Little Falls Library (3.5 mi)
Sandy Spring	Olney Library (2.5 mi)
Ashton	Olney Library (2.4 mi)
Cloverly	White Oak Library (4.7 mi), Olney Library (5.5 mi)
Colesville	White Oak Library (2.1 mi)
Layhill	Wheaton Library (3.4 miles), Aspen Hill (3.1 miles)
Redland	Gaithersburg Library (4 mi), Rockville Library (4.8 miles)

APPENDIX D. Park Locations within One Mile from Centers of Activity

Category of COA	Center of Activity (COA)	Total Number of Parks	Total Number of Acres	Average Acre Per Park
Large Center	Bethesda	17	151	9
	Friendship Heights	24	251	10
	Gaithersburg / Shady Grove	25	459	18
	Glenmont	7	614	88
	Rockville	34	169	5
	Silver Spring	29	168	6
	VIVA White Oak / FDA	7	474	68
	Wheaton	16	714	45
	White Flint	7	267	38
	White Oak	5	816	163
Medium Center	Burtonsville	7	2977	425
	Clarksburg	9	4160	462
	Germantown	7	1680	240
	Grosvenor/Strathmore	13	488	38
	Olney	3	59	20
	Rock Spring	4	596	149
	Twinbrook	7	515	74
Small Center	Aspen Hill	10	211	21
	Damascus	7	1028	147
	Forest Glen	12	342	29
	Hillandale	4	522	131
	Kensington	24	620	26
	Montgomery Village	8	419	52
	Poolesville	14	103	7
Village and Neighborhood Center	Ashton	1	232	232
	Cabin John	11	4816	438
	Cloverly	8	1606	201
	Colesville	7	1258	180
	Darnestown	4	6701	1675
	Layhill	8	988	124
	Potomac Village	2	179	89
	Redland	11	2673	243
	Sandy Spring	1	232	232
<b>Total</b>		<b>353</b>	<b>36487</b>	<b>103</b>

## Orlin, Glenn

---

**From:** Wright, Gwen <gwen.wright@montgomeryplanning.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 20, 2021 1:23 PM  
**To:** Salem, Pofen; Dunn, Pamela; Orlin, Glenn; Khalid Afzal; Wellington, Meredith  
**Cc:** Beck, Mary; Knight, Julie  
**Subject:** RE: Draft FIS for Thrive for your review

**Importance:** High

### [EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Pofen, Mary and team:

Thanks for sharing the draft Fiscal Impact Statement (FIS) with us. We appreciate the hard work you and the county staff have put into producing this document. We have reviewed the draft FIS and continue to believe that Thrive, by its nature as a policy document and not a typical master plan, is not conducive to producing a traditional cost estimate no matter what approach is taken to develop such an estimate.

With regard to the FIS approach, our main concern is that the draft FIS does not compare the cost of implementing Thrive with the cost of business as usual. In the absence of such an alternative estimate, which could be far higher than \$720.5 million, the draft FIS does not provide a meaningful comparison between direct costs of Thrive versus the cost of a no-Thrive alternative of continuing the current fiscal structure to accommodate the additional 200,000 people, and grow equitably and sustainably. Therefore, it does not reflect the choice that is in front of the County Council, nor does it help the public to understand its share of these costs.

We have the following comments/questions about this analysis. This list is not intended to be exhaustive, but just highlight some of our key concerns about the analysis:

1. A fundamental flaw with this estimate is that it starts with **an unfounded assumption that Thrive is going to increase the cost of accommodating population growth over the next 30 years compared to our current trajectory**. The goal of Thrive is to change how we plan for development so that it is more compact, and thus, more efficient, cost effective, and sustainable. The population growth estimate of an additional 200,000 people is based on the Cooperative Forecast produced by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOC) that was conducted before we started the plan. The FIS extrapolates the estimates of current and planned capital projects and operating expenses over the next 30 years (with some credit for potential elimination of some of the projects due to Thrive), and then attributes ten percent of those costs to Thrive based on an *arbitrary assumption* that ten percent of the projected growth of 200,000 people will be caused by Thrive.

While public service cost savings related to compact development versus sprawl are difficult to quantify and generalize with utmost certainty because of the complexity of the factors involved, two comprehensive analyses of research into this issue find that almost all high-quality studies comparing the infrastructure and service costs of sprawling development to those of compact urbanism demonstrate that compact urbanism is less burdensome on public coffers.<sup>[1],[2]</sup> One of the most comprehensive of these studies examined actual infrastructure expenditures of 283 counties over a ten-year period.<sup>[3]</sup> It found that compactly developed counties spent less than sprawling counties (proportional to size and property values) on total direct infrastructure costs and capital facilities, as well as several subcategories of infrastructure and services including roads, trash collection, police, fire, parks and recreation, education, and libraries. Another 2019 study that similarly identifies a reduction in per capita spending for compact counties notes, "If the goal of state and local policymakers is to reduce the fiscal cost of sprawl...adopting policies that reduce potential for inefficient development on the urban fringe would be

fruitful.”<sup>[4]</sup> A study by the Victoria Transport Policy Institute notes that in addition to lowering costs, compact development also tends to increase municipal revenues, strengthening the fiscal case for quality urbanism.<sup>[5]</sup>

2. **The draft FIS only focuses on the perceived costs but fails to account for the potential benefits of Thrive in terms of the increased tax base** as a result of attracting new development and employers with better job opportunities resulting in increased property tax revenue or increases to other revenues. The goal of Thrive is to enhance the economic competitiveness of the county to make it more attractive to businesses and future residents. Economic growth will increase property and income tax revenues to the county. The FIS clearly admits that it does not account for additional income from increased property taxes, income taxes or increases to other revenues, which results in an incomplete assessment of the fiscal impacts of Thrive.
3. **The FIS also does not consider potential savings** from concentrating growth in infrastructure and amenity rich areas in a compact form of development. For example, under Thrive, reducing imperviousness through compact infill and redevelopment combined with improved transit will reduce the need for additional infrastructure upgrades such as more stormwater and flood mitigation measures. But under a non-Thrive scenario, public costs for new stormwater measures and upkeep would continue to grow as storm events become more severe and road expansions alone could add significant amounts of new imperviousness.

Another area of savings could come from Thrive’s push for greater use of colocated facilities envisioned to serve complete, walkable communities. Studies on the Colocation of Public Facilities, which were overseen by an interagency directors’ committee and endorsed by the County Council, found that colocation can produce cost savings from things such as the better utilization of land and other resources and consolidation of services. Even if in certain cases colocation can result in initially higher upfront costs, the potential for long-term savings in operating and maintenance costs can be significant compared to business-as-usual scenario.

4. **The FIS narrowly focuses on the one-time capital costs of construction but does not consider ongoing maintenance costs under a no-Thrive scenario.** We already face enormous maintenance costs. For example, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission’s (WSSC’s) rates continue to increase because of ongoing maintenance needs and debt service for already-necessary maintenance and capital improvements. WSSC noted in its fiscal year 2021 budget proposal to the Montgomery County Council that “40% of [its] water and sewer main (11,000 miles) are over 50 years old” (p. 13), that 73 cents of every water and sewer bill dollar is spent on debt service and operation/maintenance (p. 4-6), and that water and sewer rates are anticipated to increase by at least 6.5% each year through 2026 (p. 3-3). Likewise, the Montgomery County Department of Transportation already maintains 5,200 lane miles of roadway, 1,665 miles of sidewalk, curb and gutter, bridges, culverts, and an extensive storm drain system. For fiscal year 2022, the maintenance for this network is expected to require 102 full-time employees and cost almost \$17 million. And this work is expected to yield ratings of “good or better” quality for only 30% of primary and arterial roads. While the FIS notes that retrofitting some of this existing infrastructure to accommodate compact development may require extra up-front costs, a primary goal of Thrive is to reduce long-term maintenance costs for this infrastructure by limiting expansion of the County’s current inventory.
5. **The FIS includes some costs that are attributable to the Climate Action Plan, which is already being implemented independently from Thrive.** For example, the FIS includes a one-time cost of \$300 million for microgrid to support electric vehicles with the potential for private partnerships, and ongoing costs of \$8.4 million. FIS states that “The Thrive plan also assumed that the Climate Action Plan (CAP) would be integrated into Thrive. There are some individual Thrive plan recommendations that are also a part of the CAP which are included in Thrive plan cost figures when we were able to estimate them.” As the Climate Action Plan has been adopted by the county with the goal of eliminating greenhouse gas emissions by 2035, and will be implemented regardless of Thrive, why is this cost of \$300 million attributed to Thrive? Was there a FIS prepared for the Climate Action Plan and, if so, could you please share that with us?

6. **It also appears that some of the costs are based on a misinterpretation of some of the Plan's recommendations.** For example, the Plan recommends improving "access to the Agricultural Reserve for the public to experience and directly benefit from this valuable resource for locally grown food, outdoor recreation, and tourism." (Compact Growth chapter, p. 33). The FIS misinterprets improving access as requiring physical access via increased transit and therefore includes funds for additional eight bus routes and a depot, at a capital cost of \$124 million and annual operating costs of \$16 million. Improving access in this case is about greater public awareness and enjoyment through better communication/marketing and education about the Ag Reserve (most people in the county don't even know the variety of activities in the Ag Reserve) rather than improving physical means of access. In addition to the misinterpretation, we also think that this level of detail is too prescriptive for a 30-year policy document. We are not able to go line by line on all the cost estimates, but examples like this one raise questions about the validity of the assumptions in the FIS cost estimates and reinforce our view that this is not a reliable cost estimate for a 30-year general plan, let alone a true fiscal impacts assessment.

We appreciate your hard work to develop the draft FIS. Please let me know if you wish to discuss this further.

All the best,  
Gwen Wright

<sup>[1]</sup> Ewing, R., & Hamidi, S. (2015). Compactness versus sprawl: A review of recent evidence from the United States. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 30(4), 413-432.

<sup>2</sup> Litman, T. (2021). *Understanding smart growth savings*. Victoria Transport Policy Institute. [https://www.vtpi.org/sg\\_save.pdf](https://www.vtpi.org/sg_save.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> Carruthers, J. I., & Ulfarsson, G. F. (2003). Urban sprawl and the cost of public services. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 30(4), 503-522.

<sup>4</sup> Goodman, C. B. (2019). The fiscal impacts of urban sprawl: Evidence from US county areas. *Public Budgeting & Finance*, 39(4), 3-27, p.18.

<sup>5</sup> Litman, T. (2021). *Understanding smart growth savings*. Victoria Transport Policy Institute. [https://www.vtpi.org/sg\\_save.pdf](https://www.vtpi.org/sg_save.pdf)

<sup>[1]</sup> Ewing, R., & Hamidi, S. (2015). Compactness versus sprawl: A review of recent evidence from the United States. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 30(4), 413-432.

<sup>[2]</sup> Litman, T. (2021). *Understanding smart growth savings*. Victoria Transport Policy Institute. [https://www.vtpi.org/sg\\_save.pdf](https://www.vtpi.org/sg_save.pdf)

<sup>[3]</sup> Carruthers, J. I., & Ulfarsson, G. F. (2003). Urban sprawl and the cost of public services. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 30(4), 503-522.

<sup>[4]</sup> Litman, T. (2021). *Understanding smart growth savings*. Victoria Transport Policy Institute. [https://www.vtpi.org/sg\\_save.pdf](https://www.vtpi.org/sg_save.pdf)



**Gwen L.M. Wright**  
**Planning Director**

Montgomery County Planning Department  
2425 Reedie Drive, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Wheaton, MD 20902  
[Gwen.Wright@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Gwen.Wright@montgomeryplanning.org)  
c: 571-329-3053 | o:301-495-4500

