



**Committee:** Directly to Council  
**Committee Review:** N/A  
**Staff:** Glenn Orlin, Senior Analyst; Christine Wellons, Senior Legislative Attorney  
**Purpose:** Final action – vote expected

AGENDA ITEM #4A  
December 13, 2022  
**Action**

## SUBJECT

Expedited Bill 34-22, Streets and Roads – Classification of Roads

Lead Sponsor: Then-Council President Albornoz

## EXPECTED ATTENDEES

Jason Sartori, Chief, Countywide Planning and Policy Division, Planning Department

## COUNCIL DECISION POINTS & COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

- Consideration of potential amendments to Expedited Bill 34-22 (as described in the staff memorandum)
- Motion, followed by a roll-call vote, on whether to enact Expedited Bill 34-22, as amended

## DESCRIPTION/ISSUE

Expedited Bill 34-22 is a corrective bill. Then-Council President Albornoz introduced the bill on November 15, 2022, at the request of Council staff and Planning Department staff, in order to correct mistakes in the recently enacted “complete streets” legislation, Bill 24-22, which addressed road design and construction under Chapter 49. A public hearing on Expedited Bill 34-22 was held on December 6, 2022, at which there were no public speakers.

## SUMMARY OF KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

As described in the staff memorandum, the bill would make corrections and clarifications to the list of town center areas under Section 49-31 of the County Code. The corrections and clarifications would be consistent with the intent of the 19<sup>th</sup> Council in its “complete streets” legislation – Bill 24-22.

### **This report contains:**

Staff memorandum	Pages 1-3
Expedited Bill 34-22	©1
RESJ Impact Statement	©4
Economic Impact Statement	©8

**Alternative format requests for people with disabilities.** If you need assistance accessing this report you may [submit alternative format requests](#) to the ADA Compliance Manager. The ADA Compliance Manager can also be reached at 240-777-6197 (TTY 240-777-6196) or at [adacompliance@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:adacompliance@montgomerycountymd.gov)

**M E M O R A N D U M**

December 8, 2022

TO: County Council

FROM: Glenn Orlin, Senior Analyst  
Christine Wellons, Senior Legislative Attorney

SUBJECT: Expedited Bill 24-22, Streets and Roads – Classification of Roads

PURPOSE: Final action – roll call vote expected

**Expected Attendee:**

Jason Sartori, Chief, Countywide Planning and Policy Division, Planning Department

Expedited Bill 34-22, Streets and Roads – Classification of Roads was introduced by the Council President on November 15, 2022. A public hearing was held on December 6, 2022. No speakers testified at the hearing.

Council staff and Planning Department staff had requested the bill in order to correct references to certain town centers under Section 49-31 of the County Code. Recently enacted “complete streets” legislation, Bill 24-22, contained some errors regarding the names of the town centers.

**BACKGROUND**

Expedited Bill would make corrections and clarifications to the list of town center areas under Section 49-31 of the County Code. The corrections and clarifications would be consistent with the intent of the 19<sup>th</sup> Council in its “complete streets” legislation – Bill 24-22.

**BILL SPECIFICS**

With the amendment described below, the bill would clarify the list of town centers under County Code Section 49-31 to read as follows:

- Burtonsville urban area;
- Cabin Branch urban area;
- Chevy Chase Lake urban area;
- Clarksburg Town Center urban area;

- Damascus urban area;
- Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan urban area;
- Germantown Town Center urban area;
- Glenmont urban area;
- Grosvenor urban area;
- White Oak Science Gateway urban area excluding Life Sciences / FDA Village Center;
- Kensington urban area;
- Langley Crossroads urban area;
- Life Science Center South in Great Seneca Science Corridor urban area;
- Lyttonsville Station urban area;
- Olney Town Center urban area;
- Piney Branch urban area;
- Shady Grove urban area;
- Twinbrook urban area;
- Veirs Mill-Randolph urban area in Veirs Mill Corridor Master Plan;
- Washingtonian Town Center in Great Seneca Science Corridor urban area;
- Westbard Sector Plan urban area;
- White Flint 2 Sector Plan area east of the CSX Metropolitan Branch; and
- Woodside Station urban area.

#### **POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS FOR THE COUNCIL’S CONSIDERATION**

Per further review by Council and Planning Department staff, several additional clarifications to the town center designations under the bill are needed as follows.

*Amend lines 12-24 as follows.*

(D) Clarksburg [Town Center] Town Center urban area;

\* \* \*

[(F)] (G) Germantown [Town Center] Town Center urban area;

[(G)] (H) Glenmont [[Sector Plan Area]] urban area;

[(H)] (I) [[Grosvenor-Strathmore Sector Plan Area]] Grosvenor urban area;

\* \* \*

[(I)] (K) Kensington [[Town Center]] urban area;

\* \* \*

[(K)] (N) Lyttonsville [[Purple Line]] Station urban area;

**Decision point:** whether to approve the corrective amendment described above.

**NEXT STEP:** Motion and roll call vote on whether to enact Expedited Bill 34-22, as amended.

This packet contains:

Expedited Bill 34-22

Racial Equity and Social Justice Impact Statement

Economic Impact Statement

Circle #

1

4

8

Expedited Bill No. 34-22  
Concerning: Streets and Roads –  
Classification of Roads  
Revised: 11/10/2022 Draft No. 1  
Introduced: November 15, 2022  
Expires: May 15, 2024  
Enacted: [date]  
Executive: [date signed]  
Effective: [date takes effect]  
Sunset Date: [date expires]  
Ch. [#], Laws of Mont. Co. [year]

## COUNTY COUNCIL FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

---

By: Council President

---

**AN EXPEDITED ACT** to:

- (1) correct the identification of town centers; and
- (2) generally amend the law concerning the classification of roads.

By amending

Montgomery County Code  
Chapter 49, Streets and Roads  
Section 49-31

<b>Boldface</b>	<i>Heading or defined term.</i>
<u>Underlining</u>	<i>Added to existing law by original bill.</i>
<b>[Single boldface brackets]</b>	<i>Deleted from existing law by original bill.</i>
<u>Double underlining</u>	<i>Added by amendment.</i>
<b>[[Double boldface brackets]]</b>	<i>Deleted from existing law or the bill by amendment.</i>
* * *	<i>Existing law unaffected by bill.</i>

*The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland approves the following Act:*

**Sec. 1. Section 49-31 is amended as follows:**

**Sec. 49-31. Classification of roads.**

(a) In this Article and the regulations adopted under it[,], County area types are as follows until subsequently designated by functional plans, master plans, or sector plans:

\* \* \*

(2) A *town center* area consists of areas with moderate to high development intensity. These areas are:

(A) Burtonsville [Town Center] urban area;

(B) Cabin Branch urban area;

(C) Chevy Chase Lake urban area;

(D) Clarksburg [Town Center] urban area;

(E) Damascus [Town Center] urban area;

(F) Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan urban area;

[(F)] (G) Germantown [Town Center] urban area;

[(G)] (H) Glenmont Sector Plan Area urban area;

[(H)] (I) Grosvenor-Strathmore Sector Plan Area urban area;

(J) White Oak Science Gateway urban area excluding Life Sciences / FDA Village Center;

[(I)] (K) Kensington Town Center urban area;

[(J)] (L) Langley Crossroads urban area;

(M) Life Science Center South in Great Seneca Science Corridor urban area;

24 [(K)] (N) Lyttonsville Purple Line Station urban area;

25 [(L) Montgomery Hills]

26 [(M)] (O) Olney Town Center urban area;

27 [(N)] (P) Piney Branch urban area;

28 [(O)] (Q) Shady Grove [Sector Plan Area] urban area;

29 [(P)] (R) Twinbrook [Sector Plan Area] urban area;

30 (S) Veirs Mill-Randolph [Town Center] urban area in Veirs  
 31 Mill Corridor Master Plan;

32 (T) Washingtonian Town Center in Great Seneca Science  
 33 Corridor urban area;

34 [(Q)] (U) Westbard Sector Plan urban area;

35 [(R)] (V) White Flint 2 Sector Plan area east of the CSX  
 36 Metropolitan Branch; and

37 [(S)] (W) Woodside [Purple Line] Station urban area.

38 \* \* \*

39 **Sec. 2. Expedited effective date.** The Council declares that this legislation is  
 40 necessary for the immediate public interest. The Act must take effect on February 7,  
 41 2023.

# Racial Equity and Social Justice (RESJ) Impact Statement

Office of Legislative Oversight

## EXPEDITED      STREETS AND ROADS – CLASSIFICATION OF ROADS BILL 34-22:

### SUMMARY

The Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) finds the racial equity and social justice (RESJ) impact of Expedited Bill 34-22 is indeterminant. Black and Latinx residents could disproportionately benefit from the adoption of complete streets standards to roadway projects in the White Oak Science Gateway and the Veirs Mill/Randolph urban areas. However, given the analysis of spending on roadway projects for Bill 24-22, Streets and Roads, it is generally unclear whether Black, Indigenous, and Other People of Color (BIPOC) residents and communities will be the primary beneficiaries of roadway projects developed with complete streets standards.

---

### PURPOSE OF RESJ IMPACT STATEMENTS

The purpose of RESJ impact statements (RESJIS) is to evaluate the anticipated impact of legislation on racial equity and social justice in the County. Racial equity and social justice refer to a **process** that focuses on centering the needs, leadership, and power of communities of color and low-income communities with a **goal** of eliminating racial and social inequities.<sup>1</sup> Achieving racial equity and social justice usually requires seeing, thinking, and working differently to address the racial and social harms that have caused racial and social inequities.<sup>2</sup>

---

### PURPOSE OF EXPEDITED BILL 34-22

In October 2022, the County Council voted to enact Bill 24-22, Streets and Roads, which revised the County Code to apply complete streets standards to the design and construction of roads and road improvements.<sup>3</sup> Bill 24-22 established design standards for various types of streets and roads within five area types: downtown, town center, suburban, industrial, and rural.<sup>4</sup>

The purpose of Expedited Bill 34-22 is to revise the County Code to include additional areas within the list of town centers where complete streets standards will be applied to roadway projects. The following areas would be added to the list:<sup>5</sup>

- White Oak Science Gateway urban area excluding Life Sciences/FDA Village Center (already classified as a “downtown” in Bill 24-22);
- Life Science Center South urban area in the Great Seneca Science Corridor Master Plan;
- Veirs Mill/Randolph urban area in the Veirs Mill Corridor Master Plan; and
- Washingtonian Town Center in the Great Seneca Science Corridor Master Plan.

Additionally, as explained in the Introduction Staff Packet:

“This [B]ill also more precisely defines some of the other town centers. For example, in Bill 24-22 one of the town centers is “Lyttonsville Purple Line Station.” The [B]ill would amend this to read “Lyttonsville Purple Line Station urban area,” which corresponds to the area near the station, not just the station itself.”<sup>6</sup>



# RESJ Impact Statement

## Expedited Bill 34-22

Expedited Bill 34-22 was introduced to the Council on November 15, 2022.

In August 2022, OLO published a RESJIS for Bill 24-22, Streets and Roads.<sup>7</sup> Please refer to this RESJIS for background on transportation infrastructure and racial equity, and for an analysis of the RESJ impact of adopting complete streets standards to roadway projects.

### ANTICIPATED RESJ IMPACTS

To consider the anticipated impact of Expedited Bill 34-22 on RESJ in the County, OLO recommends the consideration of two related questions:

- Who are the primary beneficiaries of this bill?
- What racial and social inequities could passage of this bill weaken or strengthen?

**For the first question**, OLO considered the demographics of residents living in the areas that would be added to the list of town centers where complete streets standards will be applied to roadway projects. OLO approximated the proposed town center areas by identifying Census Designated Places (CDP) the areas are within or surrounded by. Table 1 summarizes resident demographics of the approximated areas; of note:

- Area 1, which approximates the White Oak Science Gateway urban area, includes the demographics of Burnt Mills CDP, Calverton CDP, Hillandale CDP and White Oak CDP.
- Area 2, which approximates the Life Science Center South urban area and Washingtonian Town Center, includes the demographics of the cities of Gaithersburg and Rockville.
- Area 3, which approximates the Veirs Mill/Randolph urban area, includes the demographics of Aspen Hill CDP, North Kensington CDP, and Wheaton CDP.
- The approximated areas cover a larger geography than each of the proposed town centers.

**Table 1: Percent of Residents by Race and Ethnicity, Montgomery County and Approximated Town Center Areas**

Race and ethnicity	County	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3
Asian	15.4	11.0	20.3	11.2
Black	18.6	45.6	13.8	18.1
Native American	0.7	0.7	0.8	1.3
Pacific Islander	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1
White	43.1	20.0	41.0	31.0
Latinx	20.5	22.4	22.8	38.7

Source: 2020 Decennial Census, Census Bureau.

Table 1 suggests Black and Latinx residents may be largely overrepresented in the White Oak Science Gateway and Veirs Mill/Randolph urban areas. Asian residents are possibly overrepresented in Life Science Center South urban area and Washingtonian Town Center, though to a smaller degree. White residents may be underrepresented in each area to varying degrees.

# RESJ Impact Statement

## Expedited Bill 34-22

**For the second question**, OLO considered the effect this Bill could have on reducing transportation inequities in the proposed town center areas. As discussed in the RESJIS for Bill 24-22, if the adoption of complete streets standards works as intended, BIPOC residents could benefit from safer designed streets, since racial inequities in transportation infrastructure make BIPOC more likely to suffer from traffic-related injuries than White residents.

However, in the RESJIS for Bill 24-22, the analysis of the FY23 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) found that 41.3 percent of funding for road-related projects, or \$870.6 million, is not identifiable by Council district. Thus, it is generally unclear whether BIPOC residents and communities will be the primary beneficiaries of roadway projects developed with complete streets standards. Further, it is unclear the extent to which complete streets could generally encourage redevelopment, which often tends to favor higher-income residents, White residents, and White-owned businesses, and has the potential to displace low-income and BIPOC residents.

Taken together, OLO finds the RESJ impact of this Bill is indeterminant. Black and Latinx residents could disproportionately benefit from the adoption of complete streets standards to roadway projects in the White Oak Science Gateway and the Veirs Mill/Randolph urban areas. However, given the analysis of spending on roadway projects for Bill 24-22, it is generally unclear whether BIPOC residents and communities will be the primary beneficiaries of roadway projects developed with complete streets standards.

---

### RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

The Racial Equity and Social Justice Act requires OLO to consider whether recommended amendments to bills aimed at narrowing racial and social inequities are warranted in developing RESJ impact statements.<sup>8</sup> OLO finds the RESJ impact of Expedited Bill 34-22 is indeterminant due to insufficient information on whether BIPOC residents will be the primary beneficiaries of roadway projects developed with complete streets standards. OLO does not offer recommended amendments since the bill was not found to be inequitable.

While OLO cannot conclude whether BIPOC residents will be the primary beneficiaries of Bill 34-22, funding for the FY23 CIP suggests that, where the specific Council district of a project is identified, White residents are disproportionate beneficiaries of road-related transportation projects and could thus be the primary beneficiaries of future roadway projects developed with complete streets standards. To have a more accurate understanding of the RESJ impact of adopting the complete streets framework, the Council could consider commissioning a comprehensive equity review of the CIP, as recommended for Expedited Bills 15-22, 16-22, and 19-22.<sup>9</sup>

---

### CAVEATS

Two caveats to this racial equity and social justice impact statement should be noted. First, predicting the impact of legislation on racial equity and social justice is a challenging analytical endeavor due to data limitations, uncertainty, and other factors. Second, this RESJ impact statement is intended to inform the legislative process rather than determine whether the Council should enact legislation. Thus, any conclusion made in this statement does not represent OLO's endorsement of, or objection to, the bill under consideration.

---

### CONTRIBUTIONS

OLO staffer Janmarie Peña, Performance Management and Data Analyst, drafted this RESJ impact statement.

# RESJ Impact Statement

## Expedited Bill 34-22

---

<sup>1</sup> Definition of racial equity and social justice adopted from “Applying a Racial Equity Lens into Federal Nutrition Programs” by Marlysa Gamblin, et.al. Bread for the World, and from Racial Equity Tools. <https://www.racialequitytools.org/glossary>

<sup>2</sup> Ibid

<sup>3</sup> Action Staff Report for Bill 24-22, Streets and Roads, Montgomery County Council, Montgomery County, Maryland, October 25, 2022. [https://apps.montgomerycountymd.gov/cclims/DownloadFilePage?FileName=2764\\_1\\_22528\\_Bill\\_24-22\\_Action\\_20221025.pdf](https://apps.montgomerycountymd.gov/cclims/DownloadFilePage?FileName=2764_1_22528_Bill_24-22_Action_20221025.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> Introduction Staff Report for Bill 34-22, Streets and Roads – Classification of Roads, Montgomery County Council, Montgomery County, Maryland, Introduced November 15, 2022.

[https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/council/Resources/Files/agenda/col/2022/20221115/20221115\\_3C.pdf](https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/council/Resources/Files/agenda/col/2022/20221115/20221115_3C.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> Ibid

<sup>6</sup> Ibid

<sup>7</sup> RESJIS for Bill 24-22, Streets and Roads, Office of Legislative Oversight, Montgomery County, Maryland, August 22, 2022.

<https://montgomerycountymd.gov/OLO/Resources/Files/resjis/2022/Bill24-22.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> Bill 27-19, Administration – Human Rights – Office of Racial Equity and Social Justice – Racial Equity and Social Justice Advisory Committee – Established, Montgomery County Council

<sup>9</sup> Racial Equity and Social Justice Impact Statement for Expedited Bill 19-22, Office of Legislative Oversight, Montgomery County, Maryland, June 29, 2022. <https://montgomerycountymd.gov/OLO/Resources/Files/resjis/2022/BillE19-22.pdf>

# Economic Impact Statement

Office of Legislative Oversight

## Expedited Bill 34-22

## Streets and Roads – Classification of Roads

### SUMMARY

On October 25, 2022, the Council enacted Bill 24-22, Streets and Roads, which incorporated Complete Streets (CS) into the design and construction of roads and road improvements in the County. In the Economic Impact Statement for Bill 24-22, the Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) concluded it would have a positive overall impact on economic conditions in the County in terms of the Council's priority indicators. Expedited Bill 34-22 would amend the law concerning the classification of roads to include town centers inadvertently left off the list in the original legislation and to define more precisely some of the other town centers. By including more town centers on the list, the Bill would expand the geographic scope of CS in the County. OLO anticipates that doing so would have a positive impact on economic conditions in the County for the same reasons presented in the Economic Impact Statement for the original Bill. For this reason, OLO presents its original analysis in subsequent sections of this report.

### BACKGROUND

As stated above, Bill 34-22 would amend the law concerning the classification of roads in two ways. First, it would include town centers inadvertently left off the list in the original legislation, namely White Oak Science Gateway urban area excluding the Life Sciences/FDA Village Center, the Life Science Center South urban area in the Great Seneca Science Corridor Master Plan, the Veirs Mill/Randolph urban area in the Veirs Mill Corridor Master Plan, and the Washingtonian Town Center in the Great Seneca Science Corridor Master Plan. Second, the Bill would define more precisely some of the other town centers.<sup>1</sup>

### INFORMATION SOURCES, METHODOLOGIES, AND ASSUMPTIONS

Per Section 2-81B of the Montgomery County Code, the purpose of this Economic Impact Statement is to assess, both, the impacts of Bill 34-22 on residents and private organizations in terms of the Council's priority economic indicators and whether the Bill would have a net positive or negative impact on overall economic conditions in the County.<sup>2</sup>

OLO assumes the primary economic impacts of Bill 34-22 would occur through increasing the number of CS projects in the County than there otherwise would be in the absence of a CS policy. Moreover, because several sources find that CS

---

<sup>1</sup> [Bill 34-22](#).

<sup>2</sup> Montgomery County Code, [Sec. 2-81B](#).

# Economic Impact Statement

## Office of Legislative Oversight

projects are cost neutral relative to non-CS projects, OLO does not believe the Bill would significantly affect construction costs for developers and builders or the total number of projects completed in the County per year.<sup>3</sup>

To assess the economic impacts of increasing CS projects in the County, OLO uses the following method:

1. identify studies on the direct economic outcomes of CS projects and policies using Google Scholar;<sup>4</sup>
2. rank the relative strengths of results from these studies using a standard Levels of Evidence (LOE) which rates evidence from experimental studies above descriptive studies;<sup>5</sup> and
3. infer the Bill's impacts on stakeholders and overall economic conditions in the County based on the strength of the studies' findings.

The studies identified through OLO's search (see below) evaluate whether CS projects and policies impact the following economic indicators prioritized by the Council:

- property values;
- employment;
- business income and creation; and
- private sector capital improvement.

The focus of this analysis is to assess whether establishing a CS policy in the County would affect these indicators.

Note: OLO acknowledges that Bill 34-22 could have indirect economic impacts. For instance, there is strong evidence that CS improvements increase physical activity and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.<sup>6</sup> Through increasing activity and safety, CS could decrease personal healthcare expenditures as well as revenues for the healthcare industry. Due to information and time limitations, however, these potential impacts are excluded from the scope of this analysis.

## VARIABLES

The primary variables that would affect the economic impacts of enacting Bill 34-22 are the following:

- number of CS projects;
- average residential and commercial property values;
- number of full- and part-time jobs;
- total business revenues; and
- number of businesses.

---

<sup>3</sup> OMB, [Fiscal Impact Statement: Bill 24-22](#); and Anderson and Searfoss, "[Safer Streets, Stronger Economies](#)."

<sup>4</sup> The most effective search term was: "[complete streets](#)" and "[economic](#)".

<sup>5</sup> See, for example, Cornell University Library, "[Levels of evidence](#)."

<sup>6</sup> Countyhealthrankings.org, [Complete Streets & Streetscape Design Initiatives](#).

# Economic Impact Statement

## Office of Legislative Oversight

### IMPACTS

WORKFORCE ■ TAXATION POLICY ■ PROPERTY VALUES ■ INCOMES ■ OPERATING COSTS ■ PRIVATE SECTOR CAPITAL INVESTMENT ■ ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ■ COMPETITIVENESS

### Evidence Evaluation

The purported benefits of CS are many—spanning outcomes related to the economy, safety, mobility, equity, environment, and livability. However, as stated in a 2021 review, “CS has promised much and proven little.”<sup>7</sup> This is especially true when it comes to the economics of CS, as researchers largely have focused on investigating its non-economic impacts.<sup>8</sup>

Using Google Scholar, OLO identified four studies that examine the impact of CS projects and policies on several economic indicators prioritized by the Council. As shown in **Table 1**, OLO ranked the studies that use quasi-experimental methodologies over the non-experimental studies in terms of strength of findings.

#### *Property Values*

Yu, et al (2018) and Vendegrift and Zononi (2018) use quasi-experimental designs, specifically matching, to construct artificial control groups to account for selection bias in the adoption of CS projects or policies.<sup>9</sup> They compare the outcomes of interest—property values for homes—between units that received the treatment—homes near a CS roadway or in jurisdictions with a CS policy—and units with similar characteristics that did not receive the treatment—similar homes distant from a CS roadway or in jurisdictions with no CS policy.

The studies arrived at conflicting conclusions. Focusing on the effect of CS at the *project-level* on property values for single-family homes, Yu, et al (2018) found positive and robust effects relative to two control groups. Exposure to a CS project in Orlando, Florida increased home values and home value resiliency by 8.2% and 4.3% respectively when compared to similar homes in an area adjacent to the project and by 2.7% and 1.6% respectively when compared to similar homes around auto-oriented areas with similar characteristics.

In contrast, Vendegrift and Zononi (2018) assessed the effect of CS at the *policy-level* on residential property values in municipalities in New York and New Jersey. They found no statistically significant difference between the change in values for homes in municipalities pre- and post-CS policy adoption and for homes in municipalities with similar characteristics that had not adopted CS policies during this time.

---

<sup>7</sup> Jordan and Ivey, “[Complete Streets](#).”

<sup>8</sup> Ibid; Yu, et al, “[Assessing the economic benefits](#).”

<sup>9</sup> Quasi-experimental methods are distinguished from standard regression approaches and by their ability to better identify the causal effects of a policy intervention from outcomes correlated with, but unrelated to, the intervention due to unmeasured confounding, selection bias, and other threats to causal inference.

# Economic Impact Statement

## Office of Legislative Oversight

The non-experimental studies examined the relationship between CS projects and residential and commercial property values. Anderson and Searfoss (2015) and Perk, et al (2015) compared changes in property values before and after the completion of CS projects with property value trends in control areas or jurisdictions where projects were located. Both studies found a positive association between CS projects and property values.

Because the nonexperimental studies support the findings in Yu, et al (2018), OLO believes there is a high likelihood that CS projects increase residential property values for nearby homes. They may also increase commercial property values.

### *Other Indicators*

OLO was unable to identify quasi-experimental studies on the effect of CS projects/policies on other economic indicators. Both non-experimental studies found CS projects increase employment near the sites. Anderson and Searfoss (2015) found these projects increase business revenue and creation and private investment, in addition to employment. In the absence of stronger findings, OLO cannot be confident there is a high likelihood CS projects increase these outcomes. However, the non-experimental studies suggest CS projects may have these effects.

**Table 1. Relative Strength of Findings for Studies Reviews**

Source	Indicator(s)	Methodology	Findings	Relative Strength of Evidence
Yu, et al (2018)	property values	quasi-experimental: matching	CS increases property values	high
Vandegrift and Zanoni (2018)	property values	quasi-experimental: matching	no association b/w CS and property values	high
Anderson and Searfoss (2015)	property values; employment; business revenues; business creation; private investment	non-experimental: before-and-after comparison between CS projects and control areas and/or jurisdiction where project occurred	CS increases all indicators	low
Perk, et al (2015)	property values; employment	non-experimental: case study comparison between CS projects and control areas and/or jurisdiction where project occurred	CS increases property values and employment	low

# Economic Impact Statement

## Office of Legislative Oversight

### Residents

If Bill 34-22 increases the number of CS roadways in the County than there otherwise would be in its absence, OLO believes the change in law would have a positive impact on certain residents in the County in terms of several priority indicators of the Council.

The studies reviewed in this analysis indicate a high likelihood the Bill would increase residential property values for homes nearby CS projects that would not have occurred in the absence of the change in law. Homeowners would benefit from this outcome. However, increased property values may act to decrease housing affordability, which would adversely affect lower income home buyers and tenants.<sup>10</sup> The studies also suggest certain residents may benefit from increased employment opportunities.

Beyond these potential impacts, OLO is uncertain whether Bill 34-22 would affect residents in terms of the Council's other priority indicators given limited research on the economic impacts of CS projects and policies.

### Businesses, Non-Profits, Other Private Organizations

If Bill 34-22 increases the number of CS roadways in the County than there otherwise would be in its absence, OLO believes the change in law may have a positive impact on certain private organizations in the County in terms of several priority indicators of the Council. The non-experimental studies suggest the Bill may increase business revenues and creation and commercial property values in areas surrounding CS projects. Again, due to the limited research on the topic, OLO is uncertain whether Bill 34-22 would affect private organizations in terms of the Council's other priority indicators.

### Net Impact

OLO believes the overall economic impact of Bill 34-22 to residents and private organizations would be positive. The magnitude of the overall impact largely would depend on the extent to which establishing a CS policy would induce CS project creations. Assessing this relationship is beyond the scope of the analysis here due to information and time limitations.

## DISCUSSION ITEMS

Not applicable

## WORKS CITED

Anderson, Geoff and Laura Searfoss. [Safer Streets, Stronger Economies: Complete Streets Project Outcomes Across the Country](#). Smart Growth America. March 2015.

---

<sup>10</sup> Yu, et al, "[Assessing the economic benefits](#)."



# Economic Impact Statement

## Office of Legislative Oversight

Countyhealthrankings.org. [Complete Streets & Streetscape Design Initiatives](#). County Health Rankings & Roadmaps. November 16, 2017.

Guides.library.cornell.edu. [Navigating Information Resources: 3. Levels of evidence, article types, & reporting requirements](#). Cornell University Library.

Jordan, Samuel W., and Stephanie Ivey. "[Complete Streets: Promises and Proof](#)." *Journal of Urban Planning and Development* 147, no. 2 (June 1, 2021).

Montgomery County Code. [Sec. 2-81B, Economic Impact Statements](#).

Montgomery County Council. [Bill 24-22, Streets and Roads](#). Introduced on July 26, 2022.

Montgomery County Council. [Expedited Bill 34-22, Streets and Roads – Classification of Roads](#). Introduction on November 15, 2022.

Montgomeryplanning.org. [Montgomery County Complete Streets](#). February 2021.

Montgomerycountymd.gov. [Vision Zero](#).

Office of Management and Budget. [Fiscal Impact Statement: Bill 24-22](#). June 3, 2022.

Perk, Victoria, Martin Catalá, Maximilian Mantius, and Katrina Corcoran. [Capturing the Benefits of Complete Streets](#). Center for Urban Transportation Research, University of South Florida. December 1, 2015.

Vandegrift, Donald, and Nicholas Zaroni. "[An Economic Analysis of Complete Streets Policies](#)." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 171 (March 1, 2018): 88–97.

Yu, Chia-Yuan, Minjie Xu, Samuel D. Towne, and Sara Iman. "[Assessing the Economic Benefits and Resilience of Complete Streets in Orlando, FL: A Natural Experimental Design Approach](#)." *Journal of Transport & Health* 8 (March 1, 2018): 169–78.

## CAVEATS

Two caveats to the economic analysis performed here should be noted. First, predicting the economic impacts of legislation is a challenging analytical endeavor due to data limitations, the multitude of causes of economic outcomes, economic shocks, uncertainty, and other factors. Second, the analysis performed here is intended to *inform* the legislative process, not determine whether the Council should enact legislation. Thus, any conclusion made in this statement does not represent OLO's endorsement of, or objection to, the Bill under consideration.

## CONTRIBUTIONS

Stephen Roblin (OLO) prepared this report.