

MEMORANDUM

April 21, 2017

TO: County Council

FROM: Glenn Orlin, Deputy Council Administrator

SUBJECT: **Worksession**—Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan—staging and land use/school capacity balance

Councilmembers: Please bring the Draft Plan and Appendix to this worksession.

I. STAGING

As of September 2014, there was approximately 23.6 million sf of development in the Bethesda CBD. In her April 13 memorandum to the Council, Planning Director Gwen Wright reaffirmed the 23.6 million sf figure, and reported that the pipeline as of February 2017 comprises an additional 4.6 million sf, including two new projects approved in the past six months (the new buildings on the Apex site and the development at 8015 Old Georgetown-Christ Lutheran Church). Therefore, the sum of existing and already approved development is about 28.2 million sf. The difference between the 32.4 million sf cap and the 28.2 million sf of existing and already approved development is 4.2 million sf (©1-4). Of this 4.2 million sf, about 0.4 million sf will be requested for the Marriott headquarters.

On March 9, the Planning Board and staff transmitted a memorandum to the PHED Committee Chair with their views on staging (©5-8). Here are their main points and Council staff's comments:

- *The 1994 Bethesda Plan includes mode share goals and other staging elements, but the timing and amount of new development was to be determined by the Subdivision Staging Policy (then called the Annual Growth Policy, or AGP).* This is partially true. That Plan divided development into two stages within the lifetime of the plan, plus a third stage once that plan was nearly built out and amended 10-15 years hence. On page 248 the 1994 Plan states “the Plan defers to the AGP regarding when and how much additional growth can be accommodated *beyond Stage I*”; on page 250 it states “Establish a mode-share goal of 32 percent, *to be achieved during Stage I*” (*emphases, mine*). Therefore, the AGP allocated development annually, but not to exceed the Stage I cap. The Planning Board is correct that Stage II’s mode-share goal is just guidance to allocations in the AGP.

More recent plans are more specific about the role of staging. Both the White Flint Plan and the Great Seneca Science Corridor Plan state explicitly that specific NADMS goals must be met before development in the next phase or stage can proceed. The more recent Chevy Chase Lake and Lyttonsville Sector Plans have hard staging caps tied to progress on the Purple Line.

- Since the key intersections located within the Plan area are projected to meet transportation system performance thresholds in the recently adopted 2016-2020 SSP, the Draft Plan should be considered “in balance” from a master plan land use/transportation perspective. The Plan would be in balance if the LATR test could be met all the way until buildout. But the LATR test—for medium-to-large developments—extends to intersections beyond the CBD, to the gateway intersections described in the first section of this memo. The delay threshold for the gateway intersections is 80 seconds/vehicle, not the 120 seconds/vehicle threshold for the intersections within the CBD Plan area. Recall also that the Planning staff modeled only 90%, or 29.1 million sf of the 32.4 million sf cap, so the future congestion is understated. Without both intersection improvements and a much more stringent NADMS the Plan will not be in balance.
- The biennial NADMS survey has serious limitations that make it poorly suited as a staging tool in the case of the Bethesda Plan. If this were true, that would be an indictment of all NADMS-based staging in master plans over the past two decades. However, for the most part, mode share percentages from these surveys have been relatively stable, except when there are external factors that are not controlled by County actions. For example, according to surveys conducted by Bethesda Transportation Solutions (the transportation management organization for the Bethesda Transportation Management District) the morning peak-period NADMS-E (mode share of Bethesda employees) was 37.5% in 2009, 36.8% in 2010, and 35.5% in 2011. In 2012 it spiked to 41.7%, but it sunk down to 34.2% in 2014, a level largely affected by very low gas prices and the increasing unreliability of Metrorail and its escalators and elevators. Recently DOT’s Commuter Services Section reported that the current NADMS-E is about 38%.

There are two ways to address the Board’s concern. First, more effort could be made to obtain a higher response rate for the surveys. The chart on ©7 shows that the response rate had been generally in the 14-21% range from 2000 through 2010, dropping to 12% in 2011 and 2012 and only 8% in 2014. The County should strive to get back to the response rates of the last decade, which were statistically significant. The traffic mitigation interagency working group, (consisting of DOT, DPS, M-NCPPC, and Council staffs) reported to the T&E Committee last year a strategy to ramp up the transportation demand management effort countywide, including better monitoring. A specific program is anticipated this summer; part of that should be more aggressive surveying. Second, proceeding to Stage II should be predicated on meeting the next stage’s NADMS goals in two successive years, to avoid a false positive survey.

- If there is staging in Bethesda, it should be based on the implementation of the Purple Line. While the Purple Line is certainly one key for raising NADMS in Bethesda, it is by no means the only key. We know this from the Planning staff’s own analysis: assuming the

Purple Line the travel model forecasts for 2040 a NADMS-R (mode share of Bethesda residents) of 54% and a NADMS-E of 43%: higher than today's estimates of 51% NADMS-R and 38% NADMS-E, but not high enough to address the over-congestion at three gateway intersections, even with some lanes added to them. The staging should be based on performance, not a single project. Tighter parking controls, higher parking fees (especially for long-term parking), bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and more aggressive transportation demand management can achieve a higher NADMS.

In this letter the Board recommended either no staging (Alternative A), or a two-stage approach, with the first stage topping out at 30.4 million sf and a second stage of 2.0 million sf for the balance under the 32.4 million sf cap. The Board notes that the 1994 Plan capped development at 27.8 million sf, but, as noted above, existing and approved development already has reached 28.2 million sf. This is because of additional development allowed under the subsequent sector plan amendments for the Woodmont Triangle (2006) and the Purple Line Station (2014). Therefore, if Stage I were set at 30.4 million sf, that would allow an additional 2.2 million sf to be approved in this stage (including the 0.4 million sf for the Marriott headquarters).

PHED Committee (and Council staff) recommendation (2-1): Councilmembers Leventhal and Riemer propose a two-stage staging plan:

- **Stage 1: up to 30.4 million sf, which is 2.2 million sf more than existing and approved development—could proceed without meeting any added staging requirement; and**
- **Stage 2: up to 32.4 million sf, which is 2.0 million sf more than Stage 1. Stage 2 would proceed only after Bethesda achieves an NADMS-R of 60% and an NADMS-E of 52% in two successive years.**

Councilmember Floreen recommends no staging in the master plan, relying solely on the Subdivision Staging Policy to stage growth in the Bethesda CBD.

As the Planning Board reviews new developments under Stage 1—or, for that matter, existing developments reapplying for more density in Stage 1—it should be looking to require conditions that would help achieve these area-wide 60% and 52% goals.

Executive's recommendation. Subsequently the Executive wrote in opposition to the PHED Committee recommendation on staging (©9-10). He argues that the amount of remaining development is too small to warrant staging, and that the second stage may not be achievable with the 60% and 52% NADMS targets. However, Council staff avers that these goals are achievable, and without the staging mechanism there would be little incentive towards achieving them.

CBAR's recommendation. On April 14 CBAR transmitted its latest recommendations for the plan, including staging (see excerpt on ©11-12). Like the PHED Committee, it also endorses a two-stage approach, but with the limit of Stage 1 being 29.1 million sf, equal to what was assumed in the Planning staff's traffic modeling. CBAR concurs with the PHED Committee's NADMS targets to be attained prior to Stage 2, but it also recommends requiring that all Priority 1 parks be programmed in the capital improvements program. Council staff understands the logic

of a 29.1 million sf break-point, but with 28.2 million sf already existing and approved, plus the 0.4 million sf more for the Marriott headquarters, there would only be 0.5 million sf left under Stage 1.

Planning staff's and DOT's recommendation. At the April 18 Council worksession, Council President Berliner asked the Planning staff to develop an alternative to the PHED Committee's recommendation. The Planning staff's new recommendation, which is co-developed and supported by DOT, substitutes for staging an annual monitoring program of schools, parks, and transportation. The Planning Board would report the results of the monitoring and make substantive suggestions to the Council for action (©13-17). NAIOP has written in support of this approach (©18-19).

But monitoring alone doesn't usually translate into results. For many years, the Planning Board has monitored congestion at intersections and roadway links countywide and reported the results to the Council in its biennial Mobility Assessment Reports. The Board also regularly provides suggestions for the CIP. But, given the fiscal demands for other projects in the CIP, transportation initiatives that address congestion regularly take a back seat. Road projects are few and often deferred, not just due to their cost, but because they usually have some real or perceived negative impact on a limited number of residents. Funding for significant additional bus service is scarce. Programs to incentivize ridesharing are underfunded.

For schools, however, if advocacy from parents to reduce overcrowding were not enough, the SSP's school test provides another incentive: without the funding of sufficient capacity a school's service area or an entire cluster would go into a housing moratorium. As a result, the Council has taken extraordinary steps in terms of providing record dollars for school construction. Would the same be true for transportation in Bethesda if development approvals were based merely on monitoring? No, if the past is prologue.

II. LAND USE/SCHOOL CAPACITY BALANCE

Earlier this year the PHED Committee reviewed Council staff's analysis of enrollment at buildout versus the potential program capacity for schools in the B-CC Cluster. For program capacity, the analysis assumed existing capacity from the addition at B-CC HS now under construction, the new Silver Creek MS (B-CC MS #2), as well as feasibly-sized potential additions at Silver Creek MS, Westland MS, Westbrook ES, and building new ESs on the former Lynnbrook and Rollingwood ES sites. For enrollment, the analysis—updated for a presentation to B-CC PTA representatives—assumed existing enrollment projections to 2022-23 plus growth from all master-planned development in the approved Chevy Chase Lake and Lyttonsville Sector Plans, as well as the maximum potential residential buildout under the proposed Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan. The result was that there would be a surfeit of capacity at the ES and MS levels, but a shortage at the HS level. Council staff pointed out—as was noted when examining the Whitman and B-CC Clusters as part of the Westbard Plan analysis—that a Southwest Consortium consisting of the B-CC and Whitman Clusters could resolve the overcrowding at B-CC HS and at Pyle MS in the Whitman Cluster; however, this is but one of likely several potential solutions.

In the last few weeks MCPS and Planning staffs have re-examined the enrollment assumptions, given the changing understanding of the pipelines in each of these areas. The results are reported in the Planning Director's April 20 memorandum (©20-24). Planning and MCPS staff found that the earlier analysis essentially double-counted a small amount of the future development that had been assumed to be after 2022-23 but, in actuality, will occur during the next five years, and was assumed in the 2022-23 enrollment projection. Therefore, their projected buildout enrollment is marginally lower than in Council staff's earlier analysis. The analysis of future capacity is unchanged.

Thus, the earlier finding is confirmed: that there will be surplus capacity at the ES and MS level, but a shortage (albeit a marginally smaller one) at B-CC HS. The staffs calculate a shortfall at buildout of 481 seats at B-CC; even if the Bethesda Downtown Plan included no additional housing units beyond what exists or is in the pipeline, there would still be a shortfall of 313 seats at buildout. The potential solutions include: a Southwest Consortium with the Whitman Cluster, a larger consortium involving Walter Johnson and Woodward, and finding non-traditional space near B-CC, among other solutions. There are options to address this problem, and the Board of Education will recommend funding one of them when the need is evident. And, if past is prologue, the Council will fund it.

f:\orlin\fy17\phed\bethesda cbd\170425council.docx



MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

April 13, 2017

MEMORANDUM

TO: Montgomery County Council

FROM: Gwen Wright, Director 
Montgomery County Planning Department

SUBJECT: Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan
Review of Development Pipeline and Land Use Calculations

This memorandum is in response to the March 21, 2017 meeting with Council Staff and the Coalition of Bethesda Area Residents (CBAR), regarding the verification of the 2014 existing on the ground land use calculations and development pipeline used for Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan area in determining the future land use vision.

Land Use

As part of the discussion during the meeting with Council Staff and CBAR, Planning Staff have revisited the parcel files used in determining the existing on the ground development as of 2014 when the analysis was prepared for the Plan. Planning staff scrubbed the parcel files looking for any anomalies and/or errors. Following a thorough review Planning Staff have found that nine projects in the September 2014 pipeline that were under construction were included in the existing on the ground total of 23.6 million square feet.

Current Development Pipeline

In addition, Planning Staff revisited the September 2016 Development Pipeline (which is the last pipeline that has been completed and posted on the Planning Department website) to verify the projects and their square footage. To provide a more accurate account of the pipeline, Planning Staff have reviewed all projects that have gotten approved Preliminary Plans since September 2016 (there are two) and have reviewed all pipeline project resolutions to provide the actual approved residential and non-residential square footages for each project. It is important to note that projects are placed in the Pipeline once a Preliminary Plan (Subdivision) is approved by the Planning Board, or Site Plans in some cases where a subdivision currently exists. The pipeline is used to track adequate public facilities (APF) for projects approved at the subdivision stage.

In looking at the net new total for the pipeline, the residential square footage and the non-residential square footage combine for a total of approximately 4.6 million square feet. This total includes the addition of the two new projects since September 2016 (the Apex Building and 8015 Old Georgetown Road-Christ Lutheran Church) and the September 2016 Pipeline projects. As we have noted, some of the Pipeline projects may be revised after the Bethesda Downtown Plan is adopted, based on the new height allocations.

If you subtract the 23.6 existing on the ground and the 4.6 in possible Pipeline projects from the proposed cap of 32.4 million square, this would allow for a minimum of 4.2 million square feet of additional density to be allocated through the Bethesda Overlay Zone, instead of the original 4.6 million square feet as first estimated by Planning Staff. Please see the attached slides for a breakdown of the numbers.

CONCLUSION

It is the position of the Planning Department that the base numbers used in determining the existing land use in 2014 at the beginning of the project and the current development pipeline of 4.6 million square feet are an accurate depiction of what is happening in Downtown Bethesda considering the set of assumptions used by Planning Staff outlined at the March 20, 2017 PHED Committee session.

In meeting with the community, we have agreed that we will need an excellent and transparent accounting system to keep track of both approved and constructed new development so that the 32.4 million square foot cap in the Bethesda Overlay Zone can be implemented and monitored. We are prepared to work with the community on developing the tools necessary to accomplish this.

	Total – Residential + Commercial
2016 Sector Plan Vision	32.4 M
Envelope Estimate – 1994 Plan (+ *Purple Line Minor Master Plan Amendment)	27.8 M (28.15 M)
Existing – On Ground (+February 2017 Pipeline + APEX)	23.6 M (28.7) 28.2

3

23.6 Existing on the Ground
 +4.6 February 2017 Pipeline

 28.2 Total

Notes:

- a. Existing includes nine projects that were under construction in September 2014 and shown on the pipeline.
- b. 2017 pipeline includes two new projects since September 2016 – APEX and Church projects
- c. APEX – Delta between existing and new approval

***1994 Plan envelope estimate does not include:**

1. Site area was used for land use calculations/Gross Tract Area (dedications) will add density
2. MPDU Bonus Density
3. Floating Zones that increase the allowable FAR over base zones such as TS and OM zones
4. Properties under construction during 2014 were not included in the zoning envelope estimate

MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Downtown Bethesda Pipeline February 24, 2017

Plan Number	Master Plan	Project	Residential Squares Footage	Unbuilt Gross Floor Area	Unbuilt Residential SF	Unbuilt Gross Floor Area
119830150	Project Name	Non-Residential		184,299	0	184,299
119840860	Ariery Plaza	Mixed	204,381	3,904	204,381	3,904
119940310	7840 Wisconsin Avenue	Non-Residential		153,271	0	153,271
119950210	Albers Addition to Bethesda	Mixed	9,600	2,994	9,600	2,994
119960730	West Virginia Ave	Mixed	94,218	0	94,218	0
120070230	4901 Hampden Lane (The Lauren)	Residential	97,908	0	97,908	0
120070500	Parcel A & Outlot A (Toll Brothers)	Residential	118,332	0	118,332	0
120080050	Holladay at Edgemoor (4831 West Lane)	Residential		150,000	0	150,000
120110010	Air Rights Center 7300 Pearl	Non-Residential		12,090	0	12,090
120110090	Escobar Property	Non-Residential		402,952	0	402,952
120120070	*Bethesda Center	Mixed	155,586	4,539	155,586	4,539
120130200	7100 Wisconsin Avenue	Mixed	140,345	0	140,345	0
120130240	Bethesda Commerce	Mixed		237,232	561,517	237,232
120130260	Bethesda CBD	12		1,179,281	2,386,196	1,179,281
Project Totals				1,060,741	3,594,173	1,243,973
120040290	Project Name	Residential	105,174	0	105,174	0
120070750	Rugby Condominium	Non-Residential		37,238	0	37,238
120090140	4823 Rugby Avenue	Mixed	474,175	106,741	474,175	106,741
120120000	Woodmont Central	Residential	418,370	0	418,370	0
120130230	7900 Wisconsin Avenue	Mixed	138,052	5,118	138,052	5,118
120150050	4990 Fairmont Avenue	Non-Residential		9,595	0	9,595
120150260	Lot 647 Woodmont	Mixed	248,468	0	248,468	0
120160010	St. Elms Apartments	Mixed	89,790	0	89,790	0
120160030	Brightview Bethesda	Residential	150,375	0	150,375	0
120160050	8008 Wisconsin Avenue	Mixed	147,730	0	147,730	0
120160070	Woodmont View (Stonehill)	Mixed		148,366	0	148,366
120160080	Woodmont Triangle	10		164,692	1,917,977	164,692
Project Totals				1,060,741	3,594,173	1,243,973

Note: Project approvals not on September 2016 Pipeline

4



MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

OFFICE OF THE CHAIR

March 9, 2017

MEMORANDUM

TO: Glenn Orlin, Legislative Analyst
Montgomery County Council

Nancy Floreen, Chair
Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee
Montgomery County Council

FROM: Casey Anderson, Chair 
Montgomery County Planning Board

SUBJECT: Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan
Transportation Element Follow-up

This memorandum describes the Planning Board and Staff's views on follow-up items from the February 27, 2017 Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee worksession on the transportation element of the Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan. The specific item discussed in this memorandum is development staging.

HISTORICAL STAGING IN BETHESDA

The 1994 Bethesda Central Business District Sector Plan recommended staging future development, but the document deferred to the Subdivision Staging Policy (then known as the Annual Growth Policy) "to determine the timing and amount of new development, considering Sector Plan guidance."¹ This approach assumed that the Sector Plan would provide guidance about adequacy criteria to be incorporated into the SSP but ultimately deferred the application of specific staging rules to the SSP itself. Here is a synopsis from the 1994 plan:

Stage 1 (Short Term): Begins when the Sector Plan is adopted and the SSP allocates jobs and housing to the staging ceiling in the Bethesda CBD policy area.

Stage 2 (Mid Term): Begins when (i) programs and policies recommended in Stage 1 are in operation and/or programmed, (ii) an areawide transportation analysis is completed, and (iii) the Stage 1 development capacity has been reached.

Stage 3 (Long Term): Begins when an amendment to the Sector Plan is prepared.

¹ Page 249 of the 1994 Sector Plan
8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910 Phone: 301.495.4605 Fax: 301.495.1320
www.montgomeryplanningboard.org Mail: mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org

While Non-Auto Driver Mode Share (NADMS) goals were established for specific stages of the 1994 Sector Plan, NADMS was not intended to govern future development and was instead designed as a monitoring tool.

DEVELOPMENT STAGING OPTIONS

As discussed at the transportation PHED worksession and outlined in my memorandum of February 27, the Planning Board and Staff are strongly opposed to the development staging strategy proposed by Council staff. It will result in extreme reductions to the amount of near-term new development in Downtown Bethesda and will eliminate the possibility of getting any significant near-term funding to acquire new parkland. Moreover, in light of the Draft Plan's modest increase in development capacity (only 4.6 million square feet), we see no reason to adopt any new staging mechanism.

Given that all key intersections located within the Plan area are projected to meet transportation system performance thresholds established in the recently adopted 2016-2020 Subdivision Staging Policy, the Draft Plan should be considered "in balance" from a master plan land use/transportation capacity perspective. Rather than staging, the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO) process is the more appropriate tool to guide implementation of new development until a Unified Mobility Program (UMP) in the Plan area is established.

However, if the Council does recommend staging mechanisms, any such mechanism should be based on monitoring of congestion and/or NADMS only, with the consequence of failure being Planning Board recommendations to the Council about steps to bring the plan area into compliance with transportation system performance goals.

NON-AUTO DRIVER MODE SHARE SURVEY

The Planning Board and Staff believe the biennial Non-Auto Driver Mode Share (NADMS) survey has serious limitations that make it poorly suited for use as a staging tool in the case of the Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan area. The biennial NADMS survey, completed by the Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) for the Bethesda Transportation Management District (TMD), is a voluntary survey that is only sent to employers with more than 25 employees, reflecting a pool of approximately 150 employers. This represents roughly 16 percent of all 1,055 employers, according to TMD reports. The following table summarizes survey participation rates dating back to the year 2000, which are generally on the decline based on a review of historical response data. The survey response rate for the 2014 survey was 8 percent, or 713 responses. The survey still produces data that provides useful insights, particularly when results are compared over an extended period of time. The methodological limitations and low response rate, however, lead us to question whether the survey is sufficiently robust to be used as a conclusive and dispositive basis for governing development in Downtown Bethesda.

Table 4.5
2000 - 2014 Survey Participation of TMD Employers and Employees

	2014	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2000
Employers Surveyed	53	66	107	117	126	98	94	120	111	119	226	97
Employers Responding	26	36	58	72	80	68	60	78	77	71	30	46
Employer Response Rate	50%	55%	54%	62%	63%	69%	65%	65%	69%	60%	8%	47%
Surveys Distributed	8,675	9,199	11,518	11,663	13,497	10,956	10,193	9,680	11,022	8,035	7,970	8,079
Surveys Returned	713	1,096	1,428	2,413	2,298	2,812	1,373	1,775	1,902	1,865	1,216	1,560
Employee Response Rate	8%	12%	12%	21%	17%	26%	14%	18%	17%	23%	15%	19%

*There was no Commuter Survey administered in 2013

Source: Bethesda Transportation Management District Biennial Report FY 2014 – FY 2015

It is also important to note that employers with over 25 employees are only contacted once every two years. Therefore, reports in consecutive years do not represent a trend for the whole Plan area.

Finally, while programs and incentives are helpful tools for reducing driving commute trips into the Plan area, the most effective means for substituting car trips for non-auto driver trips, is constraints on parking at or near places of employment, which was one of the goals of the Plan. Employers that continue to provide parking (free or with fees) on their sites will likely continue to experience higher rates of driving commute trips. In summary, Non-Auto Driver Mode Share goals are largely attained organically through a growing mix of diverse land uses, shared and reduced vehicle parking, increased pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and increased rates of telecommuting. Each of these mechanisms is promoted and sustained through an established Transportation Demand Management program, such as the one currently in place in Bethesda. The goals are necessary, but were never intended to be used as a threshold for future development.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON POTENTIAL STAGING STRATEGIES

If the Council concludes that staging is essential despite the limited amount of additional development capacity provided by the Draft Plan, the Planning Board suggests the following alternative strategies for consideration. First and most importantly, any staging mechanism should be based on the 4.6 million square feet (msf) of potential new development capacity added to the land use density approved in the 1994 Plan, rather than the 8.8 million msf representing unused existing development capacity “mapped” as part of the 1994 plan combined with the 4.6 msf in new “pool” capacity added in the Draft Plan. Lastly, for reasons described above, staging should not be based on NADMS. Each of the following strategies are intended as discrete alternatives rather than cumulative phases of an overall staging plan.

Alternative A: No staging. As discussed at the February 27 PHED worksession, approved and unbuilt pipeline development would compromise any future development, including Marriott. Each of these developments has received Planning Board approval, including a finding of public facility adequacy in accordance with the Subdivision Staging Policy. We do not think it is appropriate to prevent or limit approved development to an additional, new staging policy.

Alternative B: Infrastructure based staging. Staging in Alternative B would be based upon the provision of the Purple Line. As the premier component of public infrastructure anticipated in this planning area, the Purple Line should serve as the catalyst for any staging requirements.² The construction of the Purple Line has also been used as a staging mechanism for both Chevy Chase Lake and Greater Lyttonsville. Staging should commence at 27.8 msf of development, the maximum land use density permitted under the 1994 Bethesda Central Business District Sector Plan. This strategy divides the additional 4.6 msf of land use density, recommended by the Planning Board Draft of the Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan, based on the following criteria:

- **Stage 1:** Commence upon approval of the Section Map Amendment; This stage would allow an additional 2.6 msf of development above the 27.8 msf allowed under the 1994 CBD Plan, up to a total of 30.4 msf.
- **Stage 2:** Commence upon the construction of Phase I of the Purple Line between Bethesda and Silver Spring; The final stage would allow an additional 2.0 msf of development, up to the maximum 32.4 msf.

CONCLUSION

The Planning Board strongly recommends against the application of staging, as the forecasts for the intersections within the Plan area meet the congestion standards as required in the recently adopted Subdivision Staging Policy. Should staging be applied, however, the thresholds for future development should be based on the provision of infrastructure, such as the Purple Line, that encourages non-auto driver trips. Such a staging strategy reflects a proactive approach that supports the NADMS goals, as recommended in the Sector Plan. Restricting future development based on attainment of the NADMS reported in the MCDOT-TDM survey, rather than performance measures, would severely limit near-term development that is critical to achieving the vision of the Bethesda Downtown Plan.

² Provision of infrastructure is often the means by which staging allocation is determined and was recently endorsed, within the context of the Purple Line, by the Council as part of the Chevy Chase Lake Sector Plan and Greater Lyttonsville Sector Plan.



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

Isiah Leggett
County Executive

MEMORANDUM

March 31, 2017

TO: Roger Berliner, President
Montgomery County Council

Nancy Floreen, Chair
Planning, Housing and Economic Development Committee
Montgomery County Council

FROM: Isiah Leggett, County Executive 

SUBJECT: Staging of the Bethesda Downtown Plan

I have been following the Planning, Housing and Economic Development (PHED) committee's work on the Bethesda Downtown Plan. The plan employs several innovative planning concepts intended to facilitate continued economic growth in Bethesda, while also improving public amenities and community benefits. I thank you for your leadership of, and participation in, the committee's work on the plan.

Last week I reviewed the PHED committee's recommendation to adopt staging of the plan related to achieving a non-auto driver mode share (NADMS) for residences and employers in the planning area. While I support NADMS and other performance-related measures as goals for the plan, I am concerned about their application as staging thresholds. There has been uncertainty about the amount of development permitted, but it appears that approximately 4.5 million additional square feet could result from adoption of this plan, and I do not believe that staging is appropriate for this amount of additional development capacity.

Staging an increment this size is an unnecessary complication to what is already an intricate plan overlaid on our County's intensive development review and approval processes that includes our Subdivision Staging Policy's controls related to adequate public facilities. Adding a staging requirement to this plan will unduly limit Montgomery County's ability to achieve the plan's vision while providing little additional protection, beyond that already provided by our regular procedures, to the communities that are concerned about more development in Bethesda.

9



Roger Berliner, President
Nancy Floreen, Chair
March 31, 2017
Page 2

In addition, the NADMS thresholds proposed as staging criteria represent an extraordinary change over the current NADMS in Bethesda. While the recommended NADMS thresholds might be appropriate as goals for Bethesda to achieve over the next 10 to 20 years, it is unlikely that they will be achieved in the next few years. Furthermore, limiting new projects will not have a significant impact on Montgomery County's ability to achieve these targets.

Engagement of all of Bethesda will be necessary to achieve these goals, and tools other than staging will be needed to influence the travel choices of all Bethesda workers, residents and visitors. Relying only on new development to achieve these metrics will be ineffective, reinforcing my view that staging the plan is inappropriate.

IL:crc

Squad. With a growing population, worsening traffic congestion, and limited possibility to expand services to other sites in the Plan area, we maintain that the Rescue Squad property should be preserved to allow expansion of public safety facilities for the future. Should financial assistance be required for updating or rebuilding the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Rescue Squad site, we support cost-sharing agreements with the County, whose primary interest is public safety, rather than private developers.

Section 2.8.4 Educational Facilities

CBAR supports the recommendations put forth by Council President Berliner and Councilmember Riemer in section 4 of their **April 7, 2017 memorandum** to the Council.

We also anticipate receiving updates to the Plan's impact on public schools that incorporates revisions to MCPS's base long-term forecasting reports and Planning Staff's updated land use vision.

New Implementation Section: Staging

CBAR concurs with the PHED Committee recommendation that development proceed in **two stages** with the following conditions:

- Stage 1 begins when the Sectional Map Amendment is approved, and ends when development reaches an **interim limit of 29.1** million square feet. As soon as possible, Planning should provide open data sets, updated and published monthly through *dataMontgomery*, that track purchase and use of density, and changes to the development pipeline.
- We recommend 29.1 million square feet as the interim limit because:
 - This limit coincides with Planning staff's traffic analysis, which used 90% theoretical achievement of the 32.4 million square foot land use vision.
 - Based on the recent pipeline numbers, 29.1 provides more than enough development capacity for current projects and the anticipated Marriott project to proceed, plus an *additional* 1 million square feet of development.
- Stage 2 begins when the following criteria are met:
 - The area achieves **NADMS-R (residential) of 60%** and **NADMS-E (employee) of 52%** over two consecutive years, as recommended by the PHED committee.
 - Improvements are made to the methodology of measuring the NADMS (Non-Auto Driver Mode Share, often referred to as "mode share"). We recommend requiring observed counts and improved survey response rates.
 - **CIP programming** and implementation proposals are in place for all "Priority 1 parks" that we recommend in Section 4.6 Capital Improvement Program.

- CBAR selected Stage 2 criteria because:
 - Planning should provide a way for the public to track progress towards the 32.4 million square foot cap in a way that is easily accessible, fully transparent, and legally defensible. Automated data publishing through database Extract Transform and Load (ETL) systems is an affordable and efficient way to assure accountability and ease concerns by both developers and residents.
 - Parks are an important public amenity that contribute significantly to community well-being and placemaking. CIP programming and implementation proposals must be in place for building the parks with the greatest potential community benefit to balance and activate the downtown area.
- Stage 2 ends when the total development cap of **32.4 million** square feet, achieved through the CR optional development method and **inclusive of all bonus density**, is attained.

Section 4.1.2 Bethesda Overlay Zone (BOZ)

CBAR supports the creation of a Bethesda Overlay Zone with the following comments:

- We support the requirement to “Set a cap on development to ensure that total density in the Plan Area, including mapped CR density, does not exceed approximately **32.4 million square feet.**”
- We recommend language to clarify that the 32.4 million square feet **includes all commercial and residential density**, including density that was acquired through bonus incentives, density transfers, acquisition through a density pool, or any other method.
- We recommend splitting into two parts the text that reads: “Establish the process for obtaining approval of a development with overlay zone density and using it in a timely manner so that unused density is not hoarded.” All development approvals in the Bethesda Overlay Zone should **proceed in a timely manner** (e.g., two years) to allow viable projects to go forward without compromising the integrity of the 32.4M cap.
- We recommend splitting the text that reads “Establish the requirements for additional density received through the Bethesda Overlay Zone, including a requirement to provide a Park Impact Payment, provide 15 percent MPDUs and participate in a Design Review Advisory Panel at the Concept Plan and/or Sketch Plan application phase,” such that all optional development projects in the Bethesda Overlay Zone dedicate **15% of their total density to MPDUs and participate in the Design Excellence review.**
- We strongly recommend that CRT-zoned properties with vehicle entrances on residential roads be limited to **CRN uses.**



MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

April 20, 2017

MEMORANDUM

TO: Montgomery County Council

FROM: Gwen Wright, Director
Montgomery County Planning Department

SUBJECT: Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan
Alternative to Development Staging: Annual Monitoring

This memorandum is in response to the April 18, 2017 County Council work session on the Bethesda Downtown Plan and summarizes the Planning Department's proposed alternative to development staging presented by Council Staff. This alternative has been discussed with MCDOT staff and they are in agreement with the approach presented.

PROPOSAL

The Planning Department staff and the Planning Board determined that development staging is not appropriate for the Bethesda Downtown Plan and based that determination on a number of factors outlined in Chair Casey Anderson's memo of February 27 (attached).

However, we fully support the need to provide adequate infrastructure in Bethesda, and believe that assurance of adequate infrastructure can be achieved through stringent annual monitoring of traffic conditions and Plan implementation. This approach would allow County officials and members of the public to continually monitor critical elements of the Sector Plan and ensure realization of the Plan's stated goals. An annual monitoring approach would also provide flexibility for the Sector Plan's land use recommendations by identifying and addressing issues with implementation of the Sector Plan as they arise. Continuous monitoring, as described in this memorandum, provides a mechanism through which the Sector Plan is operationalized and stresses a performance based approach so that the Sector Plan area remains in balance. If Planning Board determines that the Sector Plan is out of balance, the annual report must be presented to the County Council for direction and action.

Scope

The Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan is comprised of many complex elements, each of which depends upon the success of other Plan elements. In recognition of this complexity, staff proposes annual monitoring of schools, parks, and transportation adequacy. The annual report will be presented to the Planning Board each year and transmitted to the County Council for review. If

13

any of the elements included in the annual report demonstrate issues, staff will specifically identify issues and potential solutions for discussion during the annual presentation to the Board.

Schools

As with other recently adopted sector plans for Westbard and Lyttonsville, appropriate solutions to the Plan's potential enrollment impacts need to consider the potential full residential buildout of the Bethesda Downtown Plan as well as other sector plans on the B-CC Cluster. To provide timely information on the potential impacts, Planning staff will provide annual monitoring by updating the buildout enrollment forecast for the B-CC Cluster. This report will be provided to the Planning Board and County Council and will identify any concerns and potential solutions.

Parks

As part of the overarching goal of the Plan to include new civic greens, enhance and expand existing parks and open space and to increase the amount of new urban parks in the Downtown, Planning Staff will provide an annual report on the progress of implementing parks and open space recommended in the master plan. This report will provide an inventory to monitor the implementation of new and expanded parks and open space and will be provided to the Planning Board and County Council for their review. The report will also track funds associated with the PIP or any other funding source associated with Park acquisition and implementation.

Transportation

Much of the discussion about development staging during the April 18, 2017 Council Work session focused on anticipated future transportation needs. In response to that discussion, Planning staff will model and monitor critical intersections within the Downtown Bethesda vicinity, including the gateway intersections located in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Master Plan area, as well as the Non-Auto Driver Mode Share (NADMS) for both employees and residents within the Downtown Bethesda area. Annual transportation monitoring will commence upon initiation of the Bethesda Urban Mobility Plan (BUMP) by the County Council. Although transportation monitoring will be reported to the Planning Board on an annual basis, data would be collected in alternating years such that year one of the program analyzes intersection performance through the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology and year two analyzes Non-Auto Driver Mode Share.

CONCLUSION

In general, Master Plan staging is most appropriate in planning areas where the local area is in transition and is awaiting major infrastructure improvements. In the case of Downtown Bethesda, an established urban area, future development is largely organic and supported by existing infrastructure. It is for this reason, Planning staff proposes that the Plan be continuously and stringently monitored on an annual basis rather than staged, as suggested by Council staff.

14



MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
THE MARYLAND NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

February 27, 2017

MEMORANDUM

TO: Montgomery County Council

FROM: Casey Anderson, Chair
Montgomery County Planning Board

SUBJECT: Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan
Council Staff Staging Recommendation

The Planning Board and staff are concerned about the implications of the transportation staging recommendations for the Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan in the February 23, 2017 Council staff packet and in the addendum sent out over the weekend to the Planning, Housing, and Economic Development Committee. These recommendations have extreme consequences for the Bethesda Downtown Plan vision, including **reducing the amount of near-term new development in Downtown Bethesda below the amount that had been approved in the 1994 Bethesda CBD Plan and virtually eliminating the possibility of getting any near-term funding to acquire new parkland.**

We are particularly alarmed by the Council staff's current recommendation (from the addendum sent out over the weekend) to cap the first stage at an additional 3.5 million square feet of development beyond what is currently built. This is an increase of 1 million above the initial Council staff recommendation, but is still well below the density approved in the 1994 Bethesda CBD Plan – which had been considered in balance when it was adopted.

In general, Master Plan staging is most appropriate in planning areas where the local transportation network is in transition and is awaiting major infrastructure improvements (e.g., Corridor Cities Transitway or multiple BRT corridors). In these areas of transition, the planned transportation infrastructure is often assumed a prerequisite to achieve the land use/transportation balance. In the case of Downtown Bethesda, an established urban area, future development is largely organic and supported by existing (and planned) infrastructure. Given the multimodal network and available transportation capacity, the plan area is considered to be “in balance” and not predicated on staging requirements. For these reasons, staff believes that Master Plan staging, as a tool for achieving balance outside of the Plan Area, could prove both counter-productive and likely ineffective – given the amount of through traffic and major traffic generators just beyond the plan area. We see no reason for adopting staging rules that would bring new development in Bethesda to a virtual halt.

(15)

FORECAST MODELS

The Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan, as transmitted to the Council, forecasts balance between the proposed land use and proposed transportation network because intersections within the sector plan area remain within congestion standards for signalized intersections set forth in the recently adopted Subdivision Staging Policy.

Three different types of forecasting have been done for the Bethesda Downtown Plan – a traditional CLV analysis, an HCM analysis as required under the new Subdivision Staging Policy, and a University of Maryland modeling exercise paid for by the Town of Chevy Chase. Each of these techniques focuses on different measurements, but all come to essentially the same conclusion: under the build-out of the plan, the intersections with high levels of congestion are “gateway” intersections that will be congested whether any development occurs in Downtown Bethesda or not.

STAGING

In its current form, the Planning Board is strongly opposed to the development staging strategy proposed by Council staff because it will result in reducing the amount of near-term new development in Downtown Bethesda below the amount that had been approved in the 1994 Bethesda CBD Plan and will virtually eliminate the possibility of getting any near-term funding to acquire new parkland.

The Council staff’s proposed staging strategy from the addendum sent out over the weekend recommends:

“c. Staging. Given the importance of meeting the mode share goals, the 8.8 million sf of yet unbuilt development under the cap should be staged as interim goals are met. Recall earlier that only 5.5 million sf of this development was modeled, so the intersection delay findings assume only 5.5 million sf. To absorb the final 3.3 million sf, the higher mode share recommended above would have to be achieved. Therefore, the following staging is recommended:

Of the 8.8 million sf yet to be built under the cap:

- Stage 1: 3.5 million sf could proceed without meeting any added staging requirement*
- Stage 2: 2.0 million sf, but it would proceed only after Bethesda achieves an NADMS-R of 54% and an NADMS-E of 43% in two successive years*
- Stage 3: 3.3 million sf, but it would proceed only after Bethesda achieves an NADMS-R of 60% and an NADMS-E of 52% in two successive years”*

The problem is that Council staff started their staging recommendation at 23.6 million square feet. As a point of clarification, the 23.6 million square feet, referenced in the Council staff packet, represents existing “on the ground” development as of 2014 when the working draft of the plan was developed. This number does not include new development allowed by existing zoning, in the pipeline beyond May 2014, and not yet built. Additional projects have been approved since 2014.

In fact, the existing zoning from the 1994 Bethesda CBD Plan allows for a total of 27.8 million square feet – 4.2 million square feet more than what was on the ground in 2014. When the 1994 plan was adopted, the plan was considered “in balance”. **We are baffled as to why a new staging requirement would be imposed on development that is allowed without staging under the 1994 plan.** Any staging mechanism should be based on the 4.6 million square feet of potential new development that the Plan is adding to the density approved in the 1994 Plan, not the 8.8 million square feet above the existing development on the ground.

Under the Council staff’s proposed staging, a very limited amount of new development above what is already approved in the pipeline could occur in Stage 1. Because most of the density in Stage 1 has already been approved and is in the pipeline, only a small increment of remaining density would be subject to the Bethesda Overlay Zone requirements, including the new exactions for parkland. Very little funding for new parks would be generated and without new development and contributions for parks, the vision of the Bethesda Downtown Plan will not be realized.

Additionally, while the Council staff packet states that the traffic forecast assumed only 5.5 million square feet of additional development, a more accurate representation is that the traffic forecast evaluated 90 percent of the total plan vision of 32.4 million square feet in combination with anticipated future regional growth.

CONCLUSION

The Planning Board is not opposed to some form of intersection monitoring and staging specifically associated with infrastructure recommended in this plan, but any staging strategy must consider development capacity already available under the 1994 plan, particularly development that is already in the approval pipeline. The staging thresholds recommended in the packet appear arbitrary and without consideration for approved projects, which have received Adequate Public Facilities approval in accordance with the Subdivision Staging Policy.

NAIOP

COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE
DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION
DC/MD CHAPTER

April 21, 2017

The Honorable Roger Berliner
President
Montgomery County Council
Stella B. Werner Council Office Building
100 Maryland Avenue, 6th Floor
Rockville, MD 20850

Re: Bethesda Sector Plan

Dear President Berliner:

NAIOP represents over 500 members and companies. Collectively, our member companies *employ thousands* in the County. We strongly support the Bethesda Sector Plan, its vision and the many new required amenities, including parks, trails, sustainable design, architectural excellence and increased live/work/play environments. We are very concerned, however, that the County will not see the emergence of these amenities with a cap on development as currently proposed. We thus are writing to express our strong opposition to staging, but endorsement for the Planning Department more stringent monitoring requirements and other mechanisms.

NAIOP has an array of the most compelling development groups that are present in and around Bethesda and in Montgomery County. We are proud of the mixed use environments that we have created, which are not only used by current residents, but are also used as a marketing tool to attract new residents, employers and employees to the County. While Bethesda has emerged from a single use office park into a mixed use urban environment where people live, work and play, Bethesda is losing its economic competitiveness given new zoning opportunities in the County, like in White Flint, and also in the District of Columbia and Northern Virginia.

We agree with the County Executive that staging in increments, as currently proposed, would unnecessarily hinder successful investment and development in Bethesda. A cap creates uncertainty in the market concerning investment planning/design costs and opportunities (one will not know if the density is available until building permit). Such a cap would also result in an unneeded rush to apply for approvals, which could very likely prevent projects from being as thoughtfully and creatively designed as we would all like.

Rather than a cap, we support the Planning Department proposal for enhanced monitoring for schools, parks and transportation. As it relates to transportation, we know that the County has taken a very hard look at Transportation Management Districts (TMDs) and Traffic Mitigation Agreements (TMAGs) and ways to, through a TMAG, to take cars off the road. As

The Honorable Roger Berliner
April 21, 2017
Page 2

transit oriented developers, we too are committed to encourage transit/bike and pedestrian modes of transportation and support tools, through the TMD program, to get cars off the road. In addition to monitoring and increased efforts with TMDs and TMAGs, the County continues to have in place the Subdivision Staging Policy and Adequate Public Facilities Test to regulate development activity.

Our companies want to continue our investment in Montgomery County, and we are committed to encouraging alternate modes of transportation and getting cars off the road. A cap in Bethesda, however, sends the message that Montgomery County is closing its doors to business. We appreciate your willingness to be creative in your approach so that Bethesda can continue to emerge and thrive. Please reject staging, and adopt the Planning Department's recommendations. With these recommendations, you are giving businesses the tools to continue to invest in Montgomery County and its future.

Sincerely,

 (DRJ)

Tim Zulick, President

 (DRJ)

Stacy Silber, Advocacy Committee Chair

cc: The Honorable Marc Elrich
The Honorable Nancy Floreen
The Honorable Tom Hucker
The Honorable Sidney Katz
The Honorable George Leventhal
The Honorable Nancy Navarro
The Honorable Craig Rice
The Honorable Hans Riemer
Chair Casey Anderson
Dr. Glen Orlin
Ms. Marlene Michaelson
Ms. Gwen Wright
Mr. Chris Conklin



MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 20, 2017
To: Glen Orlin, Deputy Council Administrator
From: Gwen Wright, Director *GW*
CC: Rose Krasnow, Deputy Director *RK*
Subject: BCC Enrollment

The Planning staff appreciates the opportunity to review and update the potential impacts of the Bethesda Downtown Plan on public school enrollment. As indicated on page 92 of the Planning Board draft of the plan, the entire plan area falls within the Bethesda-Chevy Chase (B-CC) Cluster. Specifically, the plan area is served by Bethesda Elementary School, Westland Middle School and B-CC High School.

As with other recently adopted sector plans for Westbard and Lyttonsville, appropriate solutions to the plan's potential enrollment impacts need to consider the potential full residential buildout of the Bethesda Downtown Plan as well as other sector plans on the B-CC Cluster. Furthermore, the evaluation should not prescribe an assumed timeframe, since buildout of each plan will occur at different times (if at all), and will be impacted by many external factors that cannot be predicted at this time. Therefore, we provide an analysis that shows the effect of full buildout of all applicable plans. We intend to continue working with MCPS, the County Council, and the community to monitor enrollment changes and the development pipeline within the B-CC Cluster to determine the timing of potential capacity solutions and request funding through the six-year Capital Improvements Program (CIP) process as appropriate.

Projection Baseline

Following discussions with MCPS staff, we chose to begin our estimate of the plan's enrollment impacts using a baseline projection for the 2022-23 school, which is the last year of modeled projections included in the proposed amendment to the 2017-22 CIP. This marks a change in how this analysis has been done previously, which would have used the extended forecasts for 2031 as the baseline. The extended forecasts are not calculated in the same manner as the CIP projections, which are modeled using numerous enrollment factors that make them more reliable than the extended forecasts. More importantly, we have learned that the extended forecasts incorporate assumptions about future growth under the various sector plans, which means that we would be double counting the impact of the plans if we used the extended forecasts as our baseline. The 2022-23 B-CC Cluster projections for each school level are identified in row A of Table 1.

20

B-CC Cluster Enrollment Impacts from Applicable Sector Plans

Our next step was to increase the baseline projections with the potential impact of each sector plan. To calculate the impact of each plan, we multiplied the total potential number of units allowed by each plan by the most current applicable student generation rates, which are based on the exact number of MCPS students living in each unit type within their respective region of the county at the start of the 2015-16 school year. For enrollment projection purposes, student generation rates are calculated for three different regions of the County for four different types of dwelling units (single family detached, townhouse, multifamily low/mid-rise and multifamily high-rise). Most of B-CC Cluster falls within the Southwest Region; however, a portion of the B-CC Cluster falls within the East Region (the area of the cluster covered by the Lyttonsville Plan).

Bethesda Downtown Plan

The Bethesda Downtown Plan provides for as many as 8,456 new multifamily high-rise residential units. To calculate the enrollment impact of these new units, we split the units into two groups. The first includes 2,481 units that have already received regulatory approval under existing zoning, but for which construction has not begun. The enrollment impact of these units are shown in row B of Table 1. The second group of potential Bethesda Downtown Plan units includes the 5,975 additional multifamily high-rise units that the plan would allow beyond what is already approved, but not yet under construction. The impact of these units on B-CC Cluster enrollments are shown in row C of Table 1.

Greater Lyttonsville Sector Plan (adopted, February 2017)

The Greater Lyttonsville Sector Plan area is served by two school clusters – the B-CC Cluster and the Einstein Cluster, which is part of the Downcounty Consortium. The entire Lyttonsville Plan area falls within the East Region of the County. Within the B-CC portion of the plan area, the plan provides for as many as 2,063 new multifamily high-rise units, 71 new multifamily low-rise units, and 250 new townhouse units. The enrollment impacts of these units are calculated using the East Region generation rates and are shown in row D of Table 1.

Chevy Chase Lake Plan (adopted, July 2013)

The Chevy Chase Lake Plan area falls completely within the B-CC cluster, and the Southwest Region. The plan provided for as many as 1,323 multifamily high-rise units and 70 townhouses beyond what existed at the time the plan was adopted. Since that time, construction has begun on 200 multifamily high-rise units and 62 townhouses. We confirmed with MCPS that the impact of these units under construction have been included in the 2022-23 enrollment projections. Therefore, the full buildout impact of the Chevy Chase Lake Plan, which is shown in row E of Table 1, is calculated using the plan's remaining development capacity of 1,123 multifamily high-rise units and 8 townhouse units.

Westbard Sector Plan (adopted, May 2016)

The Westbard Sector Plan area is served by the B-CC Cluster and the Whitman Cluster. The adopted plan did not make any changes to the residential potential on the B-CC portion of the sector plan. Therefore, no additional residential units are anticipated on the B-CC portion and the estimated student impact is zero.

Cumulative B-CC Cluster Enrollment Estimate

Combining the 2022-23 baseline projections with the potential full buildout impacts of the applicable sector plans provides the full buildout enrollment estimates for the B-CC Cluster shown in row G of Table 1. Under this scenario, the B-CC Cluster would have 4,357 elementary school students, 2,139 middle school students and 2,889 high school students.

Table 1. Buildout Enrollment Forecast in the B-CC Cluster.

		ES Enrollment	MS Enrollment	HS Enrollment
A	2022-23 B-CC Cluster Projections	3,595	1,826	2,471
B	Approved but Unbuilt within the Bethesda Downtown Plan Area	+126	+52	+69
C	Draft Bethesda Downtown Plan	+305	+126	+168
D	Lyttonsville Plan	+272	+111	+149
E	Chevy Chase Lake Plan	+59	+24	+32
F	Westbard Plan	+0	+0	+0
G	FULL BUILDOUT TOTAL	4,357	2,139	2,889

Program Capacity Potential in the B-CC Cluster

Table 2 identifies the current cumulative program capacities of each school level in the B-CC Cluster in row A. Rows B and C identify capacity projects currently in progress. Silver Creek Middle School is scheduled to open in Kensington this coming August with a program capacity of 935 students. An addition at B-CC High School scheduled to open in August 2018 will add 725 seats. Rows D-G identify potential capacity solutions identified by MCPS, including additions to Silver Creek MS and Westland MS to collectively add space for 383 additional students. A potential addition to Westbrook Elementary School could add 184 additional elementary school seats. And finally, MCPS identified two closed schools within the B-CC service area that could be reopened to add space for 1,290 additional elementary school students.

Table 2. Potential B-CC Cluster Capacity.

		ES Capacity	MS Capacity	HS Capacity
A	B-CC Cluster in 2016	3,826	1,097	1,683
B	B-CC HS, planned addition			725
C	Silver Creek MS, opening 2017		935	
D	Silver Creek MS, possible addition (+12 rooms)		255	
E	Westland MS, possible addition (+6 rooms)		128	
F	Westbrook ES, possible addition (+8 rooms)	184		
G	New ESs at Lynnbrook and Rollingwood	1,290		
H	POTENTIAL CAPACITY TOTAL	5,300	2,415	2,408

As shown in row H of Table 2, MCPS has identified potential capacity solutions that would provide seats for up to 5,300 elementary school students, 2,415 middle school students and 2,408 high school students. These solutions have not been fully vetted (conducting feasibility studies for each solution would take about a year and require funding in the capital budget), but will be more fully explored by MCPS as future enrollment growth is imminent.

For elementary school and middle school, Table 2 demonstrates a total capacity that exceeds the full buildout enrollment estimates by 943 and 276 students, respectively. At the high school level, the capacity falls 481 seats short of the enrollment estimate. In this case (and if elementary or middle school capacity solutions are found to be inadequate), MCPS has indicated that it will consider alternatives including the opening of new schools and/or potential solutions in neighboring clusters. One potential high school solution currently being explored by a study group of community leaders organized by MCPS is the reopening of Woodward High School to alleviate enrollment burdens at eight downcounty high schools, including B-CC High School. In fact, the Board of Education has requested \$150,000 for a Woodward High School feasibility study in the FY18 capital budget.

Appendix: Student Generation Rates

Tables A1 and A2 provide the Southwest Region and East Region student generation rates used to estimate the enrollment impacts of the sector plans. These rates are calculated as an exact snapshot of the number of students living in each region of the County and type of houses in which they lived at the start of the 2015-16 school year. For example at the start of that school year, there were 12,628 elementary school students living in the 64,845 single family detached homes in the Southwest Region of the County. This results in a student generation rate of 0.195 students per unit.

Glen Orlin
April 20, 2017
Page Five

Table A1. Southwest Region Student Generation Rates, 2015.

	ES Rate	MS Rate	HS Rate	K-12 Rate
Single Family Detached	0.195	0.111	0.146	0.451
Single Family Attached	0.184	0.083	0.118	0.385
Multifamily Low- to Mid-Rise	0.114	0.049	0.063	0.226
Multifamily High-Rise	0.051	0.021	0.028	0.100

Table A2. East Region Student Generation Rates, 2015.

	ES Rate	MS Rate	HS Rate	K-12 Rate
Single Family Detached	0.208	0.099	0.136	0.443
Single Family Attached	0.221	0.104	0.145	0.470
Multifamily Low- to Mid-Rise	0.263	0.105	0.140	0.507
Multifamily High-Rise	0.096	0.038	0.050	0.185