



May 30, 2003

## Memorandum

To: The Montgomery County Planning Board

From: Karl Moritz, Research Manager, 301-495-1312

Re: Worksession #2 on the 2003-2005 Annual Growth Policy "Policy Element"  
and Short Revisit to FY04AGP Ceiling Element

---

### *Contents*

- Background/Review of Planning Board's May 22 Discussion..... Page 2
- Capacity Metering System..... Page 4
- Staff Recommendation..... Page 4
- The School Test/Board of Education Recommendation..... Page 6
- Information Requested by the Planning Board..... Page 7
- The FY04 AGP Ceiling Element/Nebel Street Extended..... Page 9

### *Introduction*

In preparation for this worksession on the *Annual Growth Policy "Policy Element,"* the Planning Board held a preliminary discussion on May 22, 2003, which explored themes of County growth, public facility adequacy, and the appropriate role of the Annual Growth Policy.

In this memo, staff will review the Planning Board's discussion, highlighting major themes, conclusions, and concepts. Staff will provide the supplementary information requested by the Planning Board and staff will make recommendations regarding the transportation test.

On May 27, 2003, the Montgomery County Board of Education discussed the Annual Growth Policy for the purpose of developing recommendations for the Planning Board to consider during your deliberations on the *AGP Policy Element*. This packet contains the Board of Education's recommendations.

Following the Planning Board's review of the *FY04 Annual Growth Policy Ceiling Element*, there was a change in the status of one of the transportation

improvements that was anticipated to be countable. That project, Nebel Street Extended, can no longer be counted for the FY04 AGP. This memo contains staff's recommendations for adjusting the recommended staging ceilings downward as a result of this change.

***Background: Short Review of Board Discussion on May 22***

*Growth*

The Planning Board began its preliminary session by reviewing the issue of growth: why should Montgomery County, or any locality, grow at all? Some of the reasons identified by the Board:

- Some additional growth is desirable and perhaps inevitable;
- The notion that a locality can just stop development is a fallacy;
- A dynamic economic needs some room to grow;
- A maturing community depends on redevelopment to maintain its vitality and redevelopment often requires involves some growth.
- The constitution provides rights to landowners to use their land.

The Board also discussed the potential downsides of stopping growth and considered the idea that certain kinds of growth could be socially responsible; for example, it might be socially responsible for Montgomery County to house more of the region's residents, even if there's a potential impact on overall quality of life. The Board also discussed the idea that a "no growth" stance would turn away good jobs and result in a divergence of high and low-paying jobs. A third concept related to the idea that growth is jobs-driven; that is, jobs create demand for housing units and some growth is necessary to achieve a jobs/housing balance. The Board also discussed the effect of stopping growth on home prices.

The Board talked about the rationale for controlling growth closely, referencing the testimony of Takoma Park Councilmember Marc Elrich.

The Board then talked about how and where growth decisions are made, focusing on the relationship between master plans and the Annual Growth Policy. Master plans are where the major growth decisions are made; the AGP has been used to set the pace of the jobs and housing units called for in the master plans.

*Two Conclusions*

The Planning Board's discussion suggested that they had reached two conclusions that helped frame further discussion about a potential framework for the Annual Growth Policy. In short, these two conclusions are: that roads and schools are full, and the County is approaching buildout. These two findings suggest that:

- *Since roads and schools are full:* The County still needs to stage development, because the County does not have existing public facility capacity to support new approvals, but
- *The County is approaching buildout:* so the impact of the remaining new development on public facilities will be small compared with the impacts of existing development and development that is not under the County's control. This suggests that staging does not have to be as precise as it has been in the past (both geographic precision and precision in measuring congestion/crowding).

#### *Other Conclusions/Implications*

The Planning Board generally agreed to replace the current "Policy Area Transportation Review" as a means of staging development but to keep "Local Area Transportation Review" (albeit with possible modifications). The rationale for this position: On a Countywide basis, the "upstream/downstream" impacts of new development are small compared to trips generated by existing development and through traffic, but locally, it is still quite possible that new development could have a major impact on nearby intersections.

The Planning Board expressed interest in the basic theory behind staff's "capacity metering" option. This option calculates the number of additional approvals allowed annually based on the pro rata share of the long-term infrastructure plan that is programmed. In other words, for every increment of spending on transportation facilities, a proportionate increment of development would be allowed to be approved.

The Planning Board expressed interest in applying the new test Countywide, or at least by a smaller number of larger geographies, such as the five Transportation Policy Report II areas. The Planning Board indicated that the current set of policy areas are probably too detailed for a "capacity metering"-type system.

The Planning Board also discussed the issue of payment. A "capacity metering"-type system could work in one of three ways:

1. *Deficit means moratorium:* Capacity metering is used to determine the maximum amount of development that can be approved. Once approvals reach the limit, approvals must stop until additional facilities are programmed.
2. *Deficit means payment required:* Capacity metering is used to determine the maximum amount of development that can be approved. Once approvals reach the limit, development can be approved but only if the developer agrees to make a payment to the County.
3. *Everybody pays:* Every development project is required to make a payment (becoming a de facto impact tax). Capacity metering is used to help determine the amount of that payment.

The Board also discussed how the system would give preference to desired development types or locations. Most of the Board's discussion related to ways a payment system could be used to set priorities. The payments required of high-priority projects could be lower than normal, for example, or certain areas or types of development could be exempt. There was also discussion of auctioning capacity.

Geographic areas that could be exempt or otherwise given priority might be Metro Station Policy Areas or policy areas where there is very little planned development that has yet to occur. Land use types that could be exempt or given priority could be those that meet public policy objectives, such as affordable housing or strategic economic development projects, or those that have less impact on public facilities, such as elderly housing.

### ***A Capacity Metering System***

The central features of a capacity metering system are a list of master-planned transportation infrastructure yet to be programmed, the estimated cost of that infrastructure, and an estimate of master-planned development yet to be built. This list can be aggregated on a Countywide basis, or by any smaller geography, including the five TPR II "areas," the ten TPR II "districts," the seven "community-based planning areas," master plan areas, policy areas, or some other geography.

Costs are allocated to units of development, and these costs are used as the basis to determining how much development can be approved for each increment of infrastructure. For example, \$10 million might be equivalent to 1,500 housing units or 1,000 jobs.

The capacity metering database would need to be updated to reflect changes to list of infrastructure, cost of infrastructure, or amount of development to buildout.

Another way of looking at this question is, "What are the infrastructure costs needed to support a certain level of development?" For illustrative purposes staff has prepared a spreadsheet which makes this estimation for transportation and school facilities. This spreadsheet is attached at circle 10.

### ***Staff Recommendation***

Staff believes that Montgomery County development should continue to be staged with respect to transportation facilities, and we believe that current realities call for a substantially different approach that the County is currently using. Of the three options for replacing the current Policy Area Transportation Review that were reviewed in the *Staff Draft 2003-2005 AGP Policy Element*, staff believes that the "capacity metering" approach is the soundest basis for continuing to stage development and transportation facilities in Montgomery County.

Staff's reasons include:

- Staff agrees that the County is close to approaching buildout (although this is more true in some areas than others) and we agree that, overall, roads (and

schools) are virtually full. For the reasons raised by the Planning Board in their May 22, 2003 discussion, these two conditions strongly suggests that development should continue to be staged, but in a simpler, less precision-oriented way than in the past.

- Capacity metering is simple to understand, because the basis for analysis is cost, not congestion levels. The assumption that a project's cost corresponds with the magnitude of its ability to relieve congestion is justified when each increment of infrastructure and development is small compared to existing development and regional growth.
- Capacity metering will make explicit the relationship between the master plans and the AGP. The master plan's role will be to identify a desired future, including levels of development and infrastructure needed to support that development. The AGP's role will be to implement master plans by assuring that master-planned development does not outpace the provision of master-planned infrastructure.

Staff recommends using "capacity metering" as the conceptual framework for staging development and transportation facilities in Montgomery County. Staff also has some specific recommendations on how capacity metering should be implemented. These recommendations are:

- *Allow development in moratorium areas to be approved upon payment toward facilities.* Of the three types of capacity metering systems described on page 3, staff suggests that consideration be given to number 2: the shorthand description of which is "Deficit means payment required." Our recommendation follows directly from the two main conclusions reached by the Planning Board on May 22, 2003. If we believe that the County is approaching buildout, but that existing facilities cannot support additional approvals, then it makes sense to continue to stage development but in a less strict way.
- *Payment levels:* Staff has recalculated our table of forecast master-planned development and the master-planned transportation facilities to support that development. Previous tables excluded freeways and transit projects. The new table includes them, and they total \$5.9 billion. Spread over approximately 150,000 jobs and 80,000 housing units, a \$5.9 billion program results in very large costs per unit of development, especially since, in this calculation, it is being "charged" only to new development. Staff is not suggesting that the development payment be equal to 100 percent of these costs, but we are suggesting that the development payment be equal to some percentage of these figures.
- *Geography:* Staff is persuaded that staging should be done for subareas of the County, but far fewer than the current 29 policy areas. The five TPR II areas make sense to us. If the Planning Board finds these five areas to be insufficiently detailed, the TPR II process further divided these areas into ten

“districts.” For example, the I-270 corridor was divided into three subareas: Potomac- North Bethesda-Rockville, North Potomac-Derwood-Gaithersburg, and Germantown-Clarksburg.

- *LATR*: Staff recommends that the County continue to test local transportation impacts using the current Local Area Transportation Review test. We do not believe the added complexity of including links in the LATR test would be justified by better outcomes.

Staff offers this conceptual framework for the Board’s consideration. If the Board is comfortable moving forward with this framework, additional issues remain to be addressed. These include:

- *Starting point*: A finding that “roads are full” suggests that, initially, there would be no “free” capacity available for new approvals. All proposed development could be approved, but they would be subject to a transportation facilities payment. The Planning Board could consider a different starting point, however. For example, it may be appropriate to start out with some free capacity inside the Beltway.
- *Priorities/Exemptions*: The Board would have to consider whether certain geographic areas or land uses should be given priority. As mentioned earlier, priority areas could be Metro Station Policy Areas, areas that are close to buildout, other. Priority land uses could be affordable housing and strategic economic development projects.
- *Payment rates*: The payment rates would have to be high enough to make a meaningful contribution toward transportation facilities, relate to new development’s contribution to congestion, and be financially feasible. If payment rates are to be used to set priorities, the difference in the rates should be large enough to effect private action. For example, a savings of \$2,000/unit would likely be insufficient to encourage a developer to choose to provide affordable housing over market rate housing.
- *Municipalities*: Staff has not yet addressed how to account for municipal development activity. The AGP will not, obviously, control development approval in the cities. This means that if, for example, 1,000 housing units in transportation capacity is allocated to the I-270 Corridor area, much of that could be used by Rockville and Gaithersburg approvals. An alternative would be to use a forecast of municipal development activity.

### ***The School Test/Board of Education Recommendations***

The Montgomery County Board of Education reviewed the Annual Growth Policy on May 27, 2003 for the purpose of providing input to the Planning Board during your worksessions. As you are aware, the Planning Board and the Board of Education had a dinner meeting in early 2003 during which the AGP’s school test, among other issues, was discussed.

At their May 27 meeting, the Montgomery County Board of Education adopted a resolution, which is attached, supporting the Planning staff recommendation for the AGP schools test and requesting that the Planning Board support: a) dedicating the recordation tax to school construction projects, b) a request that County Council consider further increases to the recordation tax to be set aside for school construction projects, and c) a development impact tax for schools.

MCPS staff will be available at the Board's worksession to answer questions about the recordation tax issue. As Planning Board members may be aware, the recordation tax was increased recently with the intent of raising revenues for school construction, but there is no legal requirement that the funds be used for that purpose. The recordation tax is paid at the time of purchase of all housing, new and existing. As has been discussed, turnover of existing homes as well as the purchase of new homes are sources of enrollment growth.

In the *Staff Draft 2003-2005 AGP Policy Element*, Park and Planning staff expressed support for the proposed development impact tax for schools. Staff's proposal for a school facilities payment is based on the proposed development impact tax for schools. As the County Council will be addressing revenue issues in conjunction with the Annual Growth Policy, staff sees the utility in including the recordation tax in the discussion.

At the Board of Education worksession, a Board member noted that the proposed standard of adequacy for high schools is 100 percent (and not 105 percent) because the high school test will borrow from adjacent clusters. To be consistent, shouldn't the standard of adequacy for middle schools that borrow (because there's only one middle school in the cluster) also be 100 percent? The Board member also pointed out that the Poolesville cluster also has only one middle school.

Park and Planning staff agree with the Board member and change our recommendation accordingly.

### ***Information Requested by the Planning Board***

Question 1: Based on forecasts of population, what is demand for classrooms?

*MCPS does not prepare a long-range infrastructure program that is analogous to the master plan of highways. The chart of circle 8 shows the historic relationship between school enrollment and number of households in Montgomery County. The spreadsheet on circle 10 calculates an estimate of the school infrastructure cost per unit of development of \$10,916.*

Question 2: What are the historical growth rates in housing and jobs?

*Attached at circle \_\_\_ is a chart showing annual jobs and household figures for Montgomery County from 1959 to the present and from the present to 2030. Beginning in 2001, the annual growth rates for both jobs and housing are forecast at below 2 percent and show a steady, albeit very gradual decline. Please note that since we are unable to forecast natural market fluctuations, we show long-term averages in our forecasts. It is*

*For comparison purposes, the 1990-2030 figures for jobs, households, and population for each locality in the Washington Metropolitan Area are shown on circles 11 through 13. It may be useful to note that Montgomery County's household and population growth rates are similar to the other inner ring suburbs in the region, but our job growth forecasts (29 percent over 30 years) are substantially lower, on a percentage basis, than those of Prince George's County (68 percent) and Fairfax County (42 percent).*

Question 3: What's the minimum growth rate needed to sustain a dynamic local economy?

*Staff has looked for a good answer to this question on several occasions over the past decade and again for this request by the Planning Board. We have not been able to find applicable research that would directly answer this question. Our previous research suggested an economy growing at a rate of 2 percent is typically characterized as "slow growing but still healthy." That research, however, was based on how various rates of growth during various cycles of a sample of local economies were characterized. Local economies growing by less than 1 percent were described with concern, while local economies growing faster than 3 percent tended to be characterized as very healthy. However, this research approach is purely anecdotal. Staff notes that the our job growth forecasts to 2030 for Montgomery County show growth averaging less than 2 percent and slowly declining.*

*A potentially relevant issue was raised recently in Loudoun County, Virginia, where the building industry hired George Mason University Professor Stephen Fuller to determine an "optimal growth rate." The basis for the optimal growth rate was fiscal impact, however, and not the minimum needed to sustain a dynamic economy. In Loudoun's case, the idea was to find the growth rate where new development's contribution to cost of supporting that development is optimal. Incidentally the optimal growth rate selected by GMU was that of the late 1990s, a period of high growth. This finding was strongly rejected by the County and became the subject of a somewhat heated debate.*

*One method of estimating need for growth might arise from a goal of providing a local job for each residents leaving 12<sup>th</sup> grade each year. Between now and 2008, the number of 12<sup>th</sup> graders will rise from 9,110 to 10,158. That is approximately the same number of jobs in the County's annual forecasts for 2000-2010.*

Question 4: The Board of Education already has a Northeast consortium of high schools and is considering a consortium of five downcounty high schools. Students within the consortium area could can choose which high school to attend. How would that work with staff's proposed AGP school test?

*Coincidentally, the Board of Education was reviewing the Downcounty Consortium at the same meeting at their AGP review and this provided a good education on the topic. The Northeast Consortium was instituted in 1998 and includes Springbrook, Paint Branch, and Blake High Schools. For the purposes of administering the AGP,*



however, they are treated as separate high school clusters. The Downcounty Consortium, if approved, would go into effect in 2004.

*The AGP test could continue to treat clusters within consortiums as individual clusters – that is, ignore the consortium – or restrict borrowing to within the consortium.*

*There may be the impression that MCPS is moving toward having every high school in a consortium. Park and Planning staff understands that, at this time, there are no plans for additional consortiums beyond the Downcounty consortium.*

Question 5: How many subdivisions are subject to Local Area Transportation Review? How many would have been subject to LATR if the threshold were 100 trips rather than 50?

*Staff will have the answer to this question at the Board's worksession on June 5. We regret the delay.*

### ***The FY04 AGP Ceiling Element/Nebel Street Extended***

In the *Final Draft FY04 AGP Ceiling Element*, one of the transportation projects that was anticipated to be "countable" was Nebel Street Extended. This project is no longer countable for the FY 04 AGP because it was not fully funded in the first five years of the Capital Improvements Program. The *Final Draft FY04 AGP Ceiling Element* proposes increasing ceilings in North Bethesda Metro Station Policy Areas by 720 housing units and 600 jobs because of Nebel Street Extended. Now that the project is no longer countable, the proposed ceilings must be reduced by an equivalent amount.

Montrose Parkway West was the other transportation project that is countable for FY04. Together with Nebel Street Extended, the recommended capacity allocations to North Bethesda Metro Station Policy Areas (MSPAs) are as follows:

	<b>Housing</b>	<b>Jobs</b>
Grosvenor	500	0
Twinbrook	960	550
White Flint	1,260	5,050
Total MSPAs	2,270	5,600

With Nebel Street Extended programmed, the recommended allocations were just able to accommodate near-term planned. There is no ideal option, but staff's recommendation would be to convert all of the Nebel Street Extended capacity to jobs and to focus the reductions in the White Flint policy area.

The 720 housing units and 600 jobs are equivalent, from a transportation perspective in a North Bethesda Metro Station Policy Area, to 1,040 jobs. Reducing White Flint's allocation by 1,040 jobs would result in an allocation of 1,260 housing units and 4,010 jobs. Because White Flint already has 203 housing units and 1,228 jobs in existing capacity, staff's revised recommendations would result in net remaining capacities in White Flint of 1,468 housing units and 5,328 jobs.

The reduction is focused on White Flint jobs because that is where the overwhelming majority of capacity from the transportation improvements was allocated. The reduced allocation will still support most of the near-term proposed development at White Flint. Less important but relevant is that Nebel Street Extended is located in the White Flint Policy Area.

Office of the Superintendent of Schools  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
Rockville, Maryland

May 27, 2003

Memorandum

To: Members of the Board of Education  
From: Jerry D. Weast, Superintendent of Schools  
Subject: Recommendation for Annual Growth Policy Schools Test

The Board of Education has an opportunity to comment on and influence the Annual Growth Policy (AGP) schools test as the Montgomery County Planning Board prepares to review its staff recommendation. This memorandum contains my recommendation and a proposed resolution for the Board of Education's consideration. Additional opportunities for the Board of Education to provide input also will be provided later in the process. Following is the policy review timetable:

May 1, 2003	Planning Board staff draft recommendation
June 15, 2003	Planning Board draft recommendation transmitted to the County Council, county executive, the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS), and the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) for review
August 1, 2003	County executive recommendation transmitted to the County Council
September 1, 2003	MCPS and WSSC comments transmitted to the County Council
September–October 2003	County Council review of recommendation
November 1, 2003	County Council adoption of new AGP policy element

(1)

## **Background**

In October 2001, the Montgomery County Council directed the Montgomery County Planning Board to review all aspects of the AGP element. Included in this comprehensive review was consideration of changes to the AGP schools test. There has been general dissatisfaction in school communities over the perceived shortcomings of the schools test to regulate development in areas where schools are overcrowded.

On January 23, 2003, the Board of Education Subcommittee on Long-range and Strategic Planning sponsored a joint meeting of the Board of Education, Planning Board members, and the mayors of the cities of Gaithersburg, Rockville, and Takoma Park. At this meeting, the role of the AGP and the direction of land use plans were discussed. The frank conversation focused on the persistent gap presented by plans for more housing in the county, the rapid pace of home construction, and the inability of the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) funding to keep pace with needed school facilities. The meeting played an important role in ensuring that the school system's perspective was included in the AGP review and in future land use planning considerations of the Planning Board.

On May 1, 2003, after more than a year of study that included a number of focus groups and other forms of input from stakeholders, the Planning Board staff released its recommendations for changes to the AGP. Immediately after this release, copies of the chapter on the schools test were sent to Board of Education members.

On May 6, 2003, the Board of Education Subcommittee on Long-range and Strategic Planning sponsored a community roundtable to discuss the Planning Board staff recommendations. Included in the roundtable were parent-teacher association leaders, civic association leaders, members of the building industry, and the county chamber of commerce. On May 12, 2003, the Board subcommittee met to review input received from the community roundtable and further discuss the Planning Board staff recommendation and other options.

## **Superintendent's Recommendation**

The AGP has become a lightning rod for community concern over the impact of growth in the county. Expectations for what this regulatory tool can, or should, accomplish have come to greatly exceed its actual role. The process of AGP policy review has been a valuable learning experience. Parties that are often characterized as having adversarial views—the development industry and county residents faced with overutilized facilities—have come to better appreciate each other's viewpoints. I commend the Board of Education Subcommittee on Long-range and Strategic Planning for promoting this dialogue on the AGP. The subcommittee's leadership in this effort has identified the issues that the Board must consider as it formulates its position on the AGP schools test. In recommending an AGP schools test approach, I have drawn from the work of the subcommittee and from the Planning Board staff recommendation paper.

I recommend that the Board of Education support the Planning Board staff recommendation for a new AGP schools test. This approach, Option 7 of 11 options reviewed by Planning Board staff, represents significant improvement over the current test in a number of areas. The recommended test includes the following characteristics:

**Aspects of the recommended AGP schools test that are the same as in the current test**

- School capacity available in five years is compared with projected enrollment in five years, with elementary, middle, and high schools' adequacy tested separately.
- School capacities (called AGP capacities) are calculated using uniform numbers of students per classroom in order to have a fixed capacity rating for each school (one that does not change as programs are shifted from one school to another, as in MCPS program capacity).
- The test is conducted annually. Once adopted by the County Council, it applies to one year of subdivision reviews. Proposed subdivision plans in clusters that fail the schools test, at any grade level, may not be approved. (An exemption currently exists for senior housing. An affordable housing exemption would be added in the Planning Board staff recommendation.)

**New aspects of the recommended AGP schools test**

- The geographic area tested continues to be the cluster. However, the elementary and middle schools tests compare projected capacity with projected enrollment within the cluster area only. This means that there is no "borrowing" of adjacent cluster capacity if the cluster being tested is over utilization guidelines. At the high school level, and for clusters with only one middle school, the schools test includes "borrowing" adjacent cluster capacity.
- In cases where "borrowing" adjacent cluster capacity is allowed, capacity from only one adjacent cluster may be applied (instead of multiple adjacent clusters in the present test).
- The standard of adequacy for cluster facility utilization is set at 105 percent of AGP capacity for the elementary and middle schools tests (which are conducted within the cluster). The standard of adequacy for cluster facility utilization is set at 100 percent of AGP capacity for the high school test (which is conducted applying adjacent cluster capacity, when needed).
- For cases in which a cluster fails the AGP schools test, developers are provided with a "buy-out" provision. This allows developers to pay a fee per housing unit (set at double the proposed impact tax charge) in order to proceed with development in a cluster otherwise closed to subdivision approvals. The "buy-out" provision is allowed for clusters in which projected enrollment exceeds the standard of adequacy (105 percent for elementary and middle schools and 100 percent for high schools), but does not exceed 110 percent of capacity. For cases

in which cluster utilization is over 110 percent, no “buy-out” is possible, and a building moratorium would be imposed.

### **Impact of the Recommended AGP Schools Test**

Applying current enrollment projections and funded capital projects in the adopted FY 2003 to FY 2008 CIP, four clusters would fail the recommended AGP schools test—Damascus, Walter Johnson, John F. Kennedy, and Northwest. All these clusters fail the test at the elementary school level. Planned additions to elementary school capacity through school openings in the case of the Damascus, John F. Kennedy, and Northwest clusters and school additions in the case of the Walter Johnson cluster will address these projected space deficits. However, none of these projects are funded in the adopted CIP and, therefore, are not counted in the schools test.

### **Rationale**

I support the Planning Board staff recommendation for a number of reasons. First, narrowing the test to include only capacity available within the cluster for elementary and middle schools is a significant improvement over the current test. The “borrowing” of adjacent cluster capacity is the most often cited complaint from school communities for the current test. The current approach is viewed as adding an unrealistic amount of capacity and erroneously implying that capacity shortages can be addressed by cross-cluster boundary changes. By recognizing that there are multiple elementary schools in all MCPS clusters and at least two middle schools in most clusters, the recommended schools test provides for a more realistic representation of the opportunities for boundary changes among cluster schools.

The recommendation’s continuation of the “borrowing” provision at the high school level and for clusters with only one middle school accurately represents the opportunities for boundary changes at this school level. To relieve high schools of space shortages, either additions are built or changes between high school boundaries are necessary. The improvement that I support strongly in this area is that any “borrowing” of adjacent high school capacity would be in one direction. In other words, in order to address overutilization at one high school, a single adjacent high school must make up the deficit (not multiple high schools).

In order to narrow the geographic scope of the recommended schools test to within a cluster for elementary and middle schools, a slightly higher threshold of AGP capacity utilization is recommended. This threshold is 105 percent utilization, whereas in the current AGP schools test 100 percent utilization is applied at all three school levels. In reviewing other options developed during the review of the AGP schools test, it is evident that continuing at 100 percent utilization, while narrowing the geographic scope of the test to the cluster level, results in an unrealistic number of clusters failing the schools test. In addition, this approach would close clusters where new development is extremely

limited. In these clusters, where turnover of existing housing is the major driver of enrollment change, restricting subdivision approvals would have virtually no impact on school conditions. Because of these considerations, I support the use of the 105 percent utilization threshold for the elementary and middle schools test, and the continued use of the 100 percent utilization threshold for the high school test.

The recommended revisions to the AGP schools test continue the use of so-called "AGP capacity." This rating of capacity treats all rooms in a school (except kindergarten rooms) as regular classrooms. No reduction in capacity is made for rooms used for pre-kindergarten and special education classes. While MCPS program capacity captures differences in how rooms are used for different programs, it can change when special programs are reassigned from one school to another. Using the AGP capacity for the schools test could avoid a situation in which a cluster would be put into moratorium if some special programs were added to a school that reduce program capacity just enough to fail the schools test.

As a consequence of the need to establish a stable, fixed capacity for each school, school capacities in the AGP are somewhat higher than MCPS program capacities. The greatest difference in the two ways of rating capacity is seen at the elementary school level. I appreciate the concern school communities have over this different capacity rating system. At the same time, I understand the necessity for a fixed building capacity rating for schools in the AGP. Also, it is important to remember that the school capacity ratings used in the AGP are not used in MCPS facility planning, where our own program capacity guides all projects funded in the CIP.

A new provision of the recommended AGP schools test provides a mechanism for developers to pay a facility fee, per housing unit, that would allow a subdivision to proceed if the schools test indicates cluster utilization is between 105 percent and 110 percent. A major hurdle to past efforts to tighten the AGP schools test was the absolute nature of imposing a moratorium. Providing a mechanism for development to proceed, but at a cost to a developer, makes the recommended AGP schools test more flexible. The "buy-out" provision also promotes a way for the county to raise revenue that would be dedicated to school construction, just as comparable "buy-out" provisions in the transportation test fund road improvements. I support the use of double the proposed Development Impact tax as the charge levied on developers for each proposed housing unit in a school cluster found to be between 105 percent and 110 percent utilized. I concur with the Planning Board staff recommendation not to allow a "buy-out" if cluster utilization is at 110 percent or above.

### **Revenue Approaches**

When discussing growth policy, neither side of the debate would be nearly as focused on the nuances of the AGP if funding for county infrastructure was adequate to meet school construction and transportation needs. All sides agree that meaningful improvement in

school utilization will be achieved by funding CIP projects, not by creating moratoria on development. There is evidence from the roundtable discussion, held by the Board's Sub-committee on Long-range and Strategic Planning, that the business community will support higher taxes in order to build critical county facilities, including schools.

Last year, the call for increased funding sources resulted in an increase in the Recordation tax. This is the tax paid when housing changes ownership. This increase was intended to be reserved specifically for school construction. This year, a proposal for a new Development Impact tax to be levied on each new housing unit constructed in the county was reviewed. Action on this proposal has been delayed until next fall so that it can be made in the context of AGP policy changes. Proceeds from a new impact tax would be dedicated to school construction. I support the Recordation tax and the proposed impact tax as important measures to fund school construction. These tax initiatives show a high level of support by the County Council for school needs.

Unfortunately, it appears that proceeds from the increase in the Recordation tax are not being restricted to school system construction, as was intended when the legislation passed. To me, the Recordation tax is a more important source of revenue than the proposed Development Impact tax, because it taps into enrollment growth generated by turnover of existing housing, as well as by sales of new homes. I recommend that the Board of Education strongly urge the county to tighten the restriction of increased recordation fees to school construction. I also recommend that the Board request a county review of the Recordation tax amount to determine whether there is an opportunity to further increase revenues that could be directed to school construction.

The following resolution is provided for the Board's consideration:

WHEREAS, A comprehensive review of the AGP element has been conducted over the past year, and this review has included consideration of alternative approaches to the AGP schools test; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Board of Education has participated in the review of the AGP schools test and promoted dialogue among the Montgomery County Planning Board; the mayors of the cities of Gaithersburg, Rockville, and Takoma Park; school community leaders; and the business community; and

WHEREAS, The Montgomery County Planning Board staff has recommended changes to the AGP schools test that address many concerns held by the school system and the community with the current AGP schools test; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Education Subcommittee on Long-range and Strategic Planning conducted a roundtable discussion with a cross-section of stakeholders on the Planning Board staff recommendation and identified issues to be considered in the Board's response to the Planning Board staff AGP recommendation; and



WHEREAS, The AGP review has highlighted the importance of obtaining adequate revenue as the primary solution to school overutilization; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education supports the Planning Board staff recommendation for the AGP schools test; and be it further

Resolved, That in its recommendation on the AGP the Planning Board include increased emphasis on ways to increase revenue; and be it further

Resolved, That in its recommendation on the AGP the Planning Board include a request of the County Council to codify the dedication of the Recordation tax to school construction projects; and be it further

Resolved, That in its recommendation on the AGP the Planning Board include a request of the County Council to review potential further increases to the Recordation tax that also would be set aside for school construction projects; and be it further

Resolved, That in its recommendation on the AGP the Planning Board include support for the proposed Development Impact tax on new home construction and the dedication of impact taxes that are collected to support school construction; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the County Council, the county executive, and the Planning Board; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to mayors and councils in Montgomery County municipalities with a request that they consider adoption of comparable provisions.

JDW:vnb

## Montgomery County Public School Enrollment and Households 1969-2002

Year	MCPS Enrollment	Total Households	Enrollment per Household
1969-70	124,971	156,674	0.80
1970-71	125,344	161,000	0.78
1971-72	126,207	168,100	0.75
1972-73	126,912	176,000	0.72
1973-74	126,176	185,000	0.68
1974-75	124,319	191,400	0.65
1975-76	122,272	193,600	0.63
1976-77	117,630	195,600	0.60
1977-78	112,625	198,800	0.57
1978-79	107,430	202,000	0.53
1979-80	102,519	207,195	0.49
1980-81	98,843	211,800	0.47
1981-82	95,587	216,800	0.44
1982-83	92,517	220,800	0.42
1983-84	91,030	227,500	0.40
1984-85	91,704	236,000	0.39
1985-86	92,871	246,100	0.38
1986-87	94,460	256,800	0.37
1987-88	96,271	266,900	0.36
1988-89	98,519	275,600	0.36
1989-90	100,259	282,228	0.36
1990-91	103,732	285,400	0.36
1991-92	107,399	289,900	0.37
1992-93	110,037	293,100	0.38
1993-94	113,429	296,200	0.38
1994-95	117,082	299,000	0.39
1995-96	120,291	301,800	0.40
1996-97	122,505	304,800	0.40
1997-98	125,035	310,500	0.40
1998-99	127,852	314,000	0.41
1999-00	130,689	324,565	0.40
2000-01	134,308	328,980	0.41
2001-02	136,832	333,360	0.41
2002-03	138,891	337,740	0.41

Source: Montgomery County Public Schools, Office of Shared Accountability, May 2003.

## At-Place Employment and Household Growth Montgomery County, 1959 to 2030

Year	Total Jobs	Growth	Percent Growth	Total Households	Growth	Percent Growth
1959	82,566			87,717		
1960	89,455	6,889	8.34%	92,433	4,716	5.38%
1961	96,386	6,931	7.75%	98,857	6,424	6.95%
1962	103,536	7,150	7.42%	105,281	6,424	6.50%
1963	113,747	10,211	9.86%	111,705	6,424	6.10%
1964	124,400	10,653	9.37%	118,129	6,424	5.75%
1965	135,526	11,126	8.94%	124,553	6,424	5.44%
1966	148,757	13,231	9.76%	130,977	6,424	5.16%
1967	156,294	7,537	5.07%	137,401	6,424	4.90%
1968	167,888	11,594	7.42%	143,825	6,424	4.68%
1969	178,713	10,825	6.45%	150,249	6,424	4.47%
1970	183,330	4,617	2.58%	156,674	6,425	4.28%
1971	193,143	9,813	5.35%	161,100	4,426	2.82%
1972	204,123	10,980	5.68%	168,100	7,000	4.35%
1973	221,848	17,725	8.68%	176,000	7,900	4.70%
1974	240,263	18,415	8.30%	185,000	9,000	5.11%
1975	246,573	6,310	2.63%	191,400	6,400	3.46%
1976	256,137	9,564	3.88%	193,600	2,200	1.15%
1977	268,531	12,394	4.84%	195,600	2,000	1.03%
1978	283,481	14,950	5.57%	198,800	3,200	1.64%
1979	302,526	19,045	6.72%	202,000	3,200	1.61%
1980	310,762	8,236	2.72%	207,195	5,195	2.57%
1981	324,893	14,131	4.55%	211,800	4,605	2.22%
1982	319,159	-5,734	-1.76%	216,800	5,000	2.36%
1983	328,873	9,714	3.04%	220,800	4,000	1.85%
1984	352,744	23,871	7.26%	227,500	6,700	3.03%
1985	380,673	27,929	7.92%	236,000	8,500	3.74%
1986	398,779	18,106	4.76%	246,100	10,100	4.28%
1987	419,438	20,659	5.18%	256,800	10,700	4.35%
1988	433,979	14,541	3.47%	266,900	10,100	3.93%
1989	450,848	16,869	3.89%	275,600	8,700	3.26%
1990	465,970	15,122	3.35%	282,228	6,628	2.40%
1991	446,616	-19,354	-4.15%	285,400	3,172	1.12%
1992	446,089	-527	-0.12%	289,900	4,500	1.58%
1993	446,703	614	0.14%	293,100	3,200	1.10%
1994	448,588	1,885	0.42%	296,200	3,100	1.06%
1995	462,490	13,902	3.10%	299,000	2,800	0.95%
1996	463,949	1,459	0.32%	301,800	2,800	0.94%
1997	491,032	27,083	5.84%	304,800	3,000	0.99%
1998	505,738	14,706	2.99%	310,500	5,700	1.87%
1999	523,374	17,636	3.49%	314,000	3,500	1.13%
2000	545,000	21,626	4.13%	324,565	10,565	3.36%
2001	555,000	10,000	1.83%	328,980	4,415	1.36%
2002	565,000	10,000	1.80%	333,360	4,380	1.33%
2003	575,000	10,000	1.77%	337,740	4,380	1.31%
2004	585,000	10,000	1.74%	342,120	4,380	1.30%
2005	595,000	10,000	1.71%	346,500	4,380	1.28%
2006	603,000	8,000	1.34%	351,200	4,700	1.36%
2007	611,000	8,000	1.33%	355,900	4,700	1.34%
2008	618,000	7,000	1.15%	360,600	4,700	1.32%
2009	624,000	6,000	0.97%	365,300	4,700	1.30%
2010	630,000	6,000	0.96%	370,000	4,700	1.29%
2011	636,000	6,000	0.95%	374,000	4,000	1.08%
2012	642,000	6,000	0.94%	378,000	4,000	1.07%
2013	648,000	6,000	0.93%	382,000	4,000	1.06%
2014	654,000	6,000	0.93%	386,000	4,000	1.05%
2015	660,000	6,000	0.92%	390,000	4,000	1.04%
2016	664,000	4,000	0.61%	393,000	3,000	0.77%
2017	668,000	4,000	0.60%	396,000	3,000	0.76%
2018	672,000	4,000	0.60%	399,000	3,000	0.76%
2019	676,000	4,000	0.60%	402,000	3,000	0.75%
2020	680,000	4,000	0.59%	405,000	3,000	0.75%
2021	683,000	3,000	0.44%	407,000	2,000	0.49%
2022	686,000	3,000	0.44%	409,000	2,000	0.49%
2023	689,000	3,000	0.44%	411,000	2,000	0.49%
2024	692,000	3,000	0.44%	413,000	2,000	0.49%
2025	695,000	3,000	0.43%	415,000	2,000	0.48%
2026	697,000	2,000	0.29%	416,000	1,000	0.24%
2027	699,000	2,000	0.29%	417,000	1,000	0.24%
2028	701,000	2,000	0.29%	418,000	1,000	0.24%
2029	703,000	2,000	0.29%	419,000	1,000	0.24%
2030	705,000	2,000	0.28%	420,000	1,000	0.24%

Note: Round 6.3 cooperative forecast. For at-place employment, 1959-1999 are actual numbers and 2000-2030 are forecast numbers. For households, figures or 1960 and 1970-2000 are actual numbers; figures for 1961-1969 are interpolated from Census data for 1960 and 1970. 2001-2030 are forecast numbers. Beginning in 1998, data reflects the annexation of Takoma Park from Prince George's County to Montgomery County, which occurred in July 1997. Source: Montgomery County Department of Park and Planning, Research and Technology Center. Revised 3/12/02

# Infrastructure Cost Worksheet

This worksheet calculates the cost per unit of future development of transportation and school infrastructure.

## Transportation

1) Enter Expected/Desired Growth

<b>Job growth</b>	generates demand for	<b>Housing Units</b>	generating
10,000		6,667	

2) Expected/Desired Growth is What Percent of 2030 Forecast?

<b>Jobs</b>	2030 forecast	<b>Housing</b>
146,000	Expected/desired jobs	78,000
10,000	% of 2030 forecast	6,667
6.85%		8.55%

3) Share of total transportation capital cost

<b>Job Share</b>	<b>Total Capital Cost</b>
65.5%	\$5,900,000,000
\$264,691,781	

4) Transportation cost per job or housing unit

<b>Jobs</b>	<b>Housing</b>
\$26,469	\$26,096

## Schools

<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Middle</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Total</b>
1,227	613	827	2,667

2) Cost per student of school infrastructure

<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Middle</b>	<b>High</b>
\$31,250	\$26,669	\$21,875

3) Cost of infrastructure for expected/desired growth

<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Middle</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Total</b>
\$38,333,333	\$16,356,987	\$18,083,333	\$72,773,653

4) Cost per unit of development for school infrastructure

<b>Housing</b>
\$10,916

Notes: includes the cost of all planned transportation infrastructure. The 10,000 jobs-per-year figure is illustrative.

10

**Summary of Intermediate Employment Forecasts**  
**Round 6.3 Cooperative Forecasts**  
**(Thousands)**

**Draft**

JURISDICTION	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2000 to 2030		Regional Share
										Number	% Change	
District of Columbia	747.3	701.9	678.0	720.4	752.0	783.7	807.1	831.2	831.2	153.2	22.6%	11.7%
Arlington County	183.1	195.8	201.7	209.7	236.0	255.0	274.1	293.2	301.9	100.2	49.7%	7.7%
City of Alexandria	93.2	91.9	98.6	104.1	120.7	128.3	137.0	141.9	148.1	49.5	50.3%	3.8%
<b>Central Jurisdictions</b>	<b>1,023.6</b>	<b>989.6</b>	<b>978.3</b>	<b>1,034.2</b>	<b>1,108.7</b>	<b>1,167.0</b>	<b>1,218.2</b>	<b>1,266.3</b>	<b>1,281.2</b>	<b>302.9</b>	<b>31.0%</b>	<b>23.2%</b>
Montgomery County (1)	466.0	462.5	545.0	585.0	630.0	660.0	680.0	695.0	705.0	160.0	29.4%	12.2%
Rockville (2)	56.9	62.7	68.7	80.6	92.8	98.3	101.3	102.4	103.5	34.8	50.7%	2.7%
Prince George's County	310.4	301.3	327.5	357.9	399.9	426.4	465.0	516.8	550.0	222.5	67.9%	17.0%
Fairfax County (3)	403.7	459.6	532.8	595.0	653.2	678.4	708.5	736.5	758.9	226.1	42.4%	17.3%
City of Fairfax	26.9	29.7	30.8	32.7	34.8	34.8	34.8	34.8	34.8	4.0	12.9%	0.3%
City of Falls Church	9.2	9.3	9.4	9.5	10.0	10.3	10.5	10.6	10.7	1.3	13.8%	0.1%
<b>Inner Suburbs</b>	<b>1,216.1</b>	<b>1,262.4</b>	<b>1,445.5</b>	<b>1,580.1</b>	<b>1,727.9</b>	<b>1,809.9</b>	<b>1,898.8</b>	<b>1,993.7</b>	<b>2,059.4</b>	<b>613.9</b>	<b>42.5%</b>	<b>46.9%</b>
Loudoun County	39.3	53.2	87.0	109.9	137.1	166.2	195.3	224.0	253.6	166.6	191.5%	12.7%
Prince William County	68.8	78.0	91.6	106.3	124.0	139.4	152.8	164.4	173.5	81.9	89.4%	6.3%
City of Manassas	17.2	18.5	19.9	20.7	21.4	21.7	21.9	21.9	21.9	2.0	10.1%	0.2%
City of Manassas Park	2.3	2.5	2.7	3.0	4.7	4.9	5.1	5.2	5.2	2.5	92.6%	0.2%
Calvert County (4)	18.1	21.5	25.9	29.4	32.9	33.7	34.5	35.1	35.6	9.7	37.5%	0.7%
Charles County (4)	38.7	44.6	50.1	56.5	62.9	64.8	66.8	67.9	69.1	19.0	37.9%	1.5%
Frederick County	54.0	68.0	99.7	109.2	120.7	134.6	148.5	162.5	177.8	78.1	78.3%	6.0%
Stafford County (5)	11.0	13.9	23.1	29.0	34.9	39.9	44.8	49.6	54.4	31.3	135.5%	2.4%
Anne Arundel County (6)	249.4	258.3	297.0	323.9	338.6	356.6	376.0	392.3	404.1	107.1	36.1%	n/a
Howard County (6)	106.3	123.6	160.0	180.0	200.0	215.0	230.0	245.0	249.9	89.9	56.2%	n/a
<b>Outer Suburbs (6)</b>	<b>249.4</b>	<b>300.2</b>	<b>400.0</b>	<b>464.0</b>	<b>538.6</b>	<b>605.2</b>	<b>669.7</b>	<b>730.6</b>	<b>791.1</b>	<b>391.1</b>	<b>97.8%</b>	<b>29.9%</b>
<b>Northern Virginia</b>	<b>854.7</b>	<b>952.4</b>	<b>1,097.6</b>	<b>1,219.9</b>	<b>1,376.8</b>	<b>1,478.9</b>	<b>1,584.8</b>	<b>1,682.1</b>	<b>1,763.0</b>	<b>665.4</b>	<b>60.6%</b>	<b>50.9%</b>
<b>Suburban Maryland (6)</b>	<b>887.1</b>	<b>897.9</b>	<b>1,048.2</b>	<b>1,138.0</b>	<b>1,246.4</b>	<b>1,319.5</b>	<b>1,394.8</b>	<b>1,477.3</b>	<b>1,537.5</b>	<b>489.3</b>	<b>46.7%</b>	<b>37.4%</b>
<b>REGIONAL TOTAL (6)</b>	<b>2,489.1</b>	<b>2,552.2</b>	<b>2,823.8</b>	<b>3,078.3</b>	<b>3,375.2</b>	<b>3,582.1</b>	<b>3,786.7</b>	<b>3,990.6</b>	<b>4,131.7</b>	<b>1,307.9</b>	<b>46.3%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) Forecasts for years 2000 to 2030 include all of Takoma Park.

(2) Included in Montgomery County total.

(3) Totals for all years include Fairfax County Government employees working in the Massey Complex.

(4) Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland develops ten-year incremental population, housing unit and employment forecasts for Calvert County, Charles County and St. Mary's County. Forecasts for 2005, 2015 and 2025 in Calvert County and Charles County were made by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

(5) Source: Rappahannock Area Development Commission (RADCO), January 2003.

(6) Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC) Round 6 Forecasts (2000 to 2025) for Anne Arundel and Howard counties are shown for reference purposes only and are not included in any other totals. Howard County and Anne Arundel County provided 2000 to 2025 projections and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments extrapolated their data to 2030. The official forecasts for Anne Arundel County for 2030 will not be available until January 2004.

4-Mar-03



**Summary of Intermediate Household Forecasts  
Round 6.3 Cooperative Forecasts  
(Thousands)**

**Draft**

JURISDICTION	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2000 to 2030		Regional Share
										Number	% Change	
<b>District of Columbia (1)</b>	249.6	232.1	248.3	263.9	272.2	292.9	298.7	304.4	304.4	56.1	22.6%	8.8%
<b>Arlington County</b>	78.5	86.9	86.4	90.9	94.6	98.7	102.5	104.9	106.2	19.8	22.9%	3.1%
<b>City of Alexandria</b>	53.3	56.4	61.9	66.2	70.0	71.8	73.0	74.3	75.3	13.4	21.6%	2.1%
<b>Central Jurisdictions</b>	<b>381.4</b>	<b>375.4</b>	<b>396.6</b>	<b>421.0</b>	<b>436.8</b>	<b>463.4</b>	<b>474.2</b>	<b>483.6</b>	<b>485.9</b>	<b>89.3</b>	<b>22.5%</b>	<b>13.9%</b>
<b>Montgomery County (2)</b>	282.0	299.0	324.6	346.5	370.0	390.0	405.0	415.0	420.0	95.4	29.4%	14.9%
<b>Rockville (3)</b>	15.7	16.1	17.2	20.0	22.8	24.0	24.2	24.3	24.7	7.5	43.6%	1.2%
<b>Prince George's County</b>	258.0	278.1	288.6	304.5	319.0	333.6	346.7	359.6	369.8	81.2	28.1%	12.7%
<b>Fairfax County</b>	292.3	317.0	350.7	381.2	408.7	421.8	430.5	435.0	438.4	87.7	25.0%	13.7%
<b>City of Fairfax</b>	7.4	7.7	8.4	8.6	8.9	9.0	9.1	9.2	9.3	0.9	10.7%	0.1%
<b>City of Falls Church</b>	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.9	5.1	5.2	5.3	5.4	0.9	20.0%	0.1%
<b>Inner Suburbs</b>	<b>843.9</b>	<b>906.2</b>	<b>976.8</b>	<b>1,045.4</b>	<b>1,111.5</b>	<b>1,159.5</b>	<b>1,196.5</b>	<b>1,224.1</b>	<b>1,242.9</b>	<b>266.1</b>	<b>27.2%</b>	<b>41.5%</b>
<b>Loudoun County</b>	30.7	40.9	59.9	84.9	106.6	124.6	139.6	150.0	156.7	96.8	161.6%	15.1%
<b>Prince William County</b>	69.7	82.2	94.6	113.4	127.3	137.2	143.4	148.3	152.1	57.5	60.8%	9.0%
<b>City of Manassas</b>	9.5	13.4	11.8	12.5	12.9	13.3	13.4	13.7	13.8	2.0	16.9%	0.3%
<b>City of Manassas Park</b>	2.2	2.5	3.3	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	1.0	8.5%	0.2%
<b>Calvert County (4)</b>	17.0	21.1	27.6	29.5	31.5	33.7	35.8	37.7	39.7	12.1	43.8%	1.9%
<b>Charles County (4)</b>	33.0	36.3	43.9	49.0	54.1	62.0	70.0	75.1	80.2	36.3	82.7%	5.7%
<b>Frederick County</b>	52.6	62.4	70.1	76.2	84.7	93.2	101.7	110.1	120.2	50.1	71.5%	7.8%
<b>Stafford County (5)</b>	19.4	26.9	30.2	36.6	42.5	46.9	51.4	55.7	59.9	29.7	98.3%	4.6%
<b>Anne Arundel County (6)</b>	149.1	162.7	178.7	193.2	202.8	210.5	217.2	223.1	229.8	51.1	28.6%	n/a
<b>Howard County (6)</b>	68.3	81.2	91.0	100.0	107.5	115.0	121.0	121.7	121.7	30.7	33.7%	n/a
<b>Outer Suburbs (6)</b>	<b>234.0</b>	<b>285.6</b>	<b>341.4</b>	<b>406.3</b>	<b>463.8</b>	<b>515.2</b>	<b>559.6</b>	<b>594.9</b>	<b>626.9</b>	<b>285.5</b>	<b>83.6%</b>	<b>44.5%</b>
<b>Northern Virginia</b>	<b>567.2</b>	<b>638.2</b>	<b>711.7</b>	<b>803.1</b>	<b>880.6</b>	<b>932.7</b>	<b>972.4</b>	<b>1,000.7</b>	<b>1,021.4</b>	<b>309.7</b>	<b>43.5%</b>	<b>48.3%</b>
<b>Suburban Maryland (6)</b>	<b>642.5</b>	<b>696.9</b>	<b>754.8</b>	<b>805.7</b>	<b>859.3</b>	<b>912.5</b>	<b>959.2</b>	<b>997.5</b>	<b>1,029.9</b>	<b>275.1</b>	<b>36.4%</b>	<b>42.9%</b>
<b>REGIONAL TOTAL (6)</b>	<b>1,459.3</b>	<b>1,567.2</b>	<b>1,714.8</b>	<b>1,872.7</b>	<b>2,012.1</b>	<b>2,138.1</b>	<b>2,230.3</b>	<b>2,302.6</b>	<b>2,355.7</b>	<b>640.9</b>	<b>37.4%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) The Round 6.3 population and household forecasts for the District of Columbia reflect Census 2000 counts which showed the city's population to be higher than estimated in Round 6.2.

(2) Forecasts for years 2000 to 2030 include all of Takoma Park.

(3) Included in Montgomery County total.

(4) Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland develops ten-year incremental population, housing unit and employment forecasts for Calvert County, Charles County and St. Mary's County. Forecasts for 2005, 2015 and 2025 in Calvert County and Charles County were made by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG).

(5) Source: Rappahanock Area Development Commission (RADCO), February 2003. As of February 5, 2003, RADCO has not completed the estimates of households for Stafford County. The data for 2005 to 2030 was estimated by MWCOG. Therefore, the estimates for households are subject to minor revision.

(6) Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC) Round 6 Forecasts (2000 to 2025) for Anne Arundel and Howard counties are shown for reference purposes only and are not included in any other totals. Howard County and Anne Arundel County provided 2000 to 2025 projections and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments extrapolated their data to 2030. The official forecasts for Anne Arundel County for 2030 will not be available until January 2004.

12

**Summary of Intermediate Population Forecasts  
Round 6.3 Cooperative Forecasts  
(Thousands)**

**Draft**

JURISDICTION	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2000 to 2030		Regional Share
										Number	% Change	
<b>District of Columbia (1)</b>	606.9	554.3	572.1	607.0	627.0	673.7	688.1	702.4	702.4	<b>130.3</b>	<b>22.8%</b>	<b>8.4%</b>
<b>Arlington County</b>	170.9	187.9	189.5	197.4	202.5	209.1	215.5	219.5	221.9	<b>32.4</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>
<b>City of Alexandria</b>	111.2	117.3	128.3	136.5	142.9	145.9	147.8	150.0	151.7	<b>23.4</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>
<b>Central Jurisdictions</b>	<b>889.0</b>	<b>859.4</b>	<b>889.9</b>	<b>940.9</b>	<b>972.4</b>	<b>1,028.7</b>	<b>1,051.4</b>	<b>1,071.9</b>	<b>1,076.0</b>	<b>186.1</b>	<b>20.9%</b>	<b>12.0%</b>
<b>Montgomery County (2)</b>	757.0	810.0	873.3	925.0	975.0	1,020.0	1,050.0	1,070.0	1,080.0	<b>206.7</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>
<b>Rockville (3)</b>	44.8	47.0	47.4	53.7	60.4	62.8	63.3	63.5	64.4	<b>17.0</b>	<b>35.9%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
<b>Prince George's County</b>	729.3	767.0	808.0	856.6	881.1	907.7	932.3	952.1	967.8	<b>159.8</b>	<b>19.8%</b>	<b>10.3%</b>
<b>Fairfax County (4)</b>	818.6	879.4	969.8	1,046.9	1,116.1	1,151.8	1,176.6	1,189.4	1,199.4	<b>229.6</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>14.8%</b>
<b>City of Fairfax</b>	19.6	20.4	21.4	22.4	23.0	23.3	23.6	23.4	23.2	<b>1.8</b>	<b>8.4%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
<b>City of Falls Church</b>	9.6	10.0	10.4	10.6	11.3	11.6	11.9	12.1	12.2	<b>1.8</b>	<b>17.3%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
<b>Inner Suburbs</b>	<b>2,334.1</b>	<b>2,486.8</b>	<b>2,682.9</b>	<b>2,861.5</b>	<b>3,006.5</b>	<b>3,114.4</b>	<b>3,194.4</b>	<b>3,247.0</b>	<b>3,282.6</b>	<b>599.7</b>	<b>22.4%</b>	<b>38.7%</b>
<b>Loudoun County</b>	86.1	112.8	169.6	239.3	300.4	351.2	393.7	423.0	441.9	<b>272.3</b>	<b>160.6%</b>	<b>17.6%</b>
<b>Prince William County</b>	215.7	249.9	280.8	339.9	376.2	400.6	414.8	425.9	433.1	<b>152.3</b>	<b>54.2%</b>	<b>9.8%</b>
<b>City of Manassas</b>	28.0	32.0	35.7	36.7	37.5	37.6	37.7	37.9	38.1	<b>2.4</b>	<b>6.7%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
<b>City of Manassas Park</b>	6.7	7.6	10.3	14.8	15.3	15.5	15.7	15.7	15.8	<b>5.5</b>	<b>53.4%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>
<b>Calvert County (5)</b>	51.4	63.9	74.6	80.6	86.6	91.1	95.6	100.0	104.4	<b>29.8</b>	<b>39.9%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>
<b>Charles County (5)</b>	101.2	111.1	120.6	134.0	147.4	165.2	183.0	194.0	205.0	<b>84.4</b>	<b>70.0%</b>	<b>5.4%</b>
<b>Frederick County</b>	150.2	174.2	195.3	216.6	238.3	260.0	281.9	299.6	324.6	<b>129.3</b>	<b>66.2%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>
<b>Stafford County (6)</b>	61.2	80.2	92.5	110.2	127.9	141.3	154.7	167.5	180.4	<b>87.9</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	<b>5.7%</b>
<b>Anne Arundel County (7)</b>	427.2	459.7	489.7	520.2	534.1	543.7	553.2	562.9	572.2	<b>82.5</b>	<b>16.8%</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>Howard County (7)</b>	187.3	220.0	250.8	273.3	291.7	304.0	312.6	308.9	304.9	<b>54.1</b>	<b>21.6%</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<b>Outer Suburbs (7)</b>	<b>700.5</b>	<b>831.8</b>	<b>979.4</b>	<b>1,172.1</b>	<b>1,329.6</b>	<b>1,462.5</b>	<b>1,577.1</b>	<b>1,663.6</b>	<b>1,743.3</b>	<b>763.9</b>	<b>78.0%</b>	<b>49.3%</b>
<b>Northern Virginia</b>	<b>1,527.7</b>	<b>1,697.5</b>	<b>1,908.3</b>	<b>2,154.7</b>	<b>2,353.1</b>	<b>2,487.9</b>	<b>2,592.0</b>	<b>2,664.4</b>	<b>2,717.7</b>	<b>809.4</b>	<b>42.4%</b>	<b>52.2%</b>
<b>Suburban Maryland (7)</b>	<b>1,789.0</b>	<b>1,926.2</b>	<b>2,071.8</b>	<b>2,212.8</b>	<b>2,328.4</b>	<b>2,444.0</b>	<b>2,542.8</b>	<b>2,615.7</b>	<b>2,681.8</b>	<b>610.0</b>	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>39.4%</b>
<b>REGIONAL TOTAL (7)</b>	<b>3,923.6</b>	<b>4,178.0</b>	<b>4,552.2</b>	<b>4,974.5</b>	<b>5,308.5</b>	<b>5,605.6</b>	<b>5,822.9</b>	<b>5,982.5</b>	<b>6,101.9</b>	<b>1,549.7</b>	<b>34.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(1) The Round 6.3 population and household forecasts for the District of Columbia reflect Census 2000 counts which showed the city's population to be higher than estimated in Round 6.2.

(2) Forecasts for years 2000 to 2030 include all of Takoma Park.

(3) Included in Montgomery County total.

(4) Includes Fairfax County group quarters population in the Massey Complex.

(5) Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland develops ten-year incremental population, housing unit and employment forecasts for Calvert County, Charles County and St. Mary's County. Forecasts for 2005, 2015 and 2025 in Calvert County and Charles County were made by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG).

(6) Source: Rappahanock Area Development Commission (RADCO), January 2003. The estimates for 2010, 2020 and 2030 are control totals provided by the Virginia Employment Commission (VEC) and should only be used for transportation planning purposes. Incremental five-year estimates (2005, 2015, and 2025) have been developed by MWCOG for the purpose of transportation modeling and air quality analysis.

(7) Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC) Round 6 Forecasts (2000 to 2025) for Anne Arundel and Howard counties are shown for reference purposes only and are not included in any other totals. Howard County and Anne Arundel County provided 2000 to 2025 projections and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments extrapolated their data to 2030. The official forecasts for Anne Arundel County for 2030 will not be available until January 2004.

13