



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

February 26, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board

VIA: Rollin Stanley, Planning Director

FROM: Gwen Wright, Chief, Countywide Planning Division
Karl Moritz, Chief, Research and Technology
Matt Zisman, Planner Coordinator, Strategic Planning Division

SUBJECT: Worksession #2 on Master Plan Reassessment Project

BACKGROUND

On January 31st, the Planning Board was briefed on the progress of the Master Plan Reassessment Project. An Executive Summary was presented which highlighted the major recommendations being contemplated in the project (see Attachment #1.) In addition, the Board received copies of several reports prepared by Planning Department staff and by consultants on the project, including results of approximately 20 stakeholder focus groups, ideas for integrating form based code concepts into master plans, background information on the current master plan process, and ideas for new technologies that may be useful in upcoming master plans.

The Board seemed to generally agree with the direction of the recommendations and made several suggestions for additional work. Some of the major comments were:

- develop more fully each of the recommendations to reflect: 1) why the suggestion is important; 2) what problem(s) it addresses; and 3) how the recommendation reflects best practice as identified in the Comparative Survey.
- articulate the context for different types of master plans - while the General Plan offers guidance, master plans will still need an overview approach such as that provided by the I-270/MD355 Corridor Study, the Georgia Avenue Study, and other similar plans. The Board emphasized the master plans are not islands, but need to be developed within the broader economic and fiscal context of the County.
- gather information about how many plans other jurisdictions tackle in a given time, and about how many and what types of resources these jurisdictions apply to develop their plans.

- do further study on resource allocation. The Board made clear that it cannot yet make a decision on any new structure of staff teams, but that it will take a hard look at the issue as the Master Plan Process Reassessment moves forward. The Board acknowledged its impression that the Department's resources are currently stretched too thin.
- consider more fully how Board participation is handled. Specifically, it was suggested that several worksessions with the Board are required both before the publication of the Preliminary Draft Plan and after the public hearing.
- include specific expectations on the use of technology. The Board noted that the Department needs to assure that staff will use the latest technology in developing plans, getting citizen input on plans, and communicating plan visions. While technology is not a substitute for discourse, it is a helpful tool that can be used to better articulate project goals and development alternatives.
- articulate how form-based codes might apply in master plans, under what circumstances, and provide some general rules for applicability.
- provide a draft of the new template for master plans.

STAFF WORK IN RESPONSE TO BOARD COMMENTS

Staff has done additional work to respond to the Board's comments. One of the points made by the Board and by a number of Department staffmembers is that the report needs to better articulate the different types of plans that are done and will be needed in the future. In response, staff has drafted an introductory piece that describes the existing hierarchy of plans in Montgomery County and suggests/provides a rationale for two new plan types: the Small Area/Neighborhood Plan and the Limited Master Plan Amendment. See Attachment #2.

Secondly, the Board requested further study of the template for successfully completing Small Area/Neighborhood Plans in a shortened time frame. Staff has worked on a draft procedural template and on detailed scheduling/timeline goals for plan completion. This draft template includes some specific suggestions made by the Board during the first worksession and attempts to address Board comments on better integrating Board discussions into the process, as well as focusing more intensively on Outreach, Graphics, and Technology. See Attachment #3.

Please note that staff is also working on potential templates for master plan formatting; however, these are still in progress and will need to be presented at a future worksession.

As requested by the Board, information about other jurisdictions – specifically how many plans are worked on simultaneously and how many staff are devoted to each plan – has been obtained. See Attachment #4.

NEXT STEPS

Staff is continuing to work on responding to the Board's additional suggestions. Particular emphasis is being directed to working with Community Based Planning staff to assure that all recommendations in the Master Plan Reassessment are realistic and achievable.

Additional work is needed on both the procedural template and the master plan format template. Also, more work is needed to look at appropriate resource allocation within the Department to make the more compressed time schedules that are being contemplated achievable.

The Department is scheduled to report on the progress of the project to the PHED Committee on March 17th. It is anticipated that there will be another Board worksession prior to this date to discuss the package of materials that will be presented to the PHED Committee.

Attachment 1: Executive Summary from January 31, 2008 Board Discussion

Project Scope

The purpose of this Master Plan Process Reassessment Report is to take a critical look at the master planning process in Montgomery County and to offer guidance and recommendations that will enhance the Planning Department's ability to meet the land use challenges posed by a maturing and urbanizing County. The Reassessment examines possible improvements to master plans in three broad categories: 1) process; 2) content; and 3) implementation.

During the past three decades, Montgomery County has developed a respected community master planning program that has successfully tackled issues such as rural preservation, transit-oriented development, and revitalization of urban centers. This current reassessment effort seeks to refine the County's master planning activities in response to the changing nature of planning issues that are being encountered. Specifically, as many portions of the County are building out, there will be significantly fewer "greenfields" plans needed. Instead, there will need to be an increased emphasis on redevelopment of existing areas and infill projects. This more "urban" milieu requires a planning effort that can focus in on smaller geographic areas and that can more quickly respond to fast-changing trends. At the same time, technological advances offer new opportunities to analyze land use, communicate with stakeholders, and visualize development concepts.

This exciting time of change offers an excellent opportunity to look at how the Planning Department can enhance its planning program with improved timeliness, nimbleness, analytical clarity, and accessibility. This Master Plan Process Reassessment Report should be viewed as a way to stimulate discussion and offer recommendations that will evolve over time as the Department strives to efficiently and effectively respond to the County's anticipated and unexpected land use, economic, and demographic trends.

Project Methodology

In undertaking this project, the Department used a multi-tiered methodology based on focus group interviews, research, and consultant expertise. This entailed seeking input from a wide spectrum of stakeholders including civic representatives, the development community, institutional/religious/educational communities, planning staff, and County agencies. The Department also utilized a consultant to undertake a nationwide comparative practice survey to identify potential improvements, and conducted its own research into how other large jurisdictions throughout the country develop master plans, convey information, and implement concepts.

Attached appendices, which reflect much of the data gathered during this project, include:

- An existing conditions report developed by the Community-Based Planning Division;
- A report on current conditions in master plan process and outreach developed by the Community-Based Planning Division;
- A Report on the Stakeholder Focus Groups developed by Rhodeside and Harwell;

- A Nationwide Comparative Survey of Planning in other Jurisdictions developed by Rhoadside and Harwell;
- A Report on Master Plan Content and Form Based Codes developed by Ferrell Madden and Associates;
- A Report on Technology and Public Outreach developed by the Research and Technology Division; and
- A Report on Information Counter Public Outreach developed by the Community-Based Planning Division.

All of the information gathered has been critically analyzed and has been the genesis of the recommendations that make up the core of this report.

Major Recommendations

Process:

1. For the majority of master plans, plan area boundaries should be narrowed to focus on clearly-defined, smaller geographic areas where significant land use changes are anticipated or desired.
2. For master plans with clearly-defined, smaller plan area boundaries, the timeframe for completion should be 18 months - from inception through Council approval and of Final Draft Plan (see attached chart.)
3. Limited master plan amendments, which focus on a very small area where there is an immediate planning concern, may be undertaken once or twice a year; however they should be infrequent so as to not disrupt the regular master plan work program.
4. Actions needed to accomplish this reduced timeframe include:
 - a. better project scoping at the outset, including clear definition of manageable geographic boundaries for each plan, identification of tasks and needed resources, a project timetable, and a budget,
 - b. early analysis of existing conditions (including demographics, employment, economic conditions, infrastructure, and environmental conditions, among other issues) to identify issues that plans should address, and more effectively identify constraints before engaging the public,
 - c. systemization of communications strategies, with an emphasis on using new technologies,
 - d. a more focused public outreach process centered on a community charrette or a series of charrettes for each plan,
 - e. elimination of the current Staff Draft process, with the emphasis shifted to preparing a Preliminary Draft Plan,
 - f. periodic updates to the Planning Board during the development of the Preliminary Draft Plan to assure that major policy concerns are being addressed,

- g. elimination of the 60 day County Executive fiscal review period,
 - h. standardization of plan formats and graphics to improve consistency and heighten efficiency.
5. Create larger planning teams within the Community Based Planning Division that are focused on fewer geographic areas.
 6. Assure that each plan has a clearly identified lead planner who will be tasked to act as a project manager. The lead planner must have sufficient access to a wider range of resources within the rest of the Department, including outreach support, graphics, administrative support, and legal advice.
 7. Enhance senior staff skills on the principles of sound project management and encourage greater accountability among staff at all levels.
 8. Enhance staff training to more effectively utilize emerging technologies.
 9. Use the Program Elements in the Program Budget to manage individual master plan projects, including monitoring project schedules and labor distribution.

Content:

10. Develop a standard Master Plan template that includes not only the topics currently addressed by master plans, but also: a focus on design excellence; economic analyses; an examination of how plans stimulate healthier communities; and analyses of how plans impact energy consumption. This new Master Plan template will require plans to have an index to improve accessibility and a more succinct overview that offers supporting materials in technical appendices.
11. Assure consistent review of master plan reports by the Department's editor, and greater use of emerging technologies, including improved web tools and 3D visualization to make plans more understandable and accessible.

Implementation:

12. Carefully coordinate the use of new zoning tools – such as form-based codes – with master plan efforts to create a community vision.
13. Achieve greater and earlier communication/coordination with other County agencies throughout the plan making process.
14. Periodically review capital improvement priorities critical to achieving the visions that plans espouse.

Conclusion and Next Steps

To summarize, we reached out to a wide range of stakeholders both within and beyond the Department, and these unique groups offered consistent feedback on areas to improve within the Department's current master plan process. The conclusions presented here represent staff efforts to develop meaningful, practical solutions to better enable planners to efficiently perform their complicated work, and better enable the Department to meet the demands of a changing but exciting future.

Our next steps will be to incorporate feedback from the Board regarding these proposed recommendations, and refine the concepts in greater detail. This will include working closely with additional Department staff to begin fleshing out the details of the concepts proposed here. Examples include:

- Developing a standardized scoping process for master plans that includes key analytical steps and resource/ budget requirements for plan development;
- Developing a menu of outreach approaches, listing advantages and disadvantages, for planners to tailor to individual plans
- Creating menus of data available to planners from the Research and Technology Division; and
- Working with the editor to begin developing a standardized master plan template.

In conclusion, we fully recognize that this Department has several decades of success on which to build; our goal now is to create a master plan process that is deserving of this Department's ground-breaking past, and offers a similarly innovative vision into the future.

Attachment 2: Hierarchy of Master Plans in Montgomery County

During the past three decades, Montgomery County has developed a respected community master planning program that has successfully tackled issues such as rural preservation, transit-oriented development, and revitalization of urban centers. Montgomery County is a large and varied geographic area and, as it matures, there is recognition that master planning activities need to evolve in response to both changing land uses and the increasing socioeconomic, age and ethnic diversity of its residents.

This need for change has been recognized by the Planning Department through many discussions with citizens, the Board, and the County Council over the last few years. As the result of one major study – the October 2007 Centers and Boulevards Report – there were a number of recommendations for actions to improve the Department’s ability to respond to rapid changes and to deliver the communities that County residents desire. This report included these key ideas:

- Prioritize development of Master Plans and concept studies along two of the county’s major roadways, I270/MD355 and Georgia Avenue, to more clearly articulate how individual master plans work within their respective corridors.
- Review the Department’s Master Plan process to identify opportunities to create plans more quickly that better respond to neighborhood-scale infill development. The project will determine best practices and their potential applicability to the county, with a specific focus on creating a range of master plan products reflective of different planning environments. This includes broad master plans focusing on large areas, as well as smaller-scale, shorter timeframe.
- Rewrite the existing zoning code to a form-based code to improve plan implementation and better support mixed use developments that the community desires.
- Recognize that community outreach informs the planning process as much as it informs the public.
- Convene a Montgomery County Design Summit to explore the concepts of good design, and how they can best be applied to future development in the county.
- Initiate a Functional Master Plan for Public Facilities, beginning with a strategic exploration of the types, quantities and costs of infrastructure – both new and maintenance of existing – that is needed to support future development. This effort will address concepts expressed in *Centers and Boulevards* to expand consideration of infrastructure beyond the critical components of school and transportation capacity to include a wider range of amenities such as public and open space. The goals of the plan will be to identify the types of infrastructure Master Plans should address that are critical to creating and sustaining well-designed communities and provide some options for creating a stronger link between Master Plans and the Capital Improvement Program.

The Planning Department has been acting on all of these recommendations and is currently focused on reviewing the Master Plan process. A major focus of the Master Plan Reassessment project has been looking at the hierarchy of plan types that are done in the County and creating a new plan type – a small area or neighborhood plan – that will allow for an increased emphasis on redevelopment of existing areas and on infill projects. This more “urban” milieu requires a

planning effort that can focus in on smaller geographic areas and that can more quickly respond to fast-changing trends driven by changing economic conditions.

This is not to say that small area/neighborhood plans will be the only type of plans needed. They are one of several tools, functioning within a broader planning context that begins with the County's General Plan, *On Wedges and Corridors*. The next layer of plans includes Functional Plans that address particular County-wide planning issues (such as the Master Plan for Historic Preservation, the Water Resources Plan, etc.) This hierarchy continues with framework studies such as the I-270/MD 355 Corridor Study and the Georgia Avenue Corridor study, which examine how larger corridor areas function both collectively and individually within the context of the General Plan. Additionally, Planning Area master plans will still be need to be updated every 20 years so as to address important broad planning issues that require more specificity than what is offered through the General Plan. Finally, another new concept that is being fleshed out as part of the Master Plan Reassessment project is the use of Limited Master Plan Amendments to address very narrowly defined planning issues that arise.

The Department has developed a wide range of master plans to apply to the County and each has different time lines and related issues. Clearly, a County-wide Functional Plan on a topic of major importance will take longer to prepare than a small area/neighborhood plan with limited planning issues.

The effort to develop small area/neighborhood master plans and explore the relationships between the different scales and functionalities of the County's master plans will provide opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the larger planning structure the County uses to develop its land use plans. Ultimately, the goal is to simplify the range of tools available to the Department while improving their effectiveness, clearly recognizing that this nested hierarchy of plans works interactively to create an overall framework, from conceptual to zone-specific, for development in the County.

Existing Hierarchy of Land Use Plans

A description of the existing range of plan types and relationships offers a useful starting point. The hierarchy of land use plans in Montgomery County begins with the General Plan, *On Wedges and Corridors*, updated in 1993. The General Plan provides broad policy guidance, framing development in Montgomery County within broad wedges interspersed with roadway corridors. The vision of the General Plan, including protection of the northern third of the County as agricultural space, has largely remained intact. The result is distinct areas of neighborhoods, bounded by transportation networks that function as commercial corridors. From the General Plan, the Department develops the following master plans for geographic areas of different size:

- **Master Plans for Large Areas:** these plans provide land use recommendations for larger geographic areas – usually identified Planning Areas. They focus on broad concepts and planning issues, such as the Olney Area Master Plan.
- **Sector Plans for Smaller Geographic Areas:** these plans provide land use recommendations for smaller areas such as central business districts (CBDs). Because of the smaller geographic area, they can offer greater detail. Examples include the recently completed staff draft of the Twinbrook Sector Plan.

- **Master Plan Amendments:** these plans focus on a limited number of key issues. They retain a community outreach and public hearing process, but are completed in a shorter time period because of the limited number of issues to be considered. Recently approved amendments include both comprehensive amendments (such as the Woodmont Triangle Amendment) and limited amendments (such as the Montrose Parkway Amendment).
- **Concept plans and studies:** including studies for areas like the Georgia Avenue and the I-270/MD 355 corridors, which examine how several planning areas conceptually function uniquely while contributing to a greater whole.
- **Functional plans:** including documents like the Master Plan for Historic Preservation, the Green Infrastructure Functional Plan and the Countywide Water Resources Functional Plan, covering specific issues that impact the entire County.

Existing Thematic Categories of Master Plans

In addition to the types of land use plans listed above, the Department also groups planning projects in to several thematic groups of plans. Broadly, they fall into the following categories:

- **Corridor City Plans:** including the Germantown Employment Corridor and the Gaithersburg West Master Plan;
- **Metro Station Plans:** which include the Twinbrook and White Flint Sector Plans and the Wheaton Central Business District Plan. These plans address the unique possibilities provided by metro stations, which offer high-capacity alternative transportation linking County employment centers like Bethesda and Silver Spring, as well as the District of Columbia. The Department has made a consistent effort to develop areas adjacent to Metro stations at higher densities, to create pedestrian-oriented environments focused on transit as the primary transportation mode; and
- **Plans for Neighborhoods and Centers:** including the Takoma/Langley Crossroads Master Plan and the Kensington Sector Plan. These plans offer land use recommendations for existing, moderate density communities that have distinct characteristics achieved over time.

New Additions to the Hierarchy of Master Plans

As noted above, there has been an identified need to create a mechanism for undertaking master plan tools that will be quicker, more nimble, and more responsive to rapidly emerging planning issues and economic trends. Also as noted above, there will still be a need to undertake Master Plans for larger areas, Functional Plans, and Concept Studies. These projects – given their complexity and broad geographic boundaries – will take longer to develop and will need to be updated less frequently.

The current Master Plan Reassessment Project recommends adding two types of plans to the existing hierarchy and recognizes that these new planning tools will require looking at ways of streamlining the planning process. The two new plan types are:

Small Area/Neighborhood Master Plans

Small area or neighborhood master plans offer an opportunity for more detailed analysis and focus on a more limited geography. Unlike limited master plan amendments, which examine a finite number of issues (see below), small area master plans examine the entirety of land use issues addressed by larger master plans. Their primary differences are: 1) they focus on a limited geography with high potential for changes in economic activity (and therefore changes in land use); and 2) because of the rapid change, they require a similarly rapid planning process.

The time frame for completion of a small area or neighborhood master plan should be approximately 18 months from initiation of the plan to approval by the County Council (but not including adoption of a Sectional Map Amendment).

With an increasing focus on infill development as the County matures, these small area master plans may well represent the predominant master plan process in the future.

Limited Master Plan Amendments

Occasionally, critical planning issues arise that may justify undertaking very Limited Master Plan Amendments. These amendments can be produced by the Department in a very short time frame (i.e. 90 days) because they address very finite, very discrete land use issues and very small geographic areas (i.e. one or two properties). This extraordinarily accelerated and abbreviated planning process must focus on a very finite geography and a limited set of issues that will minimally impact the existing master plan.

As a pilot project, the Department is undertaking a Limited Master Plan Amendment to extend the Wheaton CBD zone to accommodate changes to a single parcel.

It is important to only undertake a very small number of these Limited Master Plan Amendments each fiscal year or there will be negative consequences for the overall work program. A system for selecting which Limited Master Plan Amendments to undertake should be developed, which will allow the Planning Board to weigh the public benefit in each potential amendment and make best use of staff resources in the overall context of the entire master planning program.

Formal Council Adoption of Master Plan Boundaries and Issues of Interest

A key element in developing both of these plan types should be formal County Council approval of plan boundaries, and for Limited Master Plan Amendments, of issues that the plans will cover. Stakeholders mentioned that master plans can be delayed due to additional requirements imposed by the Council. They can also be delayed as the Council adjusts plan boundaries. To better enable the Department to adhere to deadlines, we suggest that the Council formally approve the area of study for Small-Area Master Plans. And for limited master plan amendments, we strongly encourage the Department to request formal approval of the list of issues that will be examined. These measures preclude scope creep from changing political priorities, but also ensure that the Department and Council have a clear understanding of the geographical and conceptual scope of these efforts.

Attachment 3: Small Area Master Plans Draft Template

- I. County Council Formal Approval of Work Plan
 - a. Formal (written) approval of plan boundaries
 - b. For Limited Master Plan Amendments, formal (written) approval of issues to be covered

- II. Plan Initiation/Pre-Planning (3 – 4 months)
 - a. Prepare a Project Scope of Work
 - i. Detailed list of tasks to be performed
 - ii. Task schedule/project timeline
 - iii. A list of team members and responsibilities
 - iv. Project budget
 - v. Performance benchmarks

 - b. Develop an Issues and Outreach Report (*should this document be renamed?*)
 - i. Existing Conditions
 1. Demographics
 2. Employment
 3. Environmental conditions
 4. Housing details, including the number and types of units, and the presence or absence of affordable housing
 5. Urban design
 6. Transportation
 7. Infrastructure and Public Facility needs
 8. Historic and cultural resources
 9. Limited community outreach to identify other emerging issues
 10. Other?
 - ii. Analysis of Existing Conditions
 - iii. Draft Issues and Outreach Report
 - iv. Board Review
 1. Concurrence: proceed with outreach strategy
 2. Board changes: revise scope as needed

 - c. Develop an Outreach Strategy
 - i. Charrette as a the central effort (in most cases)
 - ii. Other communication strategies

 - d. Develop a Technology Strategy, which will address whether and how the team will use one or more of the following:
 - i. Technology supporting staff analysis of plan issues: GIS, 3D, digital photography, databases, etc...
 - ii. Web-based tools for information sharing and public engagement: blogs, polls, video streaming, map viewers, wikis, etc. Assign tasks, updating strategies, etc...

- iii. Technology supporting charrettes and public meetings: voting tools, visualization techniques, displays of graphics, sub-group reports, etc...
- iv. Technology supporting the form of the adopted plan: digital/interactive, 3D model, other online or digital resources to explain adopted plan
- e. Develop a Graphics Strategy
 - i. Coordinate with editor to ensure conformance with Department templates and style guides

III. Plan Development (6 – 8 months)

- a. Conduct public outreach to develop a plan vision (use charrette as major tool with follow up with a variety of stakeholders)
- b. Begin drafting master plan
 - i. Develop a concept vision
 - ii. Develop a Preliminary Draft with recommendations in the areas identified in the Issues and Outreach Report
 - iii. Make use of a standardized template that will be developed in coordination with the editor. Major components: shorter documents; summary up front and detailed appendices following; more graphics; indexes; and a clear expression of plan goals, visions and constraints. Coordinate template for printed media with use of other media.
- c. Internal testing and feedback
 - i. Hold regular worksessions with Planning Board to brief them on major planning and policy issues being addressed in the draft plan.
 - ii. Meet with the community and stakeholders relate draft plan to ideas developed during the charrette process.
- d. Complete Preliminary Draft Plan
 - i. As needed - incorporate consultant material on economic feasibility analysis
 - ii. Develop an implementation strategy: identify key steps for implementation
- e. Final review and formatting before transmittal to Planning Board for scheduling of Board public hearing

IV. Planning Board Review (3 months)

- a. Planning Board holds public hearing
- b. Planning Board holds worksessions
- c. Revise and complete Final Draft Plan
- d. Initiate fiscal impact analysis coordinated with Executive Branch agencies
 - i. Estimate the development generated by the plan
 - ii. Estimate the revenue generated by the plan

- iii. Estimate the cost of infrastructure required for the plan
- iv. Compare the revenue generated by the plan with the amortized cost of infrastructure.

- e. Revise Final Draft Plan and format for transmittal
- f. Transmit to County Council
- g. Transmit to Executive as an informational item

V. Council Review (6 – 9 months)

- a. County Council public hearing
- b. PHED Committee worksessions
- c. Full Council action on Final Draft Plan
- d. Begin preliminary sectional map amendment work as soon as practicable

VI. Post Adoption Activities

- a. Have Resolutions for Approved and Adopted Plan approved by Planning Board and full MNCPPC Commission
- b. Complete sectional map amendment work
- c. Publish adopted plan in selected formats/media
 - i. One-page posters
 - ii. Public (short) version and detailed version
 - iii. Digital media (CD, etc...)

Attachment 4: Comparison of Master Plan Program Workloads, Resources and Timeframes in other Jurisdictions

Jurisdiction	Use of Staff versus Consultants	Number of Staff on Hand	Number of "Active" Plans	Length of Time Needed to Complete Plan
Austin, TX	In-house	16 total (2-4 per neighborhood plan)	50 neighborhood planning areas (1 planner assigned to each of 50 areas; 2-4 are combined as part of a single planning process)	1-2 years per neighborhood plan to prepare and adopt
Charlotte-Mecklenburg County, NC	In-house	2-4 per plan (2 planners and one urban designer, as well as a staff technical team)	2 in progress, 55 others that have been adopted already	1-2 years to prepare and adopt
Louisville-Jefferson County, KY	Consultants	3 per plan (supervisor, coordinator, and planner I; others help on as-needed basis)	4 in progress; 17 total have been adopted	19-27 months: 10-18 months for entire planning process (sometimes takes longer though) + 9 month approval process
Miami-Dade County, FL	In-house	11-12 total	15 in progress	1-2 years to prepare and adopt
Minneapolis, MN	Consultants	1-2 per plan	7 in progress; 22 total have been adopted	18 months
Nashville-Davidson County, TN	In-house	7 total (2 general planners, 1 transportation planner, 1 bike/ped planner, 1 land development planner, 1 Design Studio staff, manager as needed)	3 in progress, currently one rural and two urban corridor plans	9-12 months for larger area community update plans; 6-8 months for a smaller detailed neighborhood or corridor design plans
Prince George's County, MD	Consultants	2-3 per plan (plus a resource team)	18 in progress	18-24 months (small area plans); 24-36 months (large area plans)
Seattle, WA	Consultants	Used community-initiated plans. The Department of Strategic Planning, which created the plans, no longer exists.	38 plans	2-4 years