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APF and Re-Testing
Adequate Public Facilities

- Ensure that capacity of public facilities can meet demands
  - Transportation
  - Parks and Recreation
  - Police
  - Fire and Rescue
  - Schools
  - Water and Sewer
- Incoming subdivisions are required to contribute (if necessary)
Adequate Public Facilities
Current

- Beech Tree (4-00010);
- 2,400 units, 557 acres
  - 7 roads built to county standards
  - 2 intersection upgrades on MD 301
  - 4th southbound lane on MD 301
  - Interior bike network and sidewalks
  - Stream valley trails and park
  - Police - Public Safety surcharge, no APF mitigation fee
  - Fire and Rescue – Public Safety surcharge + APF mitigation fee
  - Schools – School surcharge
  - Water and Sewerage Category W3/S3 – Community sewer system
## Adequate Public Facilities Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current APF Policy</th>
<th>Proposed APF Policy</th>
<th>Policy Change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Rescue</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewer</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓*</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Water and Sewer adequacy is determined by a development’s location within the correct Water and Sewer category as determined by the County Council.
## Adequate Public Facilities Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Current APF Policy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proposed APF Policy</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Transportation**   | - Roadway adequacy improvements/trip reduction funded by applicant throughout County  
  • Mitigation for appropriate locations  
  • Average LOS for College Park  
  • Bicycle and pedestrian adequacy in centers and corridors                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | - Roadway adequacy improvements funded by applicant throughout County, except in RTO/LTO Zones  
  • Mitigation for appropriate locations  
  • TDM/trip reduction funded by applicant throughout County in RTO/LTO zones  
  • Bicycle and pedestrian adequacy in Center Zones                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| **Parks and Recreation** | - Parkland Dedication  
  • 5% - 0-4 DU/acre  
  • 7.5% - 4-7.5 DU/acre  
  • 10% - 7-12 DU/acre  
  • 15% - 12+ DU/acre  
  • Fee in-lieu allowed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | - Parkland Dedication  
  • 2.5 Acres/1,000 people – Centers  
  • 15 Acres/1,000 people – all other locations  
  • Fee in-lieu allowed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
As proposed, APF would expire.

This is a substantial change from the current ordinance.

If a project’s APF expired, we would re-test their adequacy.
## Adequate Public Facilities Expiration and Re-Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Expiration</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC</td>
<td>No APF</td>
<td>No APF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard County</td>
<td>None, but any increase in traffic must be tested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore County</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>1 year (for waiting list if project fails)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel County</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles County</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>8 years (requires new traffic study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>5-10 Years (dependent on use)</td>
<td>2.5 – 6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George’s County (Proposed)</td>
<td>12 Years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick County</td>
<td>3-15 Years (dependent on size)</td>
<td>Allowed if capacity exists or project is vested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George’s County (Current)</td>
<td>No Expiration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABC Development receives approval for a residential subdivision, no improvements are needed for APF.

12 years pass, ABC does not build. Certificate expires.

ABC is now ready to build. They must re-test.

New certificate of adequacy may have new conditions.
ABC Development receives approval for a residential subdivision, with a certificate of adequacy that is subject to conditions.

12 years pass, ABC has completed construction on 60% of units. Project vested, certificate does not expire.

ABC does not have to retest for the remaining units.
ABC Development receives approval for a residential subdivision, with a certificate of adequacy that is subject to conditions.

12 years pass, ABC has completed construction on <60% of units. Project not vested, certificate expires.

ABC retests and new infrastructure is required.

ABC cannot find new financing. They may request an extension (before the original expiration) or opt not to build out.
Adequate Public Facilities
Expiration and Re-Testing

Difficult Financing

- More infrastructure improvements

Easier Financing

- Fewer infrastructure improvements

6 Years
(1st Rec.)

10 Years
(Census)

12 Years
(Staff Rec.)

Forever
(Current Policy)
Resolving the BIG questions

Re-testing APF for older approvals

Option 1  
Staff Recommendation  
All projects retested after 12 years with option of 6-year extension

Option 2  
Establish a shorter period

Option 3  
Establish a longer period
Questions?
APF in the RTO and LTO Zones
Adequate Public Facilities
RTO and LTO Zones

- Regional Transit and Local Transit Zones
  - Maximize Development Potential
  - Best opportunities for “Place”
  - Very focused areas in the County
APF Proposed for RTO/LTO zones:

- No change for APF:
  - Police
  - Fire and Rescue
  - Schools

- Transportation APF:
  - Motor Vehicle APF Exempt
  - Bicycle and Pedestrian Adequacy
  - Transportation Demand Management

- Parks and Recreation:
  - 2.5 acres / 1,000 people
Adequate Public Facilities
RTO and LTO Zones

- Motor Vehicle Exemption
- RTO/LTO zones are high frequency transit
- Higher densities encourage walking/bicycling
Vehicle trips in RTO/LTO zones will be reduced through required:

- Transportation Demand Management
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Adequacy
- Multimodal trip access
Adequate Public Facilities
RTO and LTO Zones

- Why is the exemption proposed?
- Motor vehicle improvements prioritize vehicle speeds and traffic volume, which are detrimental to:
  - Walking, bicycling, and transit use
  - Encouraging dense development
  - Economic activity
Adequate Public Facilities
RTO and LTO Zones

Street –
Platform for building Place and economic activity; low speeds; prioritize pedestrian movements

Combo –
Attempt to balance adequate road capacity, high speed and access;

Highway –
Efficient connections between productive places; high speeds; prioritize vehicle movements
Why is the exemption proposed?

Motor vehicle improvements are expensive, which result in:

- Reducing quality of development to cut costs
- Reducing square footage/number of dwelling units to reduce impact or stopping before construction triggers are met
- Projects being too expensive to "pencil out"
The exemption proposal is similar to the Transportation APF calculation used today for US 1.

On US 1, vehicle volumes for several intersections are averaged together instead of counted individually.

This allows for more development than would otherwise be allowed.
Adequate Public Facilities
RTO and LTO Zones

- US 1 and Calvert (4-17021)
  - 393 Dwelling Units
  - 84,475 SF commercial
- Transportation APF (Current)
  - Reviewed 9 intersections, 1 new signal
  - Bicycle and Pedestrian Adequacy improvements required
- Transportation APF (Proposed)
  - Property in RTO-L Zone – exempt from test
  - Bicycle and Pedestrian Adequacy improvements required
  - Trip reduction required
Adequate Public Facilities
RTO and LTO Zones

More development opportunity and activity
More vehicle congestion

Less development opportunity and activity
Less vehicle congestion

Exempt Transportation APF from RTO/LTO Zones
Exempt Transportation APF from RTO/LTO Core Zones Only
Require Transportation Adequacy in RTO/LTO Zones, reduce adequacy threshold
Require Transportation Adequacy in RTO/LTO Zones
Resolving the BIG questions

APF in the RTO and LTO zones

Option 1
*Staff Recommendation*

As done elsewhere in the region, exempt projects in these zones from transportation test for automobile traffic, to incentivize investment in transit-rich areas. Bike and pedestrian APF still tested.

Option 2

Exempt only projects in the core of these zones (1/4 mile walk circle).
Questions?
Parking
Parking

- Parking is not APF, but has similar impacts
  - Parking minimums are set for peak usage and beyond
  - Parking is space intensive and expensive
Parking minimums are reduced, generally

Maximums for certain uses/zones – no maximum for structured parking

No parking minimum in RTO/LTO

- Business owner chooses how much parking to provide
Parking Proposed

- Shared Parking
- On-street parking
- Off-site parking
- Deferred parking
Parking
RTO and LTO Zones

Developed Land in Largo Town Center (Acres)

- Parking: 166.75 acres
- Buildings: 79.85 acres

Parking
Buildings
Parking RTO and LTO Zones

Developed Land in New Carrollton RTO (Acres)

- Parking: 135.12
- Buildings: 64.05

Legend:
- Red: Parking
- Green: Buildings
Parking
RTO and LTO Zones

Developed Land in Prince George's Plaza RTO (Acres)

- Parking: 86.28
- Buildings: 62.72
Parking costs

- Surface parking – up to $6,000 (varies w/land cost) + opportunity costs of development per space
- Above ground structured parking – $22,000 per space
- Underground structured parking - $29,000 per space

Parking costs are passed on in higher rents, regardless of use
Parking
RTO and LTO Zones

More development opportunity and activity
Less total parking supply

Less development opportunity and activity
More total parking supply

No parking minimums in RTO/LTO Zones

No parking minimums in RTO/LTO Core Zones Only, if TDM implemented

Require reduced parking minimums in RTO/LTO Core and Edge Zones

Require traditional parking minimums RTO/LTO Core and Edge Zones
Resolving the BIG questions

Parking in the RTO and LTO zones

Option 1
No minimum parking required in CORE & EDGE of RTO/LTO zones; business owner chooses parking level

Option 2
Staff Recommendation
No minimum parking required in CORE of RTO/LTO zones; business owner chooses parking level

Option 3
Mandate a minimum amount of parking for all development in the RTO/LTO zones (status quo)
Questions?