

Background for District 1 Community Survey for County Council Candidates

**District 1 Neighbors was formed to represent the interests of thousands of Montgomery County community members in County Council who value balancing growth and infrastructure in the County and quality of living for its residents. The Coalition seeks to elect local officials who will address its concerns about:**

- 1) Growth and urbanization that outpaces county infrastructure, services and amenities (i.e. transportation, schools, parks, open space).**
- 2) Population growth that significantly exceeds employment opportunities in the county.**
- 3) Lack of affordable housing.**
- 4) A County budget that relies on a healthy balance of business and residence for the tax base, controls expense and debt, measures performance and negotiates effectively with developers, workers, and State Government.**

**Thank you for agreeing to participate in the District One Coalition's evaluation of the District I candidates for Montgomery County, Maryland. As you know, we are extending an invitation to you to meet briefly with the group to express your views and answer member questions.**

**In advance of your interview, would you please provide written responses to the questions set forth below. Your answers will allow us to evaluate your candidacy and, ultimately, identify the candidate(s) whom we intend to support in the June primary election. Be assured that during your interview with the group, you will be given an opportunity to explain and expand upon your written answers.**

1. What is your name?

2. To date, what have you accomplished to advance the interests of neighborhoods and citizens, especially those in District 1, with respect to the land use planning and zoning process?

3. What are the three main objectives you plan to accomplish as the District 1 County Councilmember?

4. On what criteria would you evaluate the recommendations and/or decisions of the Planning Board, Planning Department, and Board of Appeals?

5. How much of county revenue is produced by development after accounting for school and infrastructure expenses, and other costs associated with supporting that incremental development? (Note: that this question may require research or you may enter into the comment box "don't know")

6. Do you support our vision for county growth management (see below)?

Our vision for county growth management includes master/sector plans and an Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO) that work cooperatively with each other. Master/sector plans define a 10-25 year outlook on anticipated or desired growth. Each plan shall include a list of new and upgraded infrastructure, and their estimated costs, which would be required to support the plan at 100% build-out. By "support" we mean that the plan meets or exceeds all criteria of the APFO. The APFO, applied at the time of Preliminary Plan approval, would therefore govern the timing of the plan build-out, ensuring that growth and infrastructure progress in lock-step through the plan's implementation. The APFO, in conjunction with master/sector plans, shall ensure that development does not exceed the carrying capacity of the territory in question. Carrying capacity shall account for public services, resources and amenities such as natural and human infrastructure for transportation, education, water resources, air, noise and visual ambiance, recreation, parks and other green and open space. The APFO shall include criteria based on specific and quantitative measurable and verifiable parameters using methods that are robust and statistically significant. Development approval shall be contingent on meeting or exceeding every APFO criteria. Incremental carrying capacity provided by "planned" improvements shall only be counted if the project is programmed and financed, or otherwise guaranteed to be in place to accommodate the development at the time of building permits.

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

7. If an individual school or cluster meets the SSP criteria for a "moratorium", under what circumstances would it be justifiable to establish a placeholder or some other process by which the moratorium is ignored?

8. How would you have voted for the following sector plans?

	Yes	No	Unsure
Rock Spring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Westbard	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
White Flint 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bethesda Downtown	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Please check any of the following for which you will advocate for changes to decrease the impact of development on residents?

Sector Plans

Special Exceptions/Conditional Uses

Zoning Text Amendments

Variances

Specific Development Plans

I would not support changes to these county plans or processes

10. Would you support a small business, arts and culture overlay to the zoning code to help preserve small businesses and the unique character of the county in development efforts?

Yes

No

Unsure

11. What percent of the budget shortfall should be covered through development (residential and commercial), after accounting for infrastructure expenses to accommodate said development?

0-25 percent

26-50 percent

51-75 percent

More than 76 percent

12. Do you support increasing density in District 1?

Yes, please answer questions 13-17 below.

No, please skip to question 18.

Unsure, please answer questions 13-17 below.

13. If you support increased density in District 1, where would you support increased density?

14. If you support or are unsure about increased density in District 1, what infrastructure would be required to support that increased density?

15. If you support or unsure about increased density in District 1, what would be the cost of the additional infrastructure to support that density?

16. Who would pay for that infrastructure?

17. How would you assure that the needed infrastructure is in place in a timely manner to support the added density?

18. Do you support preserving the usable outdoor recreational areas in the downcounty?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

19. Do you support mandating development projects to provide 15% Moderately Priced Dwelling Units (MPDUs) and only offering density/height bonuses if the developer exceeds this floor?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

20. Would you support an increase in the MPDU requirement?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

21. Do you support changes to the Planning Board to achieve greater transparency, community involvement that will challenge planning processes, and to reduce the role of industry in County land use and planning processes?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

22. Would you support rotating individuals for the planning, housing, and economic development committee in lieu of voting on the members?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

23. Do you support increasing the developer contribution to infrastructure to offset the costs to the county and its citizens of new development?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

24. Do you support 1:1 replacement of lost affordable housing units?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure