



Local governments working together for a better metropolitan region

Chesapeake Bay and Water Resources Policy Committee

Date: Friday, July 20, 2007
Time: 10:00 a.m. - 12 noon \*
Place: Third Floor Board Room
777 North Capitol Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002

- District of Columbia
Bladensburg\*
Bowie
College Park
Frederick
Frederick County
Gaithersburg
Greenbelt
Montgomery County
Prince George's County
Rockville
Takoma Park
Alexandria
Arlington County
Fairfax
Fairfax County
Falls Church
Loudoun County
Manassas
Manassas Park
Prince William County

\*Lunch will be available for committee members and alternates after the meeting..

Meeting Agenda

- 10:00 1. Introductions and Announcements..... Hon. Martin Nohe
Chair, Prince William County
10:05 2. Approval of Meeting Summary for May 18, 2007..... Chair Nohe
Recommended action: Approve DRAFT Meeting Summary (Att. 2).
10:10 3. Regional Water Resources Program Focus ..... Tanya Spano, COG staff
• Addressing Growth Issues ..... Ted Graham, Water
Resources Program Director

\*Adjunct member

Ms. Spano will outline key themes and issues that the Water Resources Technical Committee (WRTC) and COG staff expect to focus on over the coming year based on the final FY 08 Regional Water Fund work program recently approved by the committee. She also will note those issues likely to generate policy recommendations for the committee.

Mr. Graham will discuss staff plans for one of those issues in particular - growth -- as it relates to new Bay Program developments. Staff from Virginia DCR recently outlined plans (Att. 3) to develop nutrient and sediment "load caps" at the local jurisdictional level as a way of implementing Virginia's tributary strategies for major Bay watersheds, including the Potomac. These plans imply that counties and municipalities will have targets for nonpoint nutrient and sediment discharge that they will have to meet by adjusting land use and pursuing other actions on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis.

Recommended Action: Direct COG staff to work with the WRTC and Virginia DCR staff to verify the appropriateness of the load allocation method and ask VA-DCR to make a presentation to the CBPC to discuss the policy implications of the proposed load allocation process.

10:35 4. **Preliminary Plans for Greater Washington 2050** .....Paul DesJardin, COG  
Chief of Housing and Planning

The COG Board has charged the Metropolitan Development Policy Committee (MDPC) with developing a workplan proposal for examining long-term growth and development in the Washington metropolitan region in lieu of the Envision Greater Washington project. In response, an MDPC workgroup has developed plans for a COG-led effort to implement a regional compact that would coordinate member jurisdictions' long-range planning goals and implementation through the year 2050. This "Greater Washington 2050 Compact" would seek to address how to balance future growth and economic development with environmental, health, transportation and other goals. Mr. DesJardin will brief the committee on the workgroup's preliminary proposal (*Att. 4*), which it expects to present at the COG Board Retreat July 27 - 29.

**Recommended Action:** Provide guidance to members who will participate in the discussion of this report at the Board retreat; identify members who can serve as the committee's representative(s) on any group that may be established to guide development of such a regional compact.

10:55 5. **Introduction to Septic System Issues**.....Jay Prager  
MD Dept. of the Environment  
  
COG staff

Maryland's Chesapeake Bay Restoration Fund has an active program to fund improved septic system technology and upgrades to existing systems to reduce the amount of pollutants, primarily nitrogen, those systems release to the environment. Mr. Prager will discuss preliminary results from the Maryland program on the benefits and costs of this technology. COG staff will note the estimated contribution of septic system pollutants to overall pollutant loads to the Chesapeake Bay.

**Recommended Action:** None envisioned

11:20 6. **Update on Compounds of Emerging Concern Report** .....Ms. Spano

The committee was previously directed by the COG Board to look into the concerns raised by the presence of so-called "compounds of emerging concern" in the Potomac River and their connection to findings of "intersex" fish and other abnormalities. Due to the complexity and technical nature of the issue, as well in response to various scheduling conflicts, this issue has not yet been presented to the COG Board. Ms. Spano will provide a brief update on the latest information regarding these issues, additional briefings that are planned, and the proposed schedule for reviewing and completing a formal report for submission to the Board.

**Recommended Action:** Identify any additional briefings that are required; and confirm the proposed schedule for updating the COG Board.

11:30 7. **Update on Waterborne Trash Issues**.....Mr. Graham

In the wake of the Potomac Trash Treaty signed by local governments in 2006 and coordinated by the Alice Ferguson Foundation (AFF), regulatory staff from EPA, Maryland and the District are working with other stakeholders to develop a "Trash TMDL" for the Anacostia River. The regulators are likely to designate segments of the Potomac River as "trash impaired" and an Anacostia trash TMDL is likely to

become a precedent for these areas and other watersheds in the region. Mr. Graham will outline some of the potential implications for signatories to the Trash Treaty and discuss plans for a workshop on the technology and economics of controlling waterborne trash.

**Recommended Action:** Direct the WRTC to prepare an assessment of the regional implications of an Anacostia trash TMDL.

11:45 **8. Committee Updates**..... COG staff

COG staff will present brief updates on various items of potential interest to the committee.

**Lawn Care Public Outreach Campaign**

**Stormwater Technology Tour of Prince William County**

11:55 **9. New Business** .....Members

12:00 **10. Adjourn**

*The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, Sept. 21, 2007, 10 a.m. - 12 noon.*

*(Remember: COG will reimburse members and alternates for Metro fares.)*

Enclosures/Handouts:

- Item 2 DRAFT meeting summary of May 18, 2007
- Item 3 Att. C to CBP Water Quality Steering Committee briefing materials for meeting of June 20-21
- Item 4 Strawman "Greater Washington 2050" workplan

**CHESAPEAKE BAY and WATER RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE**  
**777 North Capitol Street, N.E.**  
**Washington, D.C. 20002**

**DRAFT MINUTES OF MAY 18, 2007, MEETING**

**ATTENDANCE:**

**Members and alternates:**

Chair Martin Nohe, Prince William County  
J Davis, City of Greenbelt  
Penelope Gross, Fairfax County  
Eric Olson, Prince George's County  
Andy Fellows, College Park  
Uwe Kirste, Prince William County  
Bruce McGranahan, Loudoun County  
Carole Larsen, Frederick County

**Guests:**

Danielle Glaros, Prince George's County  
Fred Rose, Fairfax County

**Staff:**

Stuart Freudberg, DEP Director  
Ted Graham, DEP Water Resources Program Director  
Tanya Spano, COG staff  
Steve Bieber, COG staff  
Karl Berger, COG staff

**1. Introductions and Announcements**

Chair Martin Nohe called the meeting to order at the Prince William County Eastern Government Center at 10:05 a.m. He welcomed the members to the county, which would host a tour of stormwater technology sites following an abbreviated business meeting.

**2. Approval of Meeting Summary for March 16, 2007**

Acting as a committee of the whole in the absence of a quorum, the committee approved the draft summary.

**3. Review of Proposed FY 2008 Work Program and Budget for the Regional Water Fund**

Mr. Graham discussed highlights of the proposed work program. He said that the impact of future population growth and land use change on water quality in the region is emerging as a major focus for the work program. In its 2007 session, the Maryland General Assembly passed HB 1141, which requires county governments in the state to report on links between land use changes and water quality and quantity issues at the local level, he noted. Virginia, he added, recently tasked local governments with developing long-range plans for water supply that will, in many cases, be affected by land use changes.

Another work program highlight, according to Mr. Graham, will be studying emerging issues and potentially developing policies to address them on a regional basis. The best example of this, he said, is the current focus on compounds with the potential to disrupt endocrine systems. Another such issue is climate change, which is the focus of a new initiative at COG and has implications for water quality.

Finally, he said, the proposed work program has increased the emphasis that COG will place on legislative tracking and potential development of regional positions on legislation at the state and federal levels.

Mr. Graham noted that COG's Water Resources Technical Committee had reviewed the work program and was supportive of it. The Blue Plains Regional Committee would review it at its meeting on May 22.

Discussion: Ms. Gross raised two issues not directly related to the budget discussion.

She noted that legislation was recently introduced in the District of Columbia Council that would give the District's Chief Financial Officer authority over the budget of the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority (DC-WASA) and would increase the number of District representatives on DC-WASA's Board. Because other governments in the region, including Fairfax County, are represented on the board and have stake in the authority, this legislation has serious implications. She requested that COG staff track its progress and report to the relevant governments concerned.

Ms. Gross also noted that the re-issuance of so-called MS4 permits for stormwater discharges in Virginia potentially pose major issues for local governments. The state had designated a new permit for the city of Norfolk as a model for what the new permits would be; however, EPA Region III has yet to sign off on its review of this new permit. Ms. Gross said that the Department of Conservation and Recreation, the state agency responsible for administering the MS4 program, appears to be moving too quickly without adequate input from local governments. As an example, she noted a proposal to designate stormwater runoff from streets with curb and gutter systems as an illegal discharge.

Ms. Gross, noting that she recently accepted an appointment to EPA's local advisory body, said she has raised the issue to EPA. Mr. Fellows said that Maryland also has been focused on making changes to its stormwater permitting approach; however, he added, the state appears to be doing so in a workable way.

Mr. Graham suggested that the committee may wish to have a discussion with state and federal officials responsible for writing MS4 permits. Mr. Freudberg suggested a policy workshop. However, Ms. Gross suggested that the region wait to see whether EPA is willing to address this issue. She added that local governments want to do the right thing in terms of accepting more responsibility for addressing stormwater issues, but they do not want to be set up for failure. Mr. Kirste, who serves as chair of the WRTC, said committee members will track this issue and report back to the CBPC.

Mr. Graham asked for the committee's authorization to send the budget package to the full committee and use a mail ballot to seek budget approval.

Action Item: Acting as a committee of the whole, members authorized staff to seek final budget approval through use of a mail ballot.

#### **4. Report on Growth and Water Resources Workshop**

Ms. Spano of COG staff summarized discussions at a recent workshop on growth and water quality impacts sponsored by the WRTC. She noted that the workshop brought together representatives from many member governments and utilities in the region with federal and state officials involved in growth-related water planning issues. In particular, she noted, Peter Claggett of the U.S. Geological Survey, described his Chesapeake Bay Program project to estimate what nutrient and sediment loads will be from now through 2030. COG's environmental staff has been working with COG's planning staff to review the assumptions and preliminary data produced by Claggett's project, at least within the Washington region, and to compare them to the data produced by COG's Cooperative Forecasting process.

Ms. Spano said that WRTC members will continue to work with COG staff to provide the bay Program with technical input on this project. Prince William County staff also has agreed to work with COG staff to evaluate the use of a Web-based interface to the Bay Program's watershed model to generate jurisdiction-specific nutrient and sediment load estimates that are consistent with those being used by the Bay Program. She said it was likely that this work program would result in future workshops and policy considerations to bring before the committee.

#### **5. Introduction to Stormwater Technology Tour**

Mr. Kirste, who heads up stormwater planning for the Prince William County Department of Public Works, provided members with a brief description of the logistics of the tour and of what they can expect to see at each stop. After boarding a bus outside the Government Center, participants will stop at the Julie Metz Wetlands Mitigation Bank, where they will see man-made wetlands created under mitigation efforts by local developers. After lunch, he said, participants will travel to the Gainesville-area offices of WSSI Inc., where they will see a number of low-impact development practices used in the construction of this new building, including a green roof and various types of pervious pavement. Finally, participants will tour the Hopewell Landing development, where the first phase of the project has been built using various LID practices.

#### **6. New Business**

None was offered.

#### **7. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m. so that members could board a bus for the committee tour of stormwater technology sites in Prince William County.

**Chesapeake Bay Program Water Quality Steering Committee  
Advance Briefing Materials for the  
June 20 - 21, 2007 Meeting**

**Attachment C:**

**OVERVIEW OF VIRGINIA'S APPROACH TO IMPLEMENTING  
NONPOINT SOURCE REDUCTIONS AT THE COUNTY LEVEL AND  
ANTICIPATED SUPPORT NEEDS**

**STEP #1 - Locality Data Review**

**BACKGROUND**

The Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, Division of Soil and Water Conservation (DCR) was largely responsible for facilitating and drafting the last set of tributary strategies, completed in late 2004 and early 2005. Regional Managers based in the Division's five, Bay Watershed Offices, organized numerous meetings in 8 distinct, bay sub-basins or tributaries. In meeting with stakeholders, the data in the Bay watershed model phase 4.3 was described and discussed as the foundation of the nutrient and sediment reduction plans. The knowledge of local people familiar with an area's landscape and trends sometimes differed from the data built into the phase 4.3 watershed model.

With the development of a new watershed model and data updates, there is an opportunity to involve local experts in the review of certain elements of data. The Phase 5.0 model contains many more hydrologic units and data points than the current model. Review of key components of Phase 5.0 model data is essential to building jurisdictions' acceptance of the model results and their willingness to employ it or have it employed for a variety of uses. Virginia intends to have local officials review and compare the data to their own before the model is finalized. A process has been devised to introduce the Phase 5.0 model and data to the stakeholders who may eventually be affected by its findings.

Trends based on data from past years and data projected forward to 2030 will be shown to local governments and to soil and water conservation districts. They will be asked whether the trends appear accurate and to suggest changes as needed. Current local land cover patterns will be displayed for review. Virginia planning district commissions have been approached to help facilitate the review process. A very important aspect of the project is acquainting VA localities with the model and exposing them to its strengths and limitations. Then, as water quality planning and implementation progresses in the Bay, local governments will already have some experience and familiarity with this particular tool.

## **CURRENT STATUS**

DCR compiles BMP installation data provided to the Chesapeake Bay Program. The model land cover data is being grouped into land use categories corresponding more closely to typical land use categories used by local governments. The trend data for 2030 and for the intervals, 2010, 2015, 2020 and 2025 must be provided to complete the picture. When the 2030 draft projections are near finalization, DCR can begin the process of interacting with the localities and seeking local buy-in of projection data. Supporting graphic representations, at the county scale, would be most useful for this effort.

## **SUMMARY**

Appreciation and support from the CBP has been strong for the process Virginia is proposing to conduct. Timing is difficult to predict owing to Phase 5.0 model issues still being resolved. Once initial data in the model is ready, Virginia will need time to complete its review process. The WQSC initially agreed that states should be allowed 12 months for this data review process. Virginia may need assistance in preparing the graphics and charts needed to convey information about the model to local people. If DCR prepares certain graphics, review by the CBP would be helpful. Also, precise and clear explanations are needed about the source of each data type in the model, and how each type of information was distributed across the landscape and over time. This is essential because localities will ask these questions, and DCR.

## **SUPPORT DECISIONS REQUESTED**

Virginia needs 12 months to review the data with local governments and develop their support. Will that time be made available? Also, CBPO assistance with graphics, either production or review, is anticipated. Will this be available?

## **STEP #2 – Pilot Project for Local NSP Control Implementation**

### **BACKGROUND**

The Phase 5.0 model provides information about runoff rates at a scale that can be connected to the land management occurring within a particular county. In Virginia, a county or municipal government is the most logical scale for developing nonpoint source water quality plans. Every citizen, business and land-user identifies with their county. Working at the county level provides an area small enough that land use and data can be understood yet large enough to permit a great deal of flexibility and variety. Most important, counties in Virginia have the land use decision making authority. Leadership at the county level is the most direct means to affect local planning, local ordinances and ultimately land use and land management decisions.

DCR has begun looking at ways to increase county involvement in nonpoint source pollution reduction efforts while providing a means to recognize the environmental services provided by well-managed forest, farmland, open space and development. Individual tributary loading targets would be broken down to county level loading goals for each county within a tributary. Each county would then estimate the amount of NPS



loadings arising from that jurisdiction, based on land use and land management, currently and at points in the future. This presents a concept where the county can monitor their land uses and determine what activities will add to or subtract from their nutrient and sediment loads and also characterize their ability to reach and maintain an assigned loading value, i.e., their share of a tributary cap load.

To evaluate this concept, DCR is interested in conducting a pilot project. The project would try to establish the data at the county level for county-based water quality efforts that are linked to the state's tracking systems and also the Chesapeake Bay Program goals. The project would entail segmenting the watershed model into a portion operable for just one county and then working with the county to use the model and data. This might mean they merge model information with their own land use plans, overlay districts and even their GIS system. A pilot project would attempt to work out the mechanics of locally based nutrient and sediment tracking. It also would assess the viability of county-level reductions and educate local officials and citizens about how various land management practices can be used to achieve desired nutrient and sediment goals. The result would be a process that demonstrates local implementation of the tributary strategy and clarifies local options for land use and land management while attempting to control nonpoint source pollution loadings to meet tributary goals.

### **CURRENT STATUS**

Conducting the pilot project is the subject of a small watershed grant proposal to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. Funding decisions are expected in August 2007. In drafting the proposal, support was obtained from Richmond County, as well as from the Northern Neck Planning District Commission (PDC) and the Northern Neck Soil and Water Conservation District. If the project is awarded funds, the PDC will administer the project. DCR will have a major role in the pilot project.

### **SUPPORT DECISIONS REQUESTED**

The CBP has expressed great interest in this pilot. Timing of requested CBP support will be very important. Assuming the project moves forward, DCR would need to know the following:

1. By when can the CBP disaggregate the model for Richmond County?
2. What type computer knowledge or expertise will be necessary locally for someone to use that the model and data to run scenarios?
3. Will CBP staff help train someone in the project locality and help in melding the Phase 5.0 model data with existing county data systems (if feasible)?
4. Will the CBP re-engage with DCR and the locality when new NPS loads for each tributary and county are calculated by the Phase 5.0 model?

In short, DCR would like a degree of certainty as to the level of support the CBPO is willing to provide for the project.

***“Straw Man”***

***Greater Washington 2050***

**Work Plan**

**Prepared by:**  
**Metropolitan Development Policy Committee**  
***Greater Washington 2050* Work Group**

**For:**  
**Board of Directors**  
**Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments**

**July 28, 2007**  
**2007 COG Board Annual Retreat**

**Revised Draft**  
**July 10, 2007**

## **Proposed Work Plan For *Greater Washington 2050***

### **Background**

In 2006, COG, the Greater Washington Board of Trade and the Community Foundation for the National Capital Region co-convened work groups to review and make recommendations on a proposal to launch a regional visioning campaign, known as Envision Greater Washington. This effort arose following the Reality Check on Growth event in February 2005 and the Potomac Conference in February 2006. COG's Metropolitan Development Policy Committee (MDPC), as the COG Board's principal policy advisor on growth and development, also monitored and reviewed the Envision Greater Washington proposal. A recent staff business plan expanded on the Envision Greater Washington proposal completed by the organizing committee in July 2006.

During their April 11, 2007 meeting, the COG Board of Directors was briefed on the outcomes and recommended next steps on Envision Greater Washington, specifically:

- *What are the specific elements/activities that would be carried out through a visioning effort, how will it be funded, and how will progress be measured?*
- *How can the region avoid reinventing the wheel and how can we be sure there is added value from this effort?*
- *Does the region need more planning or should we focus our resources on advancing the vision and plans we already have?*
- *What will be different, better and/or measurable as a result of this effort?*

The COG Board also adopted Resolution R34-07 which charged the MPDC with advancing action on this effort, specifically directing the Committee to review the July 2006 Envision Greater Washington report and other supporting information, and to identify specific actions that can be quickly implemented by COG or proposed for the work program and budget to advance the principles of:

1. *Stronger multi-sector, multi-jurisdictional and citizen engagement.*
2. *Leveraging existing plans and visions.*
3. *Public choice through deeper understanding of the impact and consequences of alternative growth and investment scenarios.*
4. *A commitment to action and outcomes*

### **Metropolitan Development Policy Committee Recommendations**

The Metropolitan Development Policy Committee (MDPC) established a work group to respond to the COG Board request. The work group convened 4 times, and its members felt strongly that any effort must build upon recent and long-term achievements of COG and its member local governments to address growth.

This region has a storied history of vision, regional collaboration and collective action, most notably in the two decades from 1955 to 1976 when the region planned and built the 100+ mile Metro system. As the largest and most ambitious post-war transit system, the Metro investment was a far-sighted challenge to the conventional wisdom – providing a widely used alternative to the automobile in an era where virtually every other government incentive encouraged driving and car ownership. It was visionary leadership that resulted in Metro, that shaped development patterns around transit in communities around the region, and that provided visitors, residents and employees inexpensive, convenient, clean, safe and efficient mobility and access throughout the region.

As the region prepares to meet the challenges of a new century, we face the prospect of rising energy costs and possible energy shortages, the imperative to be responsive and resilient in answer to natural or man-made disasters, the necessity to address greenhouse gas emissions and the issue of climate change, a housing affordability crisis, and the sprawling growth of our region way beyond the current reach of Metro. The issues of our time call upon the leaders of our region to once again demonstrate the visionary, far-sighted, collaborative and effective collective action that has created such a strong economy, distinctive quality of place, and vibrant quality of life in the greater Washington region.

The MDPC proposal has two components. The first proposal involves working across jurisdictions to identify common planning goals from *already identified* comprehensive plans, as a way to support a shared regional vision and take advantage of the many already developed visions and goals. The second proposal focuses this first, high-level review through a focused regional planning exercise along the Baltimore-Washington-Richmond corridor intended to provide “on-the-ground” inter-jurisdiction discussions, results focused on implementation, and the opportunity to position the region to effectively compete for federal resources across a range of issues: transportation, climate change, security, and economic development.

The MDPC hereby submits its recommended actions to the COG Board.

**Action 1:**

The MDPC recommends that the effort be re-named *Greater Washington 2050*.

**Action 2:**

The MDPC recommends that COG commit to strengthening and / or reconstituting the membership of the Metropolitan Development Policy Committee through a re-affirmation of the *Bylaws of the Metropolitan Development Policy Committee*. For example, in addition to COG local government representation, the *Bylaws* currently recommend active participation by: the federal government; representatives from other COG standing and short term policy committees, including the Transportation Planning Board (TPB); Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC);, and private

sector representation from the Greater Washington Board of Trade. Representation should also be sought from COG's Chesapeake Bay Policy Committee (CBPC) and Human Services Policy Committee (HSPC) and the Climate Change Steering Committee (CCSC).

The MDPC also recommends that a *Greater Washington 2050 Committee* composed of MDPC and other COG Policy Committee representatives be charged with oversight of the *Greater Washington 2050* initiative for a period of 2 years. The *Greater Washington 2050 Committee* will prepare a detailed work program for review by the COG Board during their annual retreat on July 27 to 29 2007, with final action by the Board during their September 12, 2007 meeting.

### **Action 3:**

The MDPC recommends that the Greater Washington 2050 Committee reach out to MPOs in the Baltimore and Richmond regions to collaborate on a bold 21<sup>st</sup> century investment plan to address the issues of environmental quality, energy efficiency, climate change, sprawling development and the transportation challenges that face our collective mega-region. One near-term opportunity is the transportation reauthorization bill expected in 2009 and the potential to address the climate, national security, energy, freight, high-speed passenger and commuter rail, and transit issues of our rapidly growing region.

### **Action 4:**

The MDPC recommends that the COG Board also develop and commit to a *Greater Washington 2050 Compact* that will articulate the need for coordinated long-range planning to ensure a high quality of life while benefiting from the region's anticipated growth. Among the basic tents of the *Compact* would be the willingness of the signatory member jurisdictions to subscribe to:

- long-range planning of at least 40 years
- timely implementation of the stated goals of the *Compact*
- creative financing of public infrastructure and enhanced governmental services to achieve the goals
- development of inter-jurisdictional projects and agreements where necessary to achieve the goals

### **Action 5:**

As a first step towards development and framing of the *Compact*, the MDPC recommends a literature review and comprehensive assessment of the common goals articulated in existing member jurisdiction Comprehensive Plans; previous and current regional "visioning" efforts; and applicable federal and state regulations.

This research would define specific elements of the *Compact* to address:

- land use
- economic growth
- environmental quality
- transportation
- affordable housing
- population and demographics
- health
- climate and energy

The *Compact* will include appendices containing a detailed listing of the goals as specifically articulated in the member jurisdiction plans and other documents.

The MDPC also requests that other COG Policy Committees (MWAQC, TPB, HSPC, CBPC, and CCSC) provide more detailed goals based on their existing body of work. The MDPC further recommends that the appendices include a summary of the external influences for each level of government: county on local, state on county, federal on all entities.

#### **Action 6:**

To assess progress in achieving the specific goals of the *Compact*, the MDPC recommends the development of a series of metrics for each element. The MDPC further recommends the preparation of a tri-annual report detailing an analysis by jurisdiction of the region's progress towards achievement of the goals.

#### **Action 7:**

COG staff and the *Greater Washington 2050 Committee* will develop a Communications Plan to disseminate the purpose of and understanding of the *Compact* with the primary focus being the education of the elected officials of our member jurisdictions complimented by their Planning and/or Economic Development staffs. Included in the Communications plan will be specific recommendations on ways to enhance the Transportation Planning Board's public outreach on the alternative growth scenarios developed through the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study (RMAS).

- COG will provide the appropriate training and "talking points"
- COG will develop a "communications package" for local jurisdictions to brief their constituents

COG will work with local jurisdictions to develop a planning and public outreach process to develop Action Item 3. (One idea may be to provide staff "on-loan from other jurisdictions for a short time period to produce this plan and process.

Desired outcomes from the *Greater Washington 2050* initiative include building stronger partnerships between jurisdictions of Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia and a stronger sense of regional purpose and identity. Other potential benefits to be derived from the *Greater Washington 2050* effort include the fostering of citizen engagement and support for measures to address growth challenges and decisions, as well as the support for necessary actions. In addition, the development of regional benchmarks will enable the region's leaders to assess progress and determine whether or not the region is moving toward or further away from the stated goals.