

**Planning Directors Technical Advisory Committee  
March 17, 2006**

**Meeting Summary**

The Planning Directors Technical Advisory Committee (PDTAC) met on March 17, 2006 from 10:00 a.m. to 11:55 a.m. in the DC Office of Planning at 801 North Capitol Street. Chairman Graves called the meeting to order.

**Announcements**

Paul DesJardin, COG Staff, announced upcoming events at COG, including the Day Laborer Summit #2 on March 30 and the Predatory Lending Conference on April 27. The Predatory Lending Conference, sponsored by the Housing Directors Committee, is open to the public. Mr. DesJardin also stated that the Washington Area Housing Partnership and the Housing Directors are sponsoring a series of Affordable Housing Workshops as a way to promote the Affordable Housing Toolkit. He distributed the new *In Focus* reports, which are a series of in-depth analyses of demographics of member jurisdictions in the Washington region.

Mr. DesJardin also indicated that a Round 7A may be necessary to take the District's new baseball stadium into account. The building of FedEx field in Prince George's county set a precedent to include new projects for major development projects. Because the changes are minor, the conformity process would remain on track.

**Review of Metropolitan Development Policy Committee and COG Board of Directors Briefings and Next Steps from Greater Washington Board of Trade Potomac Conference**

Mr. DesJardin provided an overview of the Greater Washington Board of Trade's Potomac Conference 2006 Winter Meeting, "A Conversation About Our Region's Future" held February 23 and 24. He stated that the business community was not well represented and participation was not as good as expected.

Al Dobbins of Prince George's County posed the question of how could the group arrived at a consensus for the region if most of the region was not represented at the meeting.

Mr. DesJardin explained the 'Envision Greater Washington' as a process that would start with the convening of a thought leader group consisting of thirty representatives with ten each coming from government, private sector, and civic groups, respectively. The first group would have 30 days to discuss what the Envision Greater Washington entity or governance structure would be and to ascertain whether there is support for a regional visioning effort.

Faroll Hamer of Montgomery County asked what the new governance structure would be like. She stated that the governance structure is not sufficiently well addressed. There are existing entities in place to conduct a regional visioning process.

Jim Van Zee of the Northern Virginia Regional Commission indicated that the Commonwealth of Virginia needs to have a vision before a regional visioning process like this can go forward. He also stated that there are also major philosophical differences between the states.

Julia Koster of the National Capital Planning Commission stated that ULI's Reality Check on Growth in February 2005 was supposed to lead to a regional visioning process, but there was little financial support for this and it has subsequently faltered. Ms. Koster asked what would make this effort different than the efforts conducted in the past year.

Chairman Graves mentioned that he has been through regional visioning processes in his previous jobs and suggested that there needs to be a focus on just one or two issues in order to be successful.

Ron Kirby of TPB stated that the reaction from the MDPC about the Envision Greater Washington proposal was mostly negative. There were no presentations about what regional efforts have occurred in the region in the past and the organizers seem to have little knowledge of what goes on here at COG and the TPB. Mr. Kirby questioned what is the value added of the effort and suggested that the business community needs to step in and get things moving.

### **Regional Activity Center and Cluster Analysis of Round 7**

Greg Goodwin and Charles Grier of COG Staff provided an overview of the update of the Regional Activity Centers report for Round 7 numbers. Mr. Goodwin explained that because the Activity Center Boundaries do not always match existing TAZ boundaries, an allocation of employment and population for some activity centers is necessary. COG staff has provided each jurisdiction with a spreadsheet that will enable jurisdictions to make the necessary calculations and adjustments. The borders of the Activity Centers will remain the same, except in a few cases where minor adjustments may be necessary to fix errors.

Mr. Grier presented a preliminary Activity Cluster analysis using Round 7 data. Because totals for Activity Clusters were calculated using the TAZs of the Activity Centers and the TAZs immediately surrounding Activity Centers, the Clusters do not require any TAZ allocations to determine the amount of employment and population. Mr. Grier provided an overview of the Clusters with the largest changes in population and employment between Round 6.2 and Round 7. He noted that the published totals for the Clusters in the Activity Centers publication differed from Round 6.2 totals for the same area. Staff will conduct additional analysis on these discrepancies and will provide an explanation to the committee.

Mr. DesJardin added that he will brief the COG Board in April. This update of the Activity Centers and Clusters should be a faster process than the original project because the criteria remain the same and no adjustment will be made in the boundaries.

### **Other Business**

Chairman Graves suggested that each jurisdiction share a project at future PDTAC meetings so that the members could learn about what is occurring in the region and be able to learn from others' experiences. He stated that these presentations worked well in Baltimore.

### **Adjournment**

Chairman Graves adjourned the meeting at 11:55 and indicated that the next meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 14 from 10:00am to 11:45am.