



GreaterWashington2050

TO: Catherine Hudgins, Chair,
Members, GW 2050 Compact Task Force

FROM: Diana Farina
Lee Ruck

DATE: June 6, 2008

SUBJECT: Task Force Activities

At the May 30 Meeting of the GW 2050 Coalition four task forces were created, including one charged with reviewing principles, tools, and drafting a compact ultimately to be considered by the full coalition.

Members of the Compact Task Force are:

Name	Jurisdiction/Agency/Organization	Phone #	E-Mail Address:
Catherine Hudgins, Chair	Fairfax County Board of Supervisors	703-478-0283	hntmill@fairfaxcounty.gov
Chuck Bean	Nonprofit Roundtable	202-263-4761	cbean@nonprofitroundtable.org
Sam Black	Washington Smart Growth Alliance	202-626-6887	sblack@ssd.com
Brent Blackwelder	Friends of the Earth	202-222-0727	bblackwelder@foe.org
Jeff Parnes	FCFCA	703-456-2456	FedPres2007@fairfaxfederation.org
Lee Quill, Co-Chair	Cunningham Quill Architects	202-337-0090	lquill@cunninghamquill.com
Lee Schoenecker	American Planning Association	202-686-8864	leeschoenecker@aol.com
Lee Ruck, Staff	COG General Counsel	202-962-3733	lruck@mwkog.org
Diana Farina, Staff	COG/DCPS	202-962-3282	dfarina@mwkog.org

The Task Force set its next meeting for **Friday, June 27th, from 10:00 – 12:30**. The meeting will be at COG's third floor conference room – "The Fishbowl." A light lunch will be provided.

Task Force members requested staff circulate a number of representative regional "visions," compacts, interlocal agreements, and other regional agreements, both interstate and intrastate, which might serve as models for Task Force consideration.

The compacts and agreements listed here, represent several models which the Task Force may consider.

- Some are phrased in generic terms; several are very specific in goals and objectives.
- Some are philosophic statements, essentially “bully pulpit:” some include a number of specific strategies which signatories are expected to initiate.
- Some leave implementation methodologies to individual jurisdictions; others catalog and recommend specific tools, metrics, and implementation actions to be utilized.
- Some set parameters and expect each jurisdiction to consider regional impacts; others provide for regional “review” of major actions.

After conceptual review of these representative efforts, the Task Force should reach consensus on the elements to be used in a GW2050 Compact.

General Interlocal Visioning and Regional Planning

1. Denver Mile High Compact

<http://www.drcog.org/index.cfm?page=MileHighCompact>

- Intrastate agreement between local governments
- Compact voluntarily commits local governments to update comprehensive plans to implement regional vision including growth, development, transportation, environmental quality and water quality management.
- Compact commitments are fairly general, leaving definition to each party
- Does not specify means of implementation
- Contains no procedure for regional oversight or input into local government actions
- See also <http://www.sprawlaction.org/toolkit/8intergov.html>

2. Envision Utah

<http://www.envisionutah.org/index.phtml>

- Broad planning vision available to local governments
- Effort by state government, many local governments, many business and community organizations
- Vision for quality growth addresses air quality, transportation choices, land preservation, water conservation, housing options, infrastructure, and economic development
- Relatively specific goals and strategies
- Fairly comprehensive analysis of existing and developed tools for implementation
- All implementation “voluntary”
- Continued regional “conversations,” no regional “review”
- Somewhat driven by private rather than governmental entities and issues

3. Fifty Forward (Atlanta)

<http://www.atlantafiftyforward.com/>

- Two-year visioning effort, broken up into a number of “forums”
- The first forum is “Going Green”
- Future forums include energy and alternative fuels, health issues, population and employment shifts, technological innovations, and future development patterns
- Although potential solutions are discussed, there is no consideration of mechanisms to implement regionally

4. Puget Sound Regional Council Vision 2040

<http://www.psrc.org/projects/vision/index.htm>

<http://www.psrc.org/about/what/interlocal.pdf>

- Vision to focus growth in urban areas, concentrated in centers and compact communities, strengthen linkages between land use and transportation, preserve rural and resource lands, address needs of a diverse population
- Relatively specific policies and goals
- Creates an interlocal agreement and regional plan
- Establishes a process for regional review of local, countywide, and transit agency plans guided by state statute (Growth Management Act), common regional guidelines and principles, directives in the Interlocal Agreement and Plan
- Lists legal tools and authorities

5. MetroFuture Greater Boston

<http://www.metrofuture.org/>

- General goal statements in areas of sustainable growth patterns, housing, community vitality, transportation, economy, environment
- Drilling down to very specific goals and objectives under each general goal
- Numerous implementation strategies relying on local governments to plan and coordinate regionally
- Use of (yet undefined) metrics
- Tools and practices are largely those of original and continuing analysis, rather than defining or creating tools of implementation
- Excellent advocacy and outreach programs

6. Vision North Texas

<http://www.visionnorthtexas.org/main.html>

- Independent public-private partnership (Regional Council, ULI, Univ of N.Tex), for 16 county region of North Central Texas
- Issues addressed include demographics, economics, education, energy, environment, governance, health, housing, infrastructure, innovation, security, and technology
- These issues are drilled down to many analyses, challenges, and choices for each
- Numerous stakeholder and public presentation
- No formal process for implementation

Interjurisdictional Agreements with Other Interesting Components

7. Treasure Coast (Florida) Regional Planning Council

http://consensus.fsu.edu/academic_directory/2004procdesign/StasProcedure-Design.pdf

- RPC has developed a mediation procedure between and among political subdivisions with disputes over cross-cutting planning issues. Although cast in MPO transportation terms, is portable to other planning responsibilities.

8. Pittsburgh Regional Compact

<http://pittsburghregionalcompact.org>

- Formal agreement and program between dozens of school districts and +/- a hundred private businesses. Excellent language, agreement, and collaboration on curriculum and training in providing needed skills for regional employment. Provides internships, co-op programs, and corporate training/mentoring.

9. SACOG (Sacramento) Regional Compact for Production of Affordable Housing

<http://www.sacog.org/housingcompact/HousingCompact.pdf>

- SACOG has developed complex formula of low income, moderate income, and workforce housing for compact participants, and assists in review of projects and plans. SACOG also assists in securing funding for compact projects from state agencies and state legislature.

Interstate Compacts

Technical term for agreements among states, approved by Congress, which have the force and effect of law – both public and private – in all states which are parties.

10. The Council of State Governments (CSG) has developed a “Tool Kit” which addresses a number of the issues of planning, governance, implementation, and enforcement of Interstate Compacts.

<http://www.csg.org/programs/ncic/resources.aspx>

11. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

http://wmata.com/about/parp_docs/compact.pdf

- WMATA was created and is governed by an Interstate Compact
- Article 4 requires the good faith cooperation of all Metro jurisdictions
- Article 6 provides for the process of regional transportation planning
- As an example of “enforcement” of the Compact, Fairfax City sued WMATA, alleging construction delay of the “K” line to Vienna/Fairfax, and refused to pay its obligation to WMATA. WMATA and many other jurisdictions countersued the City demanding financial contribution. Ultimately, WMATA and the other jurisdictions prevailed and the City was obligated to maintain its agreed level of contributions. *City of Fairfax v. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority*, 582 F.2d 1321 (4th Cir. 1978).

Compact: Choosing a Model or Format

At the June 27 meeting, the Task Force should try and reach consensus on several issues or questions which will govern the direction of the Compact.

1. How specific should the Compact be?
 - General goals only?
 - Specific goals?
 - Drill down to specific objectives under each goal?

2. Should the Compact address strategies for accomplishing goals or objectives?
 - Regulatory/legislative strategies?
 - Executive Policy strategies?
 - Fiscal strategies?
 - Infrastructure strategies?
 - Educational or “bully pulpit” strategies?

3. Should the Compact address tools and metrics?
 - Existing tools?
 - Desired tools (perhaps requiring state or federal legislation)?
 - Suggested metrics?
 - Mandatory metrics?

4. Should the Compact provide for periodic review? Update? Amendment?

5. Should the Compact provide a mechanism for regional review of regionally significant actions?
 - Who should review? COG? Neighboring jurisdictions? A new agency?
 - What size/impact should trigger review?
 - What regional carrots and sticks exist to ensure regional consideration? What new ones might be developed?

