



GreaterWashington2050

**REPORT TO THE GW 2050 COALITION  
FROM THE COMPACT TASK FORCE  
Catherine M. Hudgins, Chair**

September 25, 2008

The Compact Task Force has now met three times in person, conducted three conference calls, and circulated documents from other regions, drafts of our concepts, and numerous personal suggestions and edits.

The Task Force is now in a position to make recommendations to the Coalition concerning the structure and format of the Compact. Although we have reached substantial consensus on our recommendations, where there is a significant minority opinion we have included it in this report. We ask the Coalition's endorsement of this proposed Compact structure and format and, if appropriate, guidance for issues to be included, deleted, or modified. We will use this recommended model, with suggestions from the Coalition, as we draft the actual Compact based upon review and acceptance of other Task Force recommendations.

The Task Force is also proposing five annexes or appendices to accompany the Compact to better explain how the Compact can be reviewed and implemented by the Region and its jurisdictions and various communities. We will present these annexes at a following meeting.

**Proposed Compact Structure:**

Before the Task Force could develop a proposed format for the Compact, a couple of structural questions were considered.

- How detailed should the Compact be? How long?

Early on the Task Force determined that the Compact itself should be relatively short, with explanations, procedures, implementation strategies, and the like being addressed in narrative appendices or annexes. The Task Force believes that "short and crisp" will make the Compact more easily understood and may make it more acceptable to the COG jurisdictions.

- Who or what should be the parties to the Compact?

There are three groups of possible parties (entities and institutions) the Task Force addressed: COG jurisdictions; other governmental entities; and non-governmental entities with clear stakeholder interests.

Although over time, and certainly within the 40+ years until 2050, additional jurisdictions may adopt the same vision and might be added to the Compact. At an appropriate time in the future, COG or the Coalition could address the issue of additional jurisdictions and communicate with others in the Washington-Baltimore consolidated metropolitan statistical area.

There is Task Force consensus that the vision and principles of the Compact be shared with and approved by the community at large, especially stakeholder organizations. The ways in which stakeholders might participate, and the timing of their participation, present a number of difficulties, including: identification appropriate stakeholder organizations, without perceived favoritism; informing stakeholders and securing their input, within the allowable timeframe of the project; and their status as signatories or parties to the Compact.

The Task Force has concluded that the COG jurisdictions should be the initial **“parties”** to the Compact. In the future, perhaps near future, additional jurisdictions may be solicited or may present themselves to be parties as well. NGO’s and other stakeholder organizations will be invited and encouraged to be **“endorsers”** of the Compact. Their role is not to implement the Compact but, rather, to support the principles of the Compact and governmental efforts to ensure fulfillment of its goals. Regional stakeholders should be identified by the Coalition and solicited after a draft Compact is prepared; other, more localized stakeholders should be identified and solicited as each jurisdiction considers the Compact after approval by the COG Board.

*A minority view preferred to have the Compact “agreed to by the Coalition and signed by more than just WashCOG’s 21 member jurisdictions.” There should be agreement “among the private sector (business & industry) and the non-profit sector (organizations, institutions, and associations) that sign and support the Compact.” . . . “All the major stakeholders in the region should be enlisted in this effort, not just local governments.”*

*Response: While a laudable goal, a requirement to identify and seek formal agreement from a potentially large group of stakeholders would significantly delay consideration and completion of the Compact. Selection of potential stakeholders, alone, would be a difficult and politically sensitive process. Additionally, opening up principle or strategy language negotiations at a later date to address specific concerns of specific stakeholders may require major revisions to current efforts. The recommended role of “stakeholder endorsers” addresses broad community involvement without these negatives.*

## Proposed Compact Format:

1. The Compact will begin with the language of agreement, of reciprocal pledges, of the concept of mutual responsibility to reach a regional vision. It will define the effort as a living document, moving forward with the region.
2. The Compact will set forth principles which are agreed upon by all of the signatories, successful observance will fulfill the vision. As prefatory language, the Compact will set forth the “why” of this action, essentially the “whereas” provisions. The Principles Task Force has proposed such language as an introduction to their recommended principles.
3. The Compact will acknowledge that while all signatory jurisdictions agree to the principles, the methods of ensuring the vision espoused by the principles will differ from jurisdiction to jurisdiction based upon statutory law, history of development, demographics, etc. All jurisdictions agree to use best efforts within their own legal, political, and financial structure to comply with the Compact, using or considering the information in the annexes.
4. The Compact will contain an invitation for other political jurisdictions, whose environmental, financial, and demographic futures are intertwined with the COG region, to become parties to the Compact. It will also contain an invitation for non-governmental organization stakeholders to study, consider, and endorse the principles of the Compact, and to agree to support their governmental entities in taking appropriate to comply with the Compact.
5. The Compact will restate the agreement of the parties signatory and the support of the endorsers signatory and will provide for formal execution and signatures and attestation.
6. Proposed annexes will include:
  - **Strategies:** Regulatory, executive, financial, and educational strategies to be considered by jurisdictions as conducive to Compact fulfillment.
  - **Planning Tools:** Specific planning tools recommended by the Planning Tools Task Force. These maybe narrative or graphic, e.g., Activity Centers or Activity Clusters, TPB scenario, etc.
  - **Metrics:** Specific metrics for periodic review to ascertain the level of success of the region in fulfilling the Compact; certain metrics, where capable of being modeled can inform jurisdictions prior to decision or action. Metrics are currently being analyzed and will be recommended by Planning Tools Task Force.

- **Regional Review and Consideration:** Proposed procedures to insure regional consideration at the time of decision or action by individual jurisdiction, including possibility of regional review of major actions.
- **Implementation Tools:** A compendium of tools or legal methods of Implementation available to various jurisdictions is being prepared by the COG Attorneys Committee.

DRAFT