



LONG-RANGE PLAN TASK FORCE

May 18, 2016
10:30 - 11:45 A.M.
Walter A. Scheiber Board Room

Tim Lovain, TPB Chair
Bridget Newton, Task Force Chair
Jonathan Way, Task Force Vice Chair

*If you would like to participate by conference call, please call: 888-702-9706;
Conference Room Number: 2650; Participant PIN: 6227*

AGENDA

10:30 A.M. 1. INTRODUCTIONS

10:35 A.M. 2. DISCUSSION OF APRIL 20, 2016 TASK FORCE MEETING

The task force will have a chance to make corrections and clarifications in a memo summarizing the task force discussion at the April 20 meeting.

Attachment Memo: Summary of Comments from April 20th Meeting and Responses

10:40 A.M. 3. DISCUSSION OF TASK FORCE WORK PLAN

The task force will discuss the work plan document from May 12, 2016, which combines work activities that were included in memos and scopes of work that have been previously presented to the task force. Discussion will include:

- 10:40 Work Plan outcomes
- 10:50 Work Plan methodology
- 11:05 Promoting regional criteria in the project selection processes of TPB member jurisdictions (Step 5)

Attachment Memo: Work Plan Elements Summary

11:30 A.M. 4. DISCUSSION OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT REGIONAL CRITERIA

Staff will present a preliminary draft list of regional project selection criteria, (Step 2 of the Work Plan) that are grounded in regional policy documents, to initiate discussions. The draft criteria and suggestions received will be more extensively discussed at the Task Force meeting in June.

Attachment Memo: Preliminary set of draft regional project selection criteria

- 11:40 A.M. 5. WRAP-UP AND NEXT STEPS**
The group will discuss its next steps.
- 11:45 A.M. 5. ADJOURN**

The next meeting of the Working Group is scheduled for June 15, 2016 at 10:30 A.M.

All materials from the Long-Range Plan Task Force meetings are posted at:

www.mwcog.org/LRPTF

**The TPB is staffed by the Department of Transportation Planning
of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.**

Reasonable accommodations are provided upon request, including alternative formats of meeting materials.
For more information, visit: www.mwcog.org/accommodations or call (202) 962-3300 or (202) 962-3213 (TDD)



MEMORANDUM

TO: Long Range Plan Task Force
FROM: Officers of the Task Force (Board members - Mr. Lovain, Ms. Newton, Mr. Way)
SUBJECT: Summary of comments from the April 20th meeting and responses
DATE: May 12, 2016

This memo provides a summary of some of the discussions from the Task Force's discussion during the April 20, 2016 meeting and the guidance provided to the staff.

1. Comment: The proposed activities to promote consideration of regional priorities in the project selection at the local, sub regional and state levels as outlined in the 3/10/2016 staff memo is very important and should be discussed in detail.

Response: Yes. The majority of the Task Force's 5/18/2016 work session will be focused on discussing the activities to implement the work scope of the Task Force. An overview of the methodology, together with all relevant previous memoranda, has been included in the meeting packet as read-ahead materials. Members are encouraged to review the documents and be prepared to assist in finalizing the work activities.

2. Comment: It is important for the TPB to understand local policy- and decision-making processes with regard to project selection and prioritization.

Response: Agreed. One of the activities outlined in the 3/10/2016 staff memo is conducting a survey of the TPB member jurisdictions to learn about the project selection/prioritization process used by the jurisdiction/agency. Comments on staff's proposed approach to do this will be part of the outcomes sought from the 5/18/2016 work session.

3. Comment: It is very important for the TPB to make a strong case for funding regionally significant projects. This is consistent with one of the TPB's Vision goals.

The objective of one of the two actions to emanate from the Task Force's work is the TPB championing the case for funding a set of regionally significant projects with the potential to improve the transportation system's performance but are currently unfunded. This activity is noted in the 3/10/2016 staff memo. Further discussion and feedback on this will be part of the outcomes sought from the 5/18/2016 work session.

4. Comment: Ways to improve the outcomes of the CLRP on transportation system performance should be focused on policies rather than projects.

Response: The TPB has long focused on policy principles to shape the regional transportation plan (CLRP) starting with the adoption of the Vision document in 1999. This comprehensive document, developed with the full endorsement all of its member jurisdictions over a couple years, is multi-modal in scope and addresses many policy areas including affordability, economy, preservation, environment landuse and commerce. The

TPB Vision document has served as the source document for other regional policy documents such as the Region Forward and the TPB's Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. The TPB's Call for Projects document for updating the CLRP lists the policy priorities to be considered by TPB member jurisdictions and agencies while selecting transportation projects for the CLRP.

Through the Task Force's work the TPB is currently working to take direct action to increase the extent to which projects advancing to the CLRP reflect these regional policy priorities. The 5/12/2016 staff memo provides an overview of the direct action the Board intends to take as part of next update of the CLRP.

5. Comment: The No Build scenario helps us recognize the improvements the projects in the current CLRP provide by 2040, in the face of a significant increase in demand, relative to no transportation improvement projects being implemented. It might also be helpful to also examine a scenario that would essentially do the opposite of the No-Build scenario, i.e., analyze the proposed 2040 CLRP transportation improvements in combination with current, not future, land-use. The outcome of such a scenario analysis would potentially show how effective the current package of CLRP projects would be in addressing the demands of today. One potential conclusion of such an analysis might be that funding for current CLRP projects should be accelerated.

Response: The TPB is focused on completing the analysis to facilitate the two direct actions it plans to take (outlined in the 5/12/2016 staff memo) in time for the 2018 CLRP Update. Given the significant amount of work that needs to be completed in this limited time period, staff has been asked to determine if this additional scenario can be analyzed without impacting the overall schedule for the project.

6. Comment: Land use greatly affects demand on the transportation system that projects in the CLRP are designed to meet. In order to examine ways to change the performance outcomes of the projects in the CLRP the TPB should explore alternative land use scenarios.

Response: The TPB has been one of the early entities to identify the land use and transportation interaction. While land use policies and decisions are outside its purview the TPB nevertheless has worked closely with the local jurisdictions and their Planning Offices to examine and adopt policies / practices that provides a balanced linkage between land use and transportation. The earliest land use scenario analysis led by the TPB is from 1994 and the most recent one is from 2013. These collaborative efforts led to the formalization of a regional approach to land use that balances transportation planning in the form of the concept of Regional Activity Centers. As reflected in the current CLRP, between now and 2040, about three fourths of all future jobs and about 60 percent of new population will located in Activity Centers.

The TPB is currently focused on actions that it can take that are both near-term and consistent with the member jurisdiction's ongoing transportation project programming process. Additionally in this effort the TPB intends for these actions to directly inform the 2018 CLRP update. The significant amount of work that need to be completed in this limited time period consistent with the agreed-upon work plan for the task force precludes expansion of its work scope to explore additional and even more aggressive land use scenarios, both within and outside of current policies and practices, jointly with the Planning Departments.

7. Comment: It would be interesting to individually examine the impacts of the limited set of regionally significant multi-modal projects identified by the Task Force.

Response: The current work plan calls for evaluating the impact of the set of unfunded regionally significant projects collectively and at a regional level. This is to reflect the regional nature of the approach for this initiative, the capabilities of the regional travel demand model, and the resources available for this work activity. Impacts of individual projects would have to be examined using a corridor/sub-area models with a greater detail of the transportation network including post processing analytical analysis to extract measures not directly available from the travel demand model. The Task Force can however, once the list of regionally significant projects have been identified, examine the project-level analysis work that may have been undertaken by the member jurisdictions/agencies.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Long Range Plan Task Force
FROM: Kanti Srikanth, TPB Staff Director
John Swanson, Long-Range Planning Program Manager
SUBJECT: Work Plan Elements Summary
DATE: May 12, 2016

This memo summarizes the primary work plan elements as discussed and agreed to by the Task Force (previously Working Group) and the concurrence of the TPB.

BACKGROUND

During the finalization of the 2014 CLRP update, TPB members expressed a general dissatisfaction with the forecast performance of the region's transportation system in 2040 despite the planned implementation of more than \$40 billion in capacity improvements on the region's roads and transit systems. This dissatisfaction led to the establishment of the Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group which was tasked with 1) compiling a comprehensive inventory of unfunded projects that are included in the plans of the TPB's member jurisdictions and 2) determining how to conduct planning activities to identify a limited list of unfunded priority projects that would improve transportation systems performance. The Working Group met three times in 2015 and approved a work plan in November to guide the development of a list of unfunded priority projects that would be included in the TPB's 2018 long-range plan. This work plan was presented to the TPB in January.

Meanwhile, during the finalization of the 2015 amendments to the CLRP, some TPB members expressed the sentiment that the board should actively seek to ensure that regional policies are more fully reflected in the projects that are submitted for the CLRP. At a special TPB work session on this topic in January, board members generally agreed that if the TPB wishes to promote regional goals and priorities in project selection, it must find ways to influence project development well before submissions reach the CLRP. Participants at that meeting agreed that the work plan of the Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group should be augmented to include activities to promote regional project selection criteria in the project development processes of the TPB's member jurisdictions.

The Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group was renamed the Long-Range Plan Task Force and was reconvened on April 20. Based upon discussions at that meeting and guidance from the Task Force officers, staff has developed the enhanced work plan described below. The outcomes of these efforts are to be actionable at both the project and policy levels, and to be directly linked to the next update of the TPB's long-range plan in 2018.

AGREED WORK PLAN

Goal: Improve the performance levels of the regional transportation system in the TPB's Constrained Long Range Plan.

- Outcomes:
1. Work collectively to secure funding for a **limited set of currently unfunded “regional priority projects.”** This action will help change the contents of the current CLRP to improve the performance outcomes for the transportation system.
 2. Work to have TPB member jurisdictions include a **set of “regional project selection criteria”** that reflects the TPB’s Vision and Priorities in their own project selection and programming processes. Such action will put in place a process by which all projects coming into the CLRP will better address regional priorities.

Methodology:

1. Compile a list of projects identified and adopted by TPB member jurisdictions that are currently unfunded. This will serve as the primary pool of projects from which to develop a set of Regional Priority Projects.
 - a. Determine the collective contribution of the projects in the (2015) CLRP towards the performance levels of the regional transportation system. This will help put the CLRP in the context of supply-side inaction.
 - b. Determine the collective contribution of all of the unfunded projects towards improving the performance levels of the CLRP. This will help provide the best case (albeit unrealistic) scenario in accommodating current and forecast demand with supply side enhancements.
2. Develop a set of multi-modal criteria that are grounded in the TPB Vision, the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, and Region Forward. These will serve as the region's criteria for project selection/prioritization (**Regional Criteria**).
3. Using the Regional Criteria identify a limited set of multimodal unfunded projects that are regionally significant and have the potential to improve performance outcomes for the regional transportation system (**Regional Priority Projects**).
 - a. In addition to including road and transit projects, regional priority projects will also **include non-motorized projects**. The TPB’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee will lead the effort to identify two sets of projects that (i) will provide a continuous regional bicycle trail (Bicycle Beltway) and (ii) will improve pedestrian and bicycle connections to transit stations.
4. Evaluate the anticipated improvements in system performance from the consensus based Regional Priority Projects. This will serve to document the anticipated return on investment on a set of targeted transportation projects in terms of improved mobility and accessibility.
5. Urge TPB member **jurisdictions** and agencies to **incorporate Regional Criteria into their own project selection processes**. This will ensure that projects being added to the CLRP will be consistent with TPB’s visions and priorities. (see memo from 3/10/16)
6. **Champion the cause of funding the Regional Priority Projects**. This will include presenting these as TPB’s recommendations for use in the local, sub-regional and state level project prioritization processes. This will ensure that programming decisions on available transportation funding will address the performance deficiencies of the current CLRP.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group
FROM: John Swanson, Plan Development and Support Manager
SUBJECT: Promoting regional priorities in the project selection processes of the TPB's member jurisdictions
DATE: March 10, 2016

This memo describes a proposal to develop a system that the TPB can use to promote the consideration of regional priorities in project selection processes at the local, subregional, and state levels.

BACKGROUND

Last fall, during the finalization of the 2015 CLRP Amendment, TPB members expressed a general sentiment that regional priorities and goals did not appear to be adequately reflected in CLRP projects and in the plan as a whole. Members expressed general dissatisfaction with the forecast performance of the future transportation system in relation to regional goals. Some members suggested that in the future, the TPB should establish a process to score or rank CLRP project submissions in relation to regional goals and priorities as identified in the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.

The TPB convened a special work session on January 20 to discuss ways in which the board can promote regional priorities at many levels of project development. At that meeting, participants agreed to the following recommendations offered by Tim Lovain, TPB chairman, and Kanti Srikanth, TPB staff director:

1. Recognize and leverage the work of the already established Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group.
2. Redefine the TPB's long-range plan to include funded (constrained) and unfunded projects.
3. Keep abreast of project development processes at all levels.
4. Seek to influence project development at all levels.
5. Encourage project evaluation and development processes to incorporate regional considerations.

The first two of these recommendations entail changes in the TPB's long-range planning process. These recommendations are consistent with the scope of work approved by the Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group last November, which will lead to the identification of a set of unfunded regional priority projects reflecting regional goals. The selection of such unfunded projects will provide the TPB with opportunities for enhanced input at the state and local levels during earlier stages in the project development process well before new projects are submitted for the "constrained" element of the long-range plan.

In contrast, recommendations 3-5 will not change the regional planning process, but will call upon the TPB to be more cognizant and active in project development and selection activities at the local,

subregional and state levels. The remainder of this memo provides recommendations for implementing recommendations 3-5.

PROPOSAL

This proposal is premised upon a fundamental fact underlying the TPB's current long-range planning process: By the time a project is submitted for the CLRP, it is already well advanced in the project development process. Typically, projects submitted for the CLRP have already undergone extensive planning activities and have been through a process of prioritization and funding identification at the state and/or local levels. If the TPB wishes these projects to reflect and promote regional goals and priorities, it must find ways to influence project development and selection well before submissions reach the CLRP.

Staff proposes to use the following means to document local, subregional, and state project selection processes and seek to ensure that regional policies and priorities are considered in those processes:

1. *Research and document project selection processes*

Staff will gather information through written questionnaires and telephone interviews on the project selection processes used by local, state, regional transportation agencies. This research will likely address the following questions:

- What are the goals, priorities, or outcomes that the projects are intended to advance?
- How are the projects evaluated against these goals, priorities, or outcomes – qualitatively, quantitatively or a combination?
- How does the quantitative evaluation process, if used, work? What role does qualitative evaluation play in selecting projects?
- How is consensus reached on a package of selected projects?
- Does project selection currently include any explicit consideration of regional policies or priorities?

The gathered information will be condensed in narrative descriptions that will be featured on the TPB's Hub website (www.transportationplanninghub.org). In addition, the information will be synthesized in tables or on spreadsheets.

2. *Develop a set of regional priorities for project selection at all levels*

Consistent with the TPB Vision and using its Regional Transportation Priorities Plan document, the TPB will identify a specific set of regional outcomes that the TPB considers to be regional priorities for projects to address. These outcomes would serve as the project evaluation metrics that would be considered by the TPB member jurisdictions and agencies as they select projects for development and funding considerations.

One of the ways of identifying the above set of regional project priority metrics would be to use the results of the performance outcome of its latest CLRP (2015) and identify specific performance outcomes that the board finds to be deficient. These "CLRP performance deficiencies" are what the TPB would promote for use as part of the project selection process by

the member jurisdictions and transportation agencies.

The above work will also serve to implement the second recommendation (above) agreed upon during the January 20, 2016 TPB work session (“Redefine the TPB’s long-range plan to include funded [constrained] and unfunded projects”), which will require the development of a set of unfunded projects for inclusion in the region’s long-range transportation plan. Again, the development of this plan of unfunded priority projects was part of the scope of work approved by the Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group last November.

3. *Develop a systematized process for providing regional input to local and state project selection*

Working with the staffs of TPB member jurisdictions and agencies, TPB staff will develop a process for the TPB and its staff to use in conducting outreach to local, subregional and state agencies. This process will use a variety of outreach methods to pro-actively foster communication with TPB members across the region. But recognizing the TPB’s limited resources, the process will also be strategic and targeted.

Based upon the steps described above, the TPB will identify a plan for how the board wishes to convey its priorities to member jurisdictions. This plan may include the following components:

- *Provide written information to all members.* On a regular basis, the TPB may convey information in writing about regional priorities to all local, subregional and state boards that are involved in transportation project selection.
- *Develop a calendar of activities.* On an annual basis, TPB staff will develop a calendar of major planning activities that are underway throughout the region, which the TPB may seek to inform.
- *Make presentations to decision-making bodies.* On a regular basis, TPB staff will identify a list of decision-making bodies that could/should be contacted to receive presentations on regional priorities.
- *Seek to inform regular programming activities and events.* Selected annual activities that occur on an annual basis are particularly appropriate venues in which to share information about regional priorities. These include MDOT’s Annual Tour, VDOT’s SYIP development process, NVTAs’s programming, and others.
- *Seek to include regional priorities in scoring and ranking systems.* The TPB may seek to integrate regional priorities and needs with the project evaluation criteria used in local, sub-regional and state level project prioritization processes (qualitative and or quantitative).

NEXT STEPS

The working group will discuss this proposal at their meeting on March 16. TPB staff welcomes all comments and suggestions regarding its implementation.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Long-Range Plan Task Force
FROM: Kanti Srikanth, TPB Staff Director
John Swanson, Long-Range Planning Program Manager
SUBJECT: Preliminary set of draft regional project selection criteria
DATE: May 12, 2016

This memo describes a preliminary set of selection criteria that the TPB could potentially use to select a limited list of unfunded regional priority projects.

TPB staff developed the set of eight criteria (listed in Phase II) based upon goals and objectives in the TPB Vision and the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. The draft selection criteria are described below in broad brush terms. Questions regarding the actual application of such criteria are listed at the end of this memo.

It should be noted that the final set of criteria would not only be used to identify unfunded regional priority projects; they would also be used by the TPB to promote regional priorities in the project selection processes of the TPB's members.

PHASE I: Network of regionally significant multi-modal projects

The full inventory of unfunded projects that the TPB staff has compiled (the projects in the All-Build Scenario) will be screened to identify a subset of regionally significant highway and transit projects. These will generally be large projects that have a significant effect on the capacity of the region's transportation system or are otherwise deemed to be regionally significant.

Regionally significant roadway projects will include Interstate highways and other facilities on the National Highway System. Regionally significant transit projects will include all fixed-guideway projects as well as bus rapid transit and projects on WMATA's Priority Corridor Network (PCN). Freight projects will include those projects that are on the Regional Freight-Significant Network will be included. Any additional projects not in the inventory but agreed to by the Task Force will be added.

Product: Basemap with unfunded regionally significant multimodal projects (described above)

PHASE II: Limited set of currently unfunded regional priority projects

A set of multi-modal criteria will be developed that are grounded in the TPB Vision, the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, and Region Forward. These will serve as the region's criteria for project selection/prioritization.

For some criteria, such as congestion relief, staff will analyze current and forecast conditions (under the CLRP) in order to identify the specific locations of anticipated deficiencies or needs. Candidate projects will then be assessed based upon whether they are anticipated to address needs in these locations. Other criteria will likely be applied in a straight-forward binary fashion— for example, projects either will or will not increase the use of non-SOV travel modes.

It should be emphasized that staff does not anticipate conducting project-level travel demand forecasting for individual candidate projects. Such analysis would be extremely resource-intensive and in many cases would not yield helpful results. Rather, the selection process will assess whether projects are or are not anticipated, based upon professional judgment, to address a problem or need that will be highlighted through staff analysis.

The following draft set of eight draft criteria has been developed by TPB staff as a starting point for discussion. A suggested treatment for each criteria is outlined below.

DRAFT CRITERIA

1. Increase Person Throughput

Will a project increase the number of people traveling through a corridor?

Assessment of Current and/or Forecast Needs: Staff will identify and map congested corridors with low person-throughput where person throughput is constrained because capacity is limited.

Project Selection: Projects that are deemed likely to increase person throughput in the above key corridors will be given credit in the evaluation system.

2. Provide Targeted Congestion Relief

Will a project offer targeted congestion relief?

Assessment of Current and/or Forecast Needs: Staff will identify facilities/corridors with the heaviest current and forecast congestion under the CLRP. The analysis will separately provide maps for vehicle hours or delay (VHD) and auto person hours of delay (PHD). Comparable measure(s) will be used to identify transit facilities with current or anticipated problems with crowding.

Project Selection: Candidate projects that are deemed likely to relieve congestion in congested corridors will be given credit in the evaluation system.

3. Increase the Use of Non-SOV Travel Modes

Will a project increase transit ridership, walking, bicycling, or carpooling?

Assessment of Current and/or Forecast Needs: None.

Project Selection: Projects that are deemed likely to increase non-SOV travel will be given credit in the evaluation system (binary assessment).

4. Connect Activity Centers

Will a project connect two or more Activity Centers?

Assessment of Current and/or Forecast Needs: Staff will provide maps of Activity Centers that will also include current and planned road and transit connections.

Project Selection: Projects that connect two or more Activity Centers will be given credit in the evaluation system.

5. Improve Access to Environmental Justice Communities

Will a project improve travel options or otherwise increase access for traditionally disadvantaged communities?

Assessment of Current and/or Forecast Needs: Staff will develop maps of Communities of Concern that will also include current and planned road and transit connections.

Project Selection: Projects that address transportation challenges of the Community of EJ Concern will be given credit in the evaluation system.

6. Improve Safety

Will a project address a specific safety issue or connection?

Assessment of Current and/or Forecast Needs: [Facilities with specific safety issues – identified by member jurisdictions? Other?]

Project Selection: Projects that specifically alleviate a safety issue will be given credit in the evaluation system.

7. Address Freight Needs

Will a project address regionally significant freight opportunities or needs?

Assessment of Current and/or Forecast Needs: Staff will provide a map of the Regionally Significant Freight Network.

Project Selection: Projects designed to enhance and /or improve freight movement on the Regionally Freight-Significant Network will be given credit in the evaluation system.

8. Improve Non-Motorized Connectivity

Will a project increase connectivity of the regional trail network and non-motorized access to transit stations?

Assessment of Current and/or Forecast Needs: Under the guidance of the TPB Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, staff will provide: 1) a map of a regional trail network (currently under development) with built and unbuilt facilities and 2) a map of transit stations with constrained walksheds (WMATA's station access improvement study).

Project Selection: Projects (packaged in groups) that are deemed likely to increase access to transit stations or close gaps in the regional trail network will be given credit in the evaluation system.

NOTE: The process of identifying projects for the above two groups will be conducted, for the Task Force's consideration, under the guidance of the Bike/Ped Subcommittee. Projects will be drawn from the Regional Bike/Ped Inventory and the inventory of unfunded projects.

Some Followup Questions

- What form will the “scores” for the individual criteria take?
Some options:
 - A checkbox or binary equivalent – A project either does or does not serve the criterion in question.
 - Harvey balls (Consumer Reports-style ideograms) – A project could be graphically shown to meet criteria in ways that indicate partial achievement.
 - A numeric range – One project may serve the criterion more effectively than another and therefore we might want to assign it a relatively higher score.

- How will the “scores” for the 8 criteria be compared to each other?
Some options:
 - Essentially qualitative: A table with checkboxes (or Harvey balls) and no cumulative total
 - A simple tally: Add up the check marks (binary score) or assigned points.
 - A weighted sum: Some criteria might convey more weight than others.

ATTACHMENT: Spreadsheet showing how the draft regional project selection criteria are derived from the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan and the TPB Vision.

How are the Preliminary Draft Project Selection Criteria Supported by the RTPP and the TPB Vision? Draft, 5-12-16

		RTPP Goal 1: Provide a Comprehensive Range of Transportation Options	RTPP Goal 2 Promote a Strong Regional Economy, Including a Healthy Regional Core and Dynamic Activity Centers	RTPP Goal 3: Ensure Adequate System Maintenance, Preservation, and Safety	RTPP Goal 4: Maximize Operational Effectiveness and Safety of the Transportation System	RTPP Goal 5: Enhance Environmental Quality, and Protect Natural and Cultural Resources	RTPP Goal 6: Support Inter-Regional and International Travel and Commerce	
Preliminary Draft Criteria	Increase Person Throughput	The RTPP calls upon the region to move more people more efficiently through a mix of supply- and demand-side strategies that use a variety of modes.			A number of RTPP strategies call for priority bus treatments and technology on roadways to squeeze more capacity out of existing system.			
						Vision Goal 5: Obj. 2 calls decreased reliance on SOV driving.		
	Provide Targeted Congestion Relief	Under this RTPP goal, roadway congestion and transit crowding were identified as key challenges.						Relieving bottlenecks was identified as an RTPP strategy to reduce congestion, which is particularly important for freight.
					Vision Goal 4: Obj. 1 calls for reducing congestion. Obj. 4 calls for more reliability on roads and transit.			
	Increase Use of Non-SOV Travel Modes	The RTPP consistently calls for expanding efficient and cost-effective non-motorized transportation options.	The RTPP discusses importance of a balance of jobs and employment within Activity Centers, with adequate pedestrian, bicycle and transit infrastructure to travel within and reduce the need for SOV travel.				The RTPP identifies a variety of environmental benefits that will result from increased use of non-SOV modes. Numerous strategies throughout the RTPP called for a reduction in driving per person.	
		Vision Goal 1, Obj. 1 calls for a range of transportation options.	Vision Goal 2: Obj. 4 calls for reduced reliance on driving within Activity Centers.				Vision Goal 5: Obj. 2 calls decreased reliance on SOV driving. Obj. 3 calls for increase mode shares for non-SOV travel. Obj. 5 calls for reduced VMT/capita	

How are the Preliminary Draft Project Selection Criteria Supported by the RTPP and the TPB Vision? Draft, 5-12-16

		RTPP Goal 1: Provide a Comprehensive Range of Transportation Options	RTPP Goal 2 Promote a Strong Regional Economy, Including a Healthy Regional Core and Dynamic Activity Centers	RTPP Goal 3: Ensure Adequate System Maintenance, Preservation, and Safety	RTPP Goal 4: Maximize Operational Effectiveness and Safety of the Transportation System	RTPP Goal 5: Enhance Environmental Quality, and Protect Natural and Cultural Resources	RTPP Goal 6: Support Inter-Regional and International Travel and Commerce
Preliminary Draft Criteria	Connect Activity Centers		The RTPP consistently called for better connection between Activity Centers and better circulation within Activity Centers.				
			Vision Goal 2: Obj. 3 calls for connections between and within Activity Centers. Vision Goal 6: Obj. 1 calls for a map of Activity Centers and transportation.				
	Improve Access to Environmental Justice Communities	RTPP Goal 1 called for increased transportation options for low-income and minority communities and people with disabilities.	The RTPP calls for better, safer connections between affordable housing and job locations for regional economic prosperity.				
		Vision Goal 1: Obj. 3 supports people with special access needs					
	Improve Safety	A challenge under Goal 1 notes that too few people have access to safe pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure or live in areas where walking and bicycling are not practical options.		RTPP Goal 3 calls for maintenance of existing transit and highway system to ensure safety for all users	Key challenges identified in the RTPP include the need for better incident management and improved pedestrian and bicycle safety.		
				The Vision Goal 3 prioritized safety as a key objective of system maintenance.			

How are the Preliminary Draft Project Selection Criteria Supported by the RTPP and the TPB Vision? Draft, 5-12-16

		RTPP Goal 1: Provide a Comprehensive Range of Transportation Options	RTPP Goal 2 Promote a Strong Regional Economy, Including a Healthy Regional Core and Dynamic Activity Centers	RTPP Goal 3: Ensure Adequate System Maintenance, Preservation, and Safety	RTPP Goal 4: Maximize Operational Effectiveness and Safety of the Transportation System	RTPP Goal 5: Enhance Environmental Quality, and Protect Natural and Cultural Resources	RTPP Goal 6: Support Inter-Regional and International Travel and Commerce
Preliminary Draft Criteria	Address Freight Needs		RTPP discusses importance of goods movement to economic stability and growth.				The RTPP called for relieving bottlenecks and improving travel-time reliability for goods movement.
							Vision Goal 8: Objectives 1-2 support freight. Obj. 3 calls for connectivity with airports.
	Improve Non-Motorized Connectivity	The RTPP identified unsafe walking and biking as a key challenge.	The RTPP called for improved non-motorized circulation within Activity Centers.				
		Vision Goal 1: Obj. 4 calls for convenient bicycle and pedestrian access	Vision Goal 2: Objective 4 calls for improved internal mobility within Activity Centers with reduced reliance on the automobile.			Vision Goal 5: Obj. 3 calls for increased non-motorized mode shares.	