NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bridget Newton, Chair, Unfunded Needs Capital Working Group
                Jonathan Way, Vice-Chair, Unfunded Needs Capital Working Group

FROM: Kanti Srikanth, TPB Staff Director
                John Swanson, TPB Staff

SUBJECT: Draft content for a scope of work for the Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group

DATE: September 29, 2015

Based upon discussions during the September 16, 2015 meeting of the Working Group and comments received thus far, staff has developed the following elements to consider as part of a scope for the Unfunded Needs Capital Working Group. We are sharing this with you now to get your preliminary feedback.

At the Working Group meeting on October 21, we intend to present the policy questions below for discussion. Based upon the input we receive at that meeting, we will craft a work scope that details tasks, timing, and key milestones. The draft scope will be presented to the Working Group in November.

It seems clear that if we conduct all the activities described below, those efforts would last longer than one year. However, in the final scope we will design the activities so that by next June, we will produce an interim report that is meaningful as a discrete product.

SCOPE ACTIVITIES AND TASKS

The scope will be designed to achieve two overall outcomes: a) address a series of policy questions and b) identify a limited set of unfunded multi-modal priority projects that the region can get behind.

A. ADDRESS KEY POLICY QUESTIONS

1. EVALUATE THE ENTIRE INVENTORY

POLICY QUESTIONS: Participants in the TPB process have observed that the region's financially Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) does not provide an acceptable level of system performance for a number of key indicators. How much would performance improve should the region be able to implement all of the unfunded projects identified in the inventory?

TASKS: Identify the improvements that can be analyzed using the TPB's travel demand model to estimate system-wide impacts. This analysis would be comparable to the annual CLRP performance analysis, but it would essentially represent a financially unconstrained plan. The

results of the analysis would be compared with the results of the analysis of the 2015 Constrained Long-Range Plan to answer the policy question. The group would decide the specific performance measures to be used for this task, which could be the same as those used in the CLRP performance analysis.

2. **EVALUATE A TARGETED LIST OF PROJECTS TO "MOVE MORE PEOPLE AND GOODS MORE EFFICIENTLY"**

POLICY QUESTION: The Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP) calls for the implementation of strategies to "move more people and goods more efficiently." What targeted set of currently unfunded multi-modal projects can best address this priority? How would implementing these projects improve the performance levels forecast for the current CLRP?

Projects will be selected to target these strategies:
- More capacity on existing transit system
- New lower-cost transit alternatives (including priority bus treatments) that connect Activity Centers and major rail stations
- Use road pricing to strategically expand supply and manage demand
- Reduce emissions (use MSWG strategies focused upon VMT reduction)

TASKS: Identify unfunded projects of a regional nature consistent with the above priorities, and analyze this network of projects. Projects will be drawn primarily from the current inventory of unfunded projects, but consideration will also be given to regional projects not included in the inventory. The project team will determine the suitability of projects for inclusion in this network based upon the number of strategies it serves, professional judgment, and results of earlier studies and/or travel data. The group would decide the specific performance measures to be used for this analysis, including those used in the CLRP performance analysis.

3. **EVALUATE A TARGETED SET OF MULTI-MODAL PROJECTS TO REDUCE CONGESTION IN KEY CORRIDORS**

POLICY QUESTION: What set of currently unfunded multi-modal projects effectively address congestion in the region's most congested travel corridors?

TASKS: Identify congested regional travel corridors using the current CLRP as the baseline and the results of travel demand forecasting and empirical data, where available. The group would decide on a limited set of measures to define congested conditions that can be assessed using models and or available data. The group would then identify no more than five congested regional travel corridors targeted for multi modal improvements. The group would identify unfunded projects within these corridors with the potential to address congestion. Projects primarily will be drawn from the current inventory of unfunded projects, but consideration will also be given to regional projects not included in the inventory. Evaluate the impact of these projects against the desired outcomes using analytical tools, including the TPB travel demand model.

4. **EVALUATE IMPROVEMENTS FOR NON- MOTORIZED MODES OF TRANSPORTATION**

POLICY QUESTIONS: Which sub-set of unfunded bicycle and pedestrian projects would best

serve the regional priority of enhanced circulation within Activity Centers and expanding bicycling as a viable transportation choice? How would non-motorized improvements increase accessibility to transit and encourage use of transit?

TASKS: With the assistance of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee the group would identify a set of unfunded bicycle and pedestrian projects that would provide regional connectivity to existing facilities, including the creation of a continuous bicycle circuit throughout the region, connecting different land uses. The Subcommittee would also identify unfunded bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure projects that are within Activity Centers and have the potential to improve circulation within the centers.

B. IDENTIFY A LIMITED SET OF PRIORITY PROJECTS

THE CHALLENGE: Based upon information from the analysis of key policy questions and stakeholder outreach, can we identify a limited package of unfunded priority projects that "the region can get behind?"

TASKS: Use a combination of quantitative and qualitative measures to evaluate and select unfunded priority projects. Such evaluation would include consideration of:
- Effectiveness (based, in part, on analysis described above)
- Feasibility and readiness (based on judgment of jurisdiction staff)
- Support (based, in part, on various outreach activities) and
- Funding potential (opportunities/likelihood to raise new revenue to implement the project)

The final list will be approved by the Working Group and endorsed by the TPB. It will be designed to be integrated into the TPB's ongoing long-range planning process.