



## **MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** TPB Long-Range Plan Task Force  
**FROM:** Kanti Srikanth, TPB Staff Director  
Michael Grant, ICF  
**SUBJECT:** Proposed Initiatives for Consideration to Recommend for TPB Acceptance  
**DATE:** July 5, 2017

---

### **JULY 5 MEETING PURPOSE AND PROCESS**

To maintain the timeline mandated by the enabling resolution, the task force must select for recommendation for TPB's acceptance on July 19 a list of "approximately 6 to 10 projects, programs, and policies for further analysis."<sup>1</sup>

To achieve this purpose, task force members will come prepared to open the meeting by voting for their preferred 10 initiatives to recommend for analysis out of the 16 initiatives described in this memo. The COG/ICF team will answer brief clarifying questions on the 16 initiatives to facilitate voting. The outcome of this vote will not be binding, but will form the basis from which the task force will develop its recommendation to the TPB. If there is a clear consensus around carrying forward certain initiatives while dropping others, the task force will do so and engage in a deeper discussion of those that remain.

ICF will then facilitate a discussion of the remaining initiatives around which there was no clear consensus. Task force members will have the opportunity to propose adjustments to these initiatives to develop a consensus position. Voting and discussion will continue until the task force has completed its list of approximately 6 to 10 initiatives to recommend for further analysis.

### **INITIATIVES PROPOSED FOR CONSIDERATION**

Based on discussions at the June 21 Long-Range Plan Task Force meeting and subsequent written comments received from members, the COG/ICF team staff recrafted the "bundles" previously discussed into a set of 16 "initiatives," which may be considered mega-projects, mega-programs, or mega-policies of a regional scale and which may involve multiple components. Use of the term "initiative" allows the task force to proceed without needing to differentiate between those that are projects, policies, or programs.

The initiatives reflect the following principles and points of agreement reached at prior meetings:

- Each initiative goes beyond the existing CLRP.
- Because this stage is only moving initiatives on to analysis, considerations of viability (e.g., political, financial, etc.) have been limited.

---

<sup>1</sup> As charged in Resolution R16-2017 establishing the mission and tasks for Phase II of the Long-Range Plan Task Force.

- Each initiative has the potential to make substantial improvements to at least some portion of the region in achieving the goals described in TPB and COG’s governing documents.
- Where an initiative requires multiple components to achieve substantial improvements and those components all relate sufficiently to each other, they will be considered one cohesive mega-project/program/policy.

Table 1 shows the 16 initiatives under the following categories to enable comparisons among similar initiatives: Highway/Multimodal Projects; Transit Projects; Technology/System Operations; Land Use Policy; and Travel Demand Management and Pricing Policies.

Each initiative has one row with separate columns for the name of the initiative; the components of it; and comments to inform the task force’s consideration. The components column describes supporting actions for each initiative and includes changes in land use<sup>2</sup> where appropriate. For instance, major transit improvements are assumed to include improved local circulator buses, park-and-ride capacity (as appropriate), bicycle/pedestrian access, and supportive land use. Similarly, roadway improvements are assumed to include operational and multimodal improvements.

As requested by the task force, Table 2 shows the COG/ICF team’s rough qualitative assessment of how initiatives might perform using a high, medium, low, none, or negative rating; a rough estimate of costs was also included.<sup>3</sup> Table 2 is background information and should not control the task force’s decision-making process.

---

<sup>2</sup> Regarding land use, most initiatives would not affect development until at least 2020-2025; any shifts in households/jobs would be in new development over 2025-2045. Much of the analysis will be conducted using sketch planning methods where detailed assumptions and land use, infrastructure alignments (feasibility), etc. will generally not be applied; some results will simply be provided in general order-of-magnitude estimates of impacts. Impacts may continue after 2045 but would not be included in Visualize 2045.

<sup>3</sup> The team did not perform independent analysis of these initiatives, and these assessments may vary depending on how each initiative and its performance measures are defined for analysis.

**TABLE 1 – REVISED LIST OF 16 INITIATIVES**

<i>Initiative</i>	<i>Components</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<b>Highway/Multimodal Projects</b>		
<p><b>M1. Regional Express Travel Network</b></p> <p><i>[Similar to previous R1]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Express toll lanes network (HOV and transit free ) with added lanes where feasible on all existing limited access highways (including remaining portion of the Capital Beltway, I-270, Dulles Toll Road, U.S. 50 and assumes expanded American Legion Bridge)</li> <li>New express bus services on network (paid in part through tolls) connecting major Activity Centers.</li> </ul>	<p>This initiative is similar to the previous CLRP Aspirations scenario and addresses many of the top congestion hotspots in the region, including those along I-495 and the I-270 spur.</p> <p>M1 addresses most of the congestion hotspots in M2, plus more. Staff recommends to not select both M1 and M2.</p>
<p><b>M2. Regional Roadway Congestion Hotspot Relief</b></p> <p><i>[Component of previous R7]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Address top 5 congestion hotspots all time and top 5 congestion hotspots peak-only, including adjoining connections (I-495 IL between VA-267 and I-270 spur, I-495 IL between MD-355 and MD-185, I-495 OL between I-270 and MD-190, I-495 OL between MD-193 and I-95, I-95 SB at VA-123, DC-295 SB at Benning Rd., I-270 SPUR SB between Democracy Blvd. and I-495)</li> <li>Incorporate enhanced system operations strategies (e.g., ramp metering, active traffic management) as feasible</li> </ul>	<p>Many of these regional congestion hotspots are addressed by the M1 Regional Express Travel Network. Staff recommends to not select both M1 and M2.</p>
<p><b>M3. Additional Northern Bridge Crossing/Corridor</b></p> <p><i>[Component of previous R7]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New northern bridge crossing of Potomac River, as multimodal corridor (VA Rt. 28 extended across the Potomac into Maryland to connect to ICC, with limited interchanges)</li> <li>New express bus services connecting Activity Centers in the corridor)</li> </ul>	<p>Assume some shifting of land use to Activity Centers in this corridor.</p>

<b>Initiative</b>	<b>Components</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Transit Projects</b>		
<b>T4. Regional Priority Bus Corridors</b>  <i>[Previous component of R2]</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Priority bus service on WMATA’s Priority Corridor Network – Includes improved operational strategies such as transit signal priority/exclusive bus lanes, increased frequency and span or service, enhanced bus stops, etc. with corridors in DC [e.g., Georgia Ave, Wisconsin Ave], MD [e.g., University Blvd, Veirs Mill Rd, US29], and VA [e.g., Richmond Hwy, Columbia Pike];</li> <li>Additional DC streetcar line (north-south) as complement to network</li> </ul>	<p>These are the highest WMATA bus ridership corridors in the region and will include express routes along existing Metrobus routes.</p>
<b>T5. Regionwide Bus Rapid Transit and Transitways</b>  <i>[Previous component of R2]</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bus rapid transit (BRT)/transitway networks in Montgomery County, Prince George’s County, Northern Virginia (TransAction 2040), DC, and transitway from Branch Ave to Waldorf.</li> </ul>	<p>These are often new routes and could represent a higher level of transit service than in T4</p>
<b>T6. Regional Commuter Rail Enhancements</b>  <i>[Previous R3]</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VRE System Plan 2040 and MARC Growth and Investment Plan (including run-thru and two-way service on selected lines, increased frequency and hours of service)</li> <li>Long Bridge corridor improvements including at least 4 tracks and bicycle-pedestrian facilities</li> </ul>	
<b>T7. Metrorail Regional Core Capacity Improvements</b>  <i>[Previous R4: Metrorail Expansion – Stage 1 plus component of previous R5: Metrorail Expansion – Stage 2]</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100% 8-car trains</li> <li>Metrorail station improvements at high-volume stations in system core</li> <li>Second Rosslyn station to reduce interlining and increase frequency</li> <li>New Metrorail core line to add capacity across Potomac River (new Rosslyn tunnel) between Virginia and DC through Georgetown to Union Station toward Waterfront</li> </ul>	

<b>Initiative</b>	<b>Components</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>T8. Metrorail Extensions</b></p> <p><i>[Component of previous R5: Metrorail Expansion – Stage 2]]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metrorail extensions to Centreville/Gainesville, Hybla Valley/Potomac Mills</li> <li>• Can consider an extension in MD, such as to National Harbor, to make this more regionally focused (to be defined later)</li> </ul>	<p>Cannot choose T8 without choosing T7, since core capacity is needed.</p> <p>May want to consider choosing between this and T5, which serves some similar functions</p> <p>Assume some shifting of land use to Activity Centers in these corridors.</p>
<p><b>T9. Regional Circumferential Light Rail System</b></p> <p><i>[Previous R6]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purple line extension to Tysons (west) and Eisenhower Avenue (east)</li> </ul>	<p>Assume some shifting of land use to Activity Centers in this corridor.</p>
<b>Technology / System Operations</b>		
<p><b>X10. Technology and Operational Improvements</b></p> <p><i>[Previous R12 and component of R8]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expanded regional incident management</li> <li>• Integrated corridor management (includes traveler information systems, and transit signal priority)</li> <li>• Reversible lanes on key highways and arterials (e.g., concepts applied on Connecticut Avenue in DC) along with improved arterial design such as turn movement treatments (to be identified based on strong directional flows)</li> <li>• Demand-responsive services for persons with limited mobility and general population</li> </ul>	<p>One option might be to combine this initiative with M2, or instead utilize these strategies as the primary focus of the congestion hotspot initiative</p>
<p><b>X11. Autonomous/ Connected Vehicles</b></p> <p><i>[Previous component of R8]</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicle-to-infrastructure CV investments</li> <li>• Potential for AV lanes</li> </ul>	<p>There is high potential for AVs/CVs to significantly alter roadway effective capacity, safety, and travel demands, and a lot of uncertainties. This could potentially be explored outside of the initiatives selected.</p>

<b>Initiative</b>	<b>Components</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Land Use Policy</b>		
<b>L12. Optimize Regional Land-Use Balance</b>  <i>[Previous R9]</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redistributing jobs/housing to increase jobs on the eastern side</li> <li>• Redistributing housing around underutilized rail stations and Activity Centers with high-capacity transit</li> <li>• Build more housing in the region to match employment (about 130,000 more households)</li> </ul>	<p>This policy would attempt to maximize land use benefit, and could be synergistic with several other initiatives. For example, this could be paired with infrastructure investments that focus on east-west divide projects, such as light rail connecting Silver Spring to Eisenhower Avenue and DC streetcars (cross-Anacostia connection); those are in T4 and T9.</p>
<b>Travel Demand Management and Pricing Policies</b>		
<b>P13. Transit Fare Policy Changes</b>  <i>[Previous component of R2, R4 and R5]</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced price Metrorail fare for off-peak direction during peak period and on underutilized segments</li> <li>• Free transit for low-income residents</li> </ul>	<p>This policy would be supportive of transit and multimodal improvement initiatives that attempt to draw more riders onto transit.</p>
<b>P14. Employer-based Travel Demand Management</b>  <i>[Previous R12]</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employer-based parking cash-out</li> <li>• Expanded employer-based transit/vanpool benefits</li> <li>• Expanded telework and flexible schedule adoption</li> <li>• Substantial increase in priced parking in major Activity Centers</li> </ul>	<p>These strategies could be implemented through an array of different policies (e.g., employer requirements) and/or programs (e.g., incentives for telework). Assumes significant expansion beyond current robust TDM programs in region.</p>
<b>P15. Gas and/or VMT tax / Full Road Pricing</b>  <i>[Previous component of R13]</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase price of all travel in region</li> </ul>	<p>Revenue generation could be used to fund project investment priorities, such as highway, transit or TDM programs investments, and pricing could maximize impact of those investments.</p>
<b>P16. Cordon Pricing</b>  <i>[Previous R14]</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toll to enter urban core</li> </ul>	<p>Revenue generation could be used to fund project investment priorities, such as highway, transit or TDM programs investments, and pricing could maximize impact of those investments.</p>

**TABLE 2 – ROUGH QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF INITIATIVES**

Initiative	Roadway Congestion	Transit Crowding	Inadequate Bus Service	Inadq & Unsafe Walk/Bike Fac	Under Develop. Around Metro	Inadq. Housing Near Jobs	Metro Repair Needs	Roadway Repair Needs	Rdwy & Transt Incidents	Walk / Bike Safety	Air & Water Quality	Open Space Preservation	Bottlenecks	Travel Time Reliability (to airports)	Cost
M1. Regional Express Travel Network	Medium	Lower	Medium	None	None	None	None	None	Lower	None	None	None	Medium	Medium	-
M2. Regional Roadway Congestion Hotspot Relief	Medium	None	None	None	Negative	None	None	Negative	Lower	None	None	None	Medium	Lower	\$\$
M3. Additional Northern Bridge Crossing/Corridor	Lower	None	Lower	None	Negative	None	None	Negative	None	None	Negative	Negative	Lower	Medium	\$
T4. Regional Priority Bus Corridors	Lower	Lower	Higher	None	Lower	None	None	None	Lower	None	Lower	None	Lower	Lower	\$\$
T5. Regionwide Bus Rapid Transit and Transitways	Lower	Lower	Higher	None	Lower	None	None	None	Lower	None	Lower	None	Lower	Lower	\$\$
T6. Regional Commuter Rail Enhancements	Lower	Lower	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	Lower	Medium	\$
T7. Metrorail Regional Core Capacity Improvements	Lower	Higher	None	None	Lower	None	Negative	None	Lower	None	Lower	None	Medium	Medium	\$\$\$
T8. Metrorail Extensions	Lower	Negative	None	Lower	Lower	None	Negative	None	None	None	Lower	None	None	Lower	\$\$\$
T9. Regional Circumferential Light Rail System	Lower	None	Lower	Lower	Medium	None	None	None	None	None	Lower	None	Lower	Lower	\$\$
X10. Technology and Operational Improvements	Lower	None	Lower	None	None	None	None	None	Lower	Lower	Lower	None	Lower	Lower	\$
X11. Autonomous/ Connected Vehicles	Medium	None	Medium	Lower	None	None	None	None	Higher	Lower	Lower	None	Lower	Medium	\$
L12. Optimize Regional Land-Use Balance	Medium	Lower	None	Medium	Higher	Higher	None	None	None	None	Lower	Lower	Lower	None	-
P13. Transit Fare Policy Changes	Lower	Negative	None	None	Lower	None	None	None	None	None	Lower	None	None	None	\$
P14. Employer-based Travel Demand Management	Medium	Medium	Lower	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	Medium	None	Lower	Lower	-
P15. Gas and/or VMT tax / Full Road Pricing	Medium	Negative	None	None	Lower	None	Medium	Medium	None	None	Lower	None	None	Lower	+
P16. Cordon Pricing	Medium	Negative	None	None	Lower	None	Medium	Medium	None	None	Lower	None	None	None	+