National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board

MEMORANDUM

TO: Long-Range Plan Task Force
FROM: Kanti Srikanth, TPB Staff Director
Michael Grant, ICF
SUBJECT: Preview of Results Tables
DATE: November 9, 2017

This memo introduces tables that will present results from analysis of the ten initiatives. There will be a short period of time next week for the task force to review the results of the analysis before discussing it at the meeting on November 15, so staff hopes that by sharing the draft format of the results tables in advance, task force members could more quickly understand the results once they become available. Because these tables are still in draft status they may look slightly different next week, but the general content and structure will be the same. Task force members are encouraged to review the attachments to the other task force-related memo from today (November 9) titled "Update on Long-Range Plan Task Force Activities," which contains important background information describing the goals, challenges, initiatives, assumptions, upcoming process, and more.

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE ACROSS CHALLENGES RELATIVE TO 2040 CLRP

The purpose of this table is to illustrate how effectively each initiative addressed each challenge. It contains the regional challenges identified by the task force in the rows, and the initiatives in the columns. Each cell in the main body of the table displays a "Consumer Reports" style rating score, which shows whether the initiative performed High, Medium, Low, Neutral, or Negative, relative to the 2040 Constrained Long-Range Plan (2040). The 2040 CLRP column is filled in with Neutral scores, because the planned transportation and land use for 2040 as documented in the 2040 CLRP is considered the baseline for this analysis. The initiatives have been compared to this 2040 CLRP baseline, and are not compared to our existing conditions today.

The highlighted "Example Initiative" column is filled in with sample ratings, so that task force members can preview what it would be like to examine the results for an initiative. When this table is complete, there will be a rating score in each of the cells, representing how well each initiative addressed each challenge.

The ratings will ultimately be determined by the professional judgment of staff and consultants, based on quantitative and qualitative assessments of the MOEs and qualitative evaluation.

TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE ACROSS QUANTITATIVE MOES RELATIVE TO 2040 CLRP

The purpose of this table is to illustrate each initiative's performance on the quantitative MOEs relative to the 2040 CLRP. The 2040 CLRP column will display the baseline MOEs. The cells in the main body of the table will display the percent difference between analyzed initiatives and the 2040

CLRP. In some instances, an initiative will not have demonstrated change from the 2040 CLRP, in which case the cell will contain a "0". If an initiative results in a higher MOE compared to the CLRP, a positive percentage change will be displayed, and if an initiative results in a lower MOE compared to the CLRP, a negative percentage change will be displayed. A sample of this can be seen in the highlighted "Example Initiative" column.

Its important to note that the positive and negative changes of an MOE do not necessarily correspond to a positive or negative impact on the region. For example, if "Example Initiative" results in an increase in VOC emissions relative to the CLRP, a percent change with a positive sign will denote the relative increase – however, everyone would agree that this is not a positive impact on the region, it is a negative one. Task force members should keep this important point in mind when reviewing the results of the initiatives and the MOEs.

ADDITIONAL TABLES

There are additional results tables that are not shown in this preview but that will be available when the results are released:

- Tables that show the quantitative MOEs that relate to each challenge (some challenges were solely evaluated qualitatively), which can help shed light onto how challenge ratings were determined
- Tables that show qualitative assessments in regard to other factors, such as implementation costs, user costs, and right-of-way requirements

Table 1 (SAMPLE): Summary of Performance Across Challenges Relative to 2040 CLRP

	BASE	EX	I1	I2	I3	I4	I5	I6	I7	I8	I9	I10
CHALLENGES	2040 CLRP	EXAMPLE INITIATIVE	Express Travel Network	Operational Improvements & Hot Spot Relief	Add'l Northern Bridge	BRT and Transitways	Commuter Rail	Metrorail Core Capacity	Transit Rail Extensions	Optimize Regional Land-Use Balance	Transit Fare Policy Changes	Employer-Based Travel Demand Management
Road Congestion	○	○										
Transit Crowding	○	◉										
Inadequate Bus Service	○	◓										
Unsafe Walking & Biking	○	◉										
Development around Metrorail	○	◒										
Housing & Job Location	○	●										
Metrorail Repair Needs	○	○										
Roadway Repair Needs	○	◓										
Incidents and Safety	○	◉										
Pedestrian & Bicyclist Safety	○	◒										
Environmental Quality	○	●										
Open Space Development	○	○										
Bottlenecks	○	○										
Travel Time Reliability	○	◓										

KEY: ◉ High ◓ Medium ◒ Low ○ Neutral ● Negative

Source: Analyses performed by COG, ICF, SWA, and F&P.

Table 2 (SAMPLE): Summary of Performance Across Quantitative MOEs Relative to 2040 CLRP

QUANTITATIVE MOES	BASE 2040 CLRP	EX EXAMPLE INITIATIVE	I1 Express Travel Network	I2 Operational Improvements & Hot Spot Relief	I3 Add'l Northern Bridge	I4 BRT and Transitways	I5 Commuter Rail	I6 Metrorail Core Capacity	I7 Transit Rail Extensions	I8 Optimize Regional Land-Use Balance	I9 Transit Fare Policy Changes	I10 Employer-Based Travel Demand Management
Commute Travel Time (Single-occupancy vehicle)	#	-1%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Commute Travel Time (High-occupancy vehicle)	#	0	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Commute Travel Time (Transit)	#	+1%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Vehicle Hours of Delay (Daily)	#	+2%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Jobs Accessible by Transit: # of jobs accessible within 45-minute transit commute	#	+3%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Jobs Accessible by Auto: # of jobs accessible within 45-minute car commute	#	+1%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Commute Mode Share: Single-occupancy vehicle	#	0	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Commute Mode Share: High-occupancy vehicle	#	0	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Commute Mode Share: Transit	#	+1%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Commute Mode Share: Bicycle/Walking	#	-2%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Reliable Trips: share of daily trips on reliable modes	#	+2%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Daily VMT	#	0	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Daily VMT per capita	#	0	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Transit Options for Households: share of HH in zones with high-capacity transit	#	+1%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Transit Options for Employment: Share of jobs in zones with high-capacity transit	#	+4%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
VOC Emissions	#	+1%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
NOx Emissions	#	0	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
CO_2 Emissions	#	0	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%

Source: Analyses performed by COG, ICF, SWA, and F&P.