



MEMORANDUM

DRAFT

For Technical Committee Review

TO: Transportation Planning Board
FROM: Kanti Srikanth, TPB Staff Director
Michael Grant, ICF
SUBJECT: Status Report on Long-Range Plan Task Force Activities
DATE: November 9, 2017

This memo provides a summary of activities related to the Long-Range Plan Task Force from the month of October and lays out next steps in the process.

RECAP OF OCTOBER 18 MEETING

At its meeting on October 18 the task force was briefed on the final list of performance measures that will be used to present the results of the technical analysis (Attachment A). The task force also discussed “a process by which to select improvement initiatives from amongst the ten analyzed to recommend the TPB endorse for future concerted TPB action.” Staff recommended a process which is described in detail in Attachment B. The task force discussed the proposed process, and came to general agreement that this process would be followed.

To briefly summarize this process: members will consider the results of the analysis as represented through the assessments of the various MOEs to help determine which of the 10 initiatives they would support recommending to the TPB for its endorsement. Additionally, members would consider other factors not reflected in the MOEs including a set of factors listed in the memo in attachment B. Members will be free to choose any number of the 10 initiatives to recommend to the TPB and would be asked to indicate their priority for each initiative they select to forward to the TPB. The Task Force will first select initiatives that were supported by at least two thirds of the members to forward to the TPB. Members will have an opportunity to discuss other initiatives that fell short of the two thirds support but were rated as high priority by those who supported it and consider changes to the initial list of initiatives. In this way, the task force will arrive at a set of initiatives to recommend to the TPB for its endorsement. The task force may choose to take a second vote on the final set of initiatives to recommend to the TPB.

The task force also discussed what endorsement by the TPB would mean, as well as what future concerted action by TPB would mean. The concepts put forward for the task force are summarized in Attachment B. One main theme of this discussion acknowledged that the TPB cannot and will not attempt to force member jurisdictions or agencies to adopt projects, programs or policies – but that the TPB can and should be leaders in setting goals and aiming high to improve the performance of the regional transportation system. Members of the task force encouraged the TPB to play a strong role in encouraging regional focus and cooperation on the initiatives.

NEXT STEPS

At its November 15 meeting, the TPB will be briefed on the draft results of the technical analysis of the ten initiatives. The task force will meet after the board's meeting to begin a detailed discussion on the results of the analysis. At this meeting the task force will determine whether they would like to hold an additional meeting on November 29 to continue discussing the results of the analysis and to continue forming their recommendation to TPB. The task force will meet on December 6 to select the initiatives to recommend to the TPB for its endorsement at its meeting on the 20th.

SCHEDULE FOR REMAINING ACTIVITIES

Meeting Date	Proposed Focus of Meeting
November 15 - TPB 12:00–2:00 P.M.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Status report on October task force activities and next steps.• Receive presentation of Draft Results of the analysis of the 10 improvement initiatives.
November 15 – Task Force 2:15–4:00 P.M.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discuss findings and takeaways from the Draft Results of the analysis.
November 29 – Task Force (IF NEEDED) 12:00–2:00 P.M.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Additional meeting of the task force, <u>if needed</u>, to further discuss the findings and takeaways of the analysis.
December 6 – Task Force 2:00–4:00 P.M.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Select a limited set of improvement initiatives from amongst the ten initiatives analyzed to recommend the TPB endorse, as called for in resolution establishing the task force.
December 20 – TPB 12:00–2:00 P.M.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Receive task force's recommendation on a subset of improvement initiatives.• Discuss and act on proposed resolution endorsing a subset of improvement initiatives for future concerted effort by TPB.



Memorandum

To: TPB Long-Range Plan Task Force
From: ICF Team and TPB staff
Date: October 12, 2017
Re: Selected Measures of Effectiveness for Long-Range Plan Task Force Study

This memo includes revisions and updates to the recommended MOEs in response to feedback received at the task force's September meeting. In instances where the input could not be addressed as part of the MOE, the memo describes how we plan to respond to the suggestion.

Desired MOE Characteristics

It is useful to recall the characteristics of the MOEs that are being sought on several desired outcomes:

1. The MOEs should address the regional goals and challenges that the task force hopes these initiatives will address, which articulate the specifics of the task force's dissatisfaction with the anticipated long-term performance of the transportation system in the CLRP.
2. The same MOEs will be reported for each initiative and will be reported at the regional level, and no MOEs will be reported at a jurisdictional or sub-regional level.
3. The MOEs should reflect best practices in measuring what matters to the public and transportation system performance outcomes.
4. The number of MOEs should be manageable (ideally no more than about 12-16) to facilitate comparisons and clearly communicate the most important issues to the region. The number of MOEs currently shown may be more than is appropriate for final reporting, and the ICF team seeks the task force's input on whether to prioritize or eliminate any.
5. For some MOEs, it may be more meaningful to present the final results as a percentage change from the CLRP rather than reporting raw numbers.
6. Finally, the MOEs must be assessable within the context of the rapid sketch planning-level analysis being conducted. Quantifiable measures that would take significant

time to develop or calculate cannot be used in the context of this study timeframe, and qualitative ratings will be used where quantified figures cannot be developed.

MOEs Selected For Use

The table below lists the selected MOEs which reflect regional goals and challenges, as well as best practices. They also represent what can be generated under the sketch planning framework and schedule adopted for the analysis. As discussed during the task force's September meeting, a combination of quantitative and qualitative assessments of the MOEs will be provided to compare how each initiative performs relative to the others. Additionally, details on how each MOE is calculated will be discussed in the final report.

Measures of Effectiveness

1. Travel time (average travel time per trip for each mode)
2. Traditional congestion (vehicle hours of delay)
3. Accessibility by transit (% change in # of jobs accessible within 45 min transit commute)
4. Accessibility by auto (% change in # of jobs accessible within 45 min car commute)
5. Mode share for work trips (non-single occupant vehicle, transit)
6. Daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) or VMT per capita
7. Rail transit crowding (qualitative)
8. Transit options for households (share of households in high capacity transit zones)
9. Transit options for employment (share of jobs in high capacity transit zones)
10. Reliable trips (share of trips on reliable modes – express lanes, BRT and transit)
11. Access/reliability to interregional hubs (major airports and Union Station, qualitative)
12. Mobile/on-road emissions (VOC, NOx, and CO2)
13. Water quality/habitat (qualitative)
14. Open space development (qualitative)
15. Safe walking and biking options (qualitative)
16. Metrorail repair needs (qualitative)
17. Roadway repair needs (qualitative)

The following section summarizes the response to specific questions/suggestions received during the task force's September 18, 2017 meeting.

- Travel times: The analysis will focus on work purpose trips on a typical weekday. The report will describe how each MOE is being measured.

- Reliable trips: This measure is a surrogate for a more direct measurement of travel reliability that is not possible with sketch planning tools. The measure will represent the proportion of typical weekday work trips that will be made on a relatively reliable mode of travel such as transit on a dedicated travelway or vehicles using express toll facilities.
- Mode share: This measure will provide the share of a typical weekday work trips as single occupant vehicles, rideshare (carpool/vanpool) and transit (bus and rail).
- Airport reliability/access: This was proposed as an experimental measure intended to represent reliable intercity travel into and out of the region's airports. Reliable access to airports is explicitly identified as one of the challenges the region faces. As discussed during the September meeting, the team acknowledges that Union Station would be another key facility that facilitates intercity travel. The team believes that this measure could more aptly be titled Access/reliability to interregional hubs and include the major airports and Union Station. After considering the options for developing a quantitative assessment for this measure, the team has concluded that analytical options available will not be viable within the project timeframe. Instead, we will present a qualitative assessment of how each initiative would change access and reliability to the airports and Union Station.
- Rail transit crowding: At the last task force meeting, it was noted that increasing transit ridership is one of the priorities of the TPB, in addition to reducing transit crowding. Therefore, reducing transit crowding should not come at the expense of transit ridership but through enhancements to transit capacity in areas facing crowded conditions. After further examination of analytical options for developing a quantitative estimate of crowding within transit vehicles (particularly Metrorail) the team has concluded that it will not be viable within the project timeframe to develop a quantitative measure of transit crowding impacts for all ten of the initiatives. Instead, the team will present a qualitative assessment of how each initiative will affect rail transit crowding.
- Transit options: These measures will capture the improvement in access to high-capacity transit by households and by jobs. For this analysis, high-capacity transit will include Metrorail, Commuter rail, BRT and Light rail, as is standard in COG's other studies. The list of MOEs distributed to the task force during its September meeting had erroneously referred to high-capacity transit as "high-quality" transit, and this has been corrected.
- Right-of-way needs: Given the conceptual nature of the various infrastructure improvement initiatives and the lack of specific alignment and engineering information, we will not have specific enough information to produce estimates of right-of-way needs and potential community and environmental impacts as a performance measure. In recognition of the importance of these issues, however,

right-of-way needs and associated community/environmental impacts is proposed as one of the additional factors to be considered (in addition to costs and other feasibility factors) as the task force and the Board evaluates which of the initiatives the TPB may wish to endorse for future concerted action (see memo on process recommendations). For that evaluation, we will provide a general statement as to whether or not each initiative will require additional right of way.

- User costs: At the September task force meeting, several members expressed an interest in understanding how each initiative might affect user's transportation costs and transportation affordability. Although the sketch-level of this analysis will not allow us to quantitatively assess the changes in user costs as a performance measure, user costs is proposed as one of the additional factors to be considered as the task force and the Board evaluates the initiatives to endorse for future concerted action (see memo on process recommendations). We will provide a qualitative assessment of whether each initiative might tend to increase or decrease users' transportation costs.



Memorandum

To: Long-Range Plan Task Force
From: ICF Team and TPB Staff
Date: October 12, 2017
Re: Potential Processes for LRPTF and TPB to Select Among Initiatives and Factors to Consider

Resolution R16-2017, which established the Long-Range Plan Task Force, charges the task force to “develop a process by which the TPB will later endorse a final selection from among these [ten initiatives] for future concerted TPB action.” In its October 18th meeting, the task force will discuss and finalize the process by which it will select initiatives from among the ten analyzed to recommend for TPB’s endorsement. After completion of the sketch planning analysis of the initiatives, the task force will use this process in its December 6th meeting to select the initiatives to put forward for endorsement by the TPB. Both the process used and the recommendations will be presented to the TPB at its December 20th meeting for action.

This memo contains three components:

1. Definition of the intended outcomes of this process;
2. Factors to consider in selecting among initiatives; and
3. A recommended process for selecting initiatives.

Outcomes of this Process

While the TPB will determine what its endorsement means, we anticipate that it would mean that the concepts represented by the endorsed initiatives have the potential to improve the performance of the region's transportation system beyond what is anticipated by its current long-range transportation plan and deserve to be comprehensively examined for implementation. We believe that the endorsement would allow including the concepts represented by these improvement initiatives in the aspirational element of the 2018 update of the TPB’s long-range plan, *Visualize 2045*.

While the TPB will determine what constitutes future concerted action, we believe that at a minimum it would involve a commitment by all TPB member jurisdictions and agencies to collaborate and undertake a further examination of the concepts represented by the endorsed initiatives to identify short- and long-term implementation actions. The intent of

such an effort is that these actions are pursued with the goal of ultimately including them in future updates to the region's long-range transportation plan.

Factors to Consider in Selecting Among Initiatives

Each task force member and the task force body as a whole will consider many factors as they compare and evaluate the initiatives. We anticipate that the members will use the measures of effectiveness (MOEs), which relate to each of the region's identified challenges, as important factors for comparing how each initiative performs relative to the others. In addition, other factors not captured in the MOEs will also be important considerations. The technical analysis will not be providing any quantitative estimates for these other factors. Staff will provide some qualitative information, where possible and as noted below, that could inform the members' consideration of the initiatives worthy of TPB's endorsement.

Measures of Effectiveness

As noted earlier, MOEs that are being analyzed (listed below) include both quantitative and qualitative measures and will reflect the regional goals and challenges.

Measures of Effectiveness

1. Travel time (average travel time per trip for each mode)
2. Traditional congestion (vehicle hours of delay)
3. Accessibility by transit (% change in # of jobs accessible within 45 min transit commute)
4. Accessibility by auto (% change in # of jobs accessible within 45 min car commute)
5. Mode share for work trips (non-single occupant vehicle, transit)
6. Daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) or VMT per capita
7. Rail transit crowding (qualitative)
8. Transit options for households (share of households in high capacity transit zones)
9. Transit options for employment (share of jobs in high capacity transit zones)
10. Reliable trips (share of trips on reliable modes – express lanes, BRT and transit)
11. Access/reliability to interregional hubs (major airports and Union Station, qualitative)
12. Mobile/on-road emissions (VOC, NOx, and CO2)
13. Water quality/habitat (qualitative)
14. Open space development (qualitative)
15. Safe walking and biking options (qualitative)
16. Metrorail repair needs (qualitative)
17. Roadway repair needs (qualitative)

Other Factors beyond the MOEs

In addition to the MOEs, several other factors that members may wish to consider are identified below:

- *Costs of Implementation.* Public sector costs for implementing the initiatives – including potential capital and on-going operating costs – may be an important factor to consider in relation to the ability of the region to advance the initiative. The ICF team/TPB staff will provide qualitative (high-medium-low) estimates for comparing the rough order of magnitude of implementation costs. More detailed cost estimates would depend on project details that are more specific than are available at this time, including phasing, alignment, and right of way costs.
- *Affordability and User Costs.* Some of the initiatives will reduce users' transportation costs (e.g., transit fare reductions) while others will increase some costs or create options (e.g., toll roads) that might be unaffordable for low and moderate income households. In addition, congestion relief and shifts to transit can reduce vehicle operating costs. While these costs are difficult to compare and will not be quantified, the team will identify what aspects of each initiative might tend to increase or decrease users' transportation costs.
- *East-West Divide and Equitable Distribution of Benefits.* Only one initiative explicitly addresses the East-West divide, but some may appear to benefit one portion of the region over the other. Although this will not be assessed quantitatively, this may be a factor for some members to consider.
- *Right-of-Way and Community and Other Environmental Impacts.* Due to the coarse representation upon which these initiatives are being studied – which, for example, do not define specific alignments – the project team is unable to estimate detailed right-of-way costs and potential threats to environmentally sensitive areas. However, some initiatives will require new right-of-way, which may cause displacements of homes or businesses, create community impacts (e.g., noise, barrier effects), or affect environmentally sensitive areas. These and other considerations would need to be explored more in later stages, but these can be important considerations. To assist with their consideration, the team will identify whether each initiative will or will not require the acquisition of new right of way.
- *Placemaking.* In addition to effects on transportation system performance, the initiatives differ in terms of likely effectiveness in supporting transit-oriented development, mixed use development, and placemaking. To assist with this consideration, the team can identify likely positive or neutral/negative impacts.
- *Public Support and Implementation Feasibility.* Each of the members represents different constituents with different priorities. The members may want to consider whether the projects will receive support or staunch opposition from any of the jurisdictions that the project would need support from to be implementable. They may also want to consider the likelihood of passing any required supporting legislation or policies.

Relationship of Initiatives

In addition to the impacts of initiatives and other factors identified above, it may be valuable for the members to consider the relationship of initiatives to each other. For instance, some initiatives may have *synergistic effects* – meaning that some initiatives (particularly those focused on policies and programs) can help to support and enhance the effectiveness of others. In contrast, some initiatives may have *antagonistic effects* or *overlap* in ways such that implementing multiple initiatives would not generate greater benefits. For instance, this may be the case for rail and express bus services, which may serve the same or similar markets, and so combining an additional major transit service on the same corridor may tend to take ridership from the other.

Within the constraints of this effort, the team will not be able to analyze initiatives in combination, but could potentially provide a qualitative assessment of those that are mutually supportive and those that are not as part of the discussion deliberation.

Recommended Process for Selecting Initiatives

There are multiple processes available by which the task force could select from among the 10 initiatives, and for the TPB to endorse a final selection. The process below is recommended as a workable solution to come to consensus within the constraints of the time-frame of this effort.

Rules, Guidelines, and Definitions

Before finalizing the process, it will be useful for the task force to agree upon some rules, guidelines, and definitions so that the members have a common understanding.

Specifically:

- **Endorsing a concept (not all individual components)** – It will be important for the TPB to keep in mind that endorsement of any of the initiatives does not mean endorsing every individual component of that initiative (for instance, it would not necessarily mean endorsement of each individual transitway facility, rail extension, or express lane facility within an initiative concept) or specific alignments. It would mean that the members believe the broad initiative concept (e.g., regional transitway expansion, a regional express lane network, etc.) is worthy of additional exploration and regional efforts to advance the concepts through further detailed project studies, program development, or policy initiatives. The meaning of TPB's endorsement would not be a mandate from the TPB for its member jurisdictions to alter their own plans, programs, or policies or to design, fund, and implement these initiatives without further study.
- **Meaning of “future concerted TPB action”** – The task force should have a common view of what endorsement for future concerted TPB action means. For instance, we recommend that endorsement means that the TPB finds the concepts/ideas in the endorsed improvement initiatives hold promise to make significantly better progress towards achieving the goals laid out in TPB and COG's governing documents and the TPB urges its member jurisdictions to commit to undertaking a more thorough and detailed examination of these improvement concepts/ideas.

- **What constitutes sufficient support for initiatives to recommend to the TPB** – As part of developing a process to select improvement initiatives to recommend, the task force should determine what constitutes sufficient support for inclusion in the set to be recommended to the TPB. For instance, it will be important to consider whether majority support of the task force is sufficient to recommend an initiative or whether a higher standard of “consensus” is desired. (Should a majority that supports an initiative hold sway even if there is opposition, or should the goal be consensus among all members in the value of advancing an initiative?) We recommend that a higher standard than simple majority be used to ensure a reasonable degree of consensus on priority projects, programs, and policies for future action. Consequently, a 2/3 minimum threshold for support is proposed.
- **How many of the ten initiatives should the TPB endorse** – It will be valuable for the task force to consider how many initiatives to recommend, recognizing that including all ten or nearly all ten would make it challenging for the region to focus on priority projects, programs, and policies for future concerted action. That said, we do not recommend that the task force set a specific limit to the number of initiatives to move forward for TPB endorsement. Using a threshold, such as minimum 2/3 support, will likely limit the number of initiatives that result from this process, and we believe that the task force should have flexibility to advance those initiatives that the task force consensus believes should be endorsed.

Task Force Process for Selection

One option for selecting initiatives would involve the task force developing a single quantitative system where each MOE, along with other evaluation factors, would be weighted and scored, and then use that system as a means of prioritizing the initiatives. Although we considered this option, we believe that developing a common weighting system would be challenging for members with disparate interests develop. There likely would be a lot of difficulty and considerable time involved in determining and agreeing upon the weights associated with each factor and the score to assign to each measure based on the combination of qualitative and quantitative assessments.

Therefore, we recommend a simpler process building on a straw poll, in which members use their own judgment to consider each of the factors discussed above. This process would involve the following steps:

1. The task force will begin with a straw poll in which each member votes for the initiatives he/she wishes to advance. Each member would not be limited to voting for a specific number of initiatives, but could choose to support as many as he/she believes would be valuable to advance (from zero to all ten).
2. As part of the voting for initiatives, the members would assign a priority to each initiative based on their assessment of the MOEs and other factors. For instance, a member who votes to advance initiatives 10, 9 and 4 would mark which of the three initiatives would be his/her first, second and third priority. This supplemental information will be used later when determining the degree of support for the initiative to be part of the package recommended to the TPB. Voting would occur by putting numbered votes in “buckets” for each initiative, rather than a “hands up” or

visible recorded vote for each member.

3. The TPB staff will tabulate the votes to determine: a) the overall level of support to advance each initiative and identify how many of them reach a 2/3 votes threshold. Additionally, TPB staff will develop an overall score for each initiative which will be calculated by assigning 10 points for 1st priority, 9 points for 2nd priority, etc. This overall score totals will not be used as a threshold but simply to provide supplemental information for how members have prioritized the initiatives.
4. The task force will then engage in a discussion to debate the pros and cons of the various initiatives, starting with the set that reached the 2/3 threshold to determine whether all of these should be advanced, should it be whittled down, or if there may be others to add. Significant time will be provided for discussion, in which there can be a robust exchange of ideas on the perspectives and priorities of members.
5. Members can then make a motion to remove initiatives from those passing the 2/3 threshold or adding initiatives from those that did not pass the 2/3 threshold. These motions will be debated and discussed in order to come to agreement on a final set that is moved forward to the TPB as the task force's consensus recommendation.
6. The task force then may choose to hold a second round of voting to support the final list of initiatives recommended for TPB endorsement as a way to formalize the results (this could also offer an opportunity for a member to abstain or be on record against the consensus, if that is desired).

TPB Process for Endorsement

We recommend that a resolution be drafted for the TPB to endorse the consensus set of initiatives recommended by the task force. Discussion on the resolution can reflect the various considerations brought forth by the task force, as well as other perspectives that may wish to be addressed by the TPB members. The TPB's voting process will govern its action on this resolution including providing members of the Board an opportunity to make changes to the recommended set of initiatives that the full body will vote on.