

Comments Received after June 21, 2017 Long-Range Plan Task Force Meeting

June 26, 2017

VDOT Comments of Long Range Plan (page 1 of 1)

6.23.17

GENERAL COMMENTS

- We support the idea of combining land use changes with each project instead of treating this as a stand-alone initiative.
- We also recommend doing the same thing with the current R11 (TDM) and R12 (Shared Mobility). All three of these initiatives (Land Use, TDM and Shared Mobility), as well as the principle of multi-modalism, should be part of project development for any significant transportation or land development project. These could be over-arching principles that are a default part of the planning process.

EDITS:

R3

1. VRE and MARC System Plan 2040 (including run-thru and two-way service on selected lines)
2. Long Bridge corridor expansion improvements including at least 4 tracks and bicycle-pedestrian facilities.

R7

Split New Northern Potomac Crossing out from R7 as a separate initiative. Edit: New northern ~~crossing multimodal across~~ Potomac River crossing.

R8

1. ~~Reversible lanes on key highways, along with~~ improved arterial design features such as turn movement treatments-, reversible lanes on key highways where appropriate.

Add as a new initiative, or replace R1 with this more specific project:

I-495 Multi-modal Improvements

In a collaboration between Virginia and Maryland, extend the I-495 Express Lanes Across the American Legion Bridge to Interstate 270. Address bottlenecks at American Legion Bridge and at the Dulles Toll Road in Tysons. Project includes additional transit and carpool services and incentives as well as Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) technology.

From: Kari Snyder [<mailto:ksnyder3@mdot.state.md.us>]

(page 1 of 1)

Sent: Friday, June 23, 2017 4:26 PM

To: Lyn Erickson <lerickson@mwcog.org>; Kanti Srikanth <ksrikanth@mwcog.org>; Lori Zeller <lzeller@mwcog.org>

Cc: Heather Murphy <hmurphy@mdot.state.md.us>; R. Earl Lewis <rlewis1@mdot.state.md.us>; Charles Glass <cglass@mdot.state.md.us>; Mark Crampton <mcrampton1@mdot.state.md.us>

Subject: RE: LRPTF follow-ups, due tomorrow 6/23

Good Afternoon,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the initiatives of the Long-Range Plan Taskforce. Deputy Secretary Lewis asked me to send this response on his behalf. Below are our comments on modified bundles R1-R14:

- **R1 – Number 1 priority**
- R2 – Express buses will operate more freely and efficiently on Express Toll Lanes. That's the best way to promote a regional bus network.
- R3
- R4
- R5
- R6
- R7 – Separate into R7.1 (Address top 5 congestion hotspots) and R7.2 (New northern Potomac River crossing)
 - R7.1 – **Number 2 priority**, and make sure that the congested hot spots are in line with those identified as MDOT-SHA priorities
- **R8 – Number 3 priority**
- R9 – Combine with R10
- R10 – Combine with R9
- R11 – Combine with R12
- R12 – Combine with R11
- R13 – There is no political will to make this happen. We should not waste time and resources analyzing this.
- R14 – This is a regressive policy that would take away choices from middle to low income commuters in our region.

In the qualitative assessment of improvement potential of the top 10 bundles, R1, R7.1, and R8 are the only initiatives with a medium to high potential to positively affect roadway congestion and travel time reliability. Given the limited resources that all agencies and jurisdictions are dealing with, it would be wise to prioritize initiatives that have the most impacts on the most commuters in the National Capitol Region.

Thanks you again for all of your hard work. If you have any questions or need additional information, please let us know.



Kari Snyder

Regional Planner
Office of Planning and Capital Programming

Maryland Department of Transportation
7201 Corporate Center Drive
Hanover, Maryland 21076

410-865-1305
ksnyder3@mdot.state.md.us

Comments from Dan Emerine, DC Office of Planning (page 1 of 5)

Code	Theme	Projects	Programs	Policies	Dan's comments
R1	Regional Express Travel Network	<p>1. Express toll lanes network (free HOV) on all existing limited access and major travel facilities (includes remaining portion of the Capital Beltway)</p> <p>2. New express bus services on network</p>		<p>3. Redistribute forecast growth (within jurisdictions) to Activity Centers served by the express toll network</p>	no evidence that jobs and households would shift to be closer to HOT lanes
R2	Regional Rapid Bus System and Arterial Transit	<p>1. Express bus on WMATA's Priority Corridors Network and streetcar expansion in DC using dedicated lanes.</p> <p>2. Local BRT transitway Network (Montgomery Co., Prince George's Co., NVTA TA2040 TransAction, D.C., and transitway to Waldorf).</p>	<p>3. Subsidized/free fares for low-income population</p>	<p>4. Redistribute forecast growth (within jurisdictions) to increase density and concentrate mixed-use development around the regional rapid bus network</p>	<p>Change "BRT" to "transitway" to be mode neutral.</p> <p>Use current TransAction BRT network for NoVA, rather than the version from TransAction 2040 (ie the previous plan).</p>
R3	Expanded Commuter Rail System	<p>1. VRE and MARC System Plan 2040 (including run-thru and two-way service on selected lines).</p> <p>2. Long Bridge corridor expansion</p>		<p>3. Redistribute forecast growth (within jurisdictions) to increase density and concentrate mixed-use development in regional Activity Centers served by rail</p>	n/a
R4	Metrorail Expansion – Stage 1	<p>1. 100% 8-car trains, Metrorail station improvements at high-volume stations in system core, and new tunnel at Rosslyn and Metrorail inner loop</p>	<p>2. Reduce Metrorail fares in off-peak direction during peak period and on other underutilized Metrorail segments</p>	<p>3. Redistribute forecast growth (within jurisdictions) to increase density/mixed-use development around underutilized Metrorail stations</p>	n/a

Comments from Dan Emerine, DC Office of Planning (page 2 of 5)

R5	Metrorail Expansion – Stage 2 (requires R4)	<p>1. New tunnel at Rosslyn and Metrorail inner loop</p> <p>2. Extensions to Centreville or Gainesville/ Haymarket, Hybla Valley, Potomac Mills</p>	<p>3. Reduce Metrorail fares in off-peak direction during peak period and on other underutilized Metrorail segments</p>	<p>4. Redistribute forecast growth (within and between jurisdictions) to increase density/mixed-use development around underutilized Metrorail stations</p>	<p>Including "and between" strengthens the land use changes. It's supportable for this package because there are a lot of underused Metro stations.</p>
R6	Circumferential Light Rail-Multimodal System	<p>1. Purple line extension to Tysons (west) and Eisenhower Avenue (east).</p> <p>2. Complete Beltway HOT lanes, including Legion & Wilson bridges</p>	<p>2. Redistribute forecast growth (within jurisdictions) to increase density/mixed-use development around underutilized Metrorail stations and new light rail stations</p>	<p>This bundle could also be strengthened by adding subsidized low-income fares. Rethink this theme. Instead of building around circumferential LRT, make this the "Multimodal beltway" bundle instead.</p>	
R7	Cross-Region Connection/Relieve Regional Congestion Hotspots	<p>1. Address top 5 congestion hotspots (all time periods) per latest TPB CMP (I-495 IL between VA-267 and GW Pkwy, I-95 SB at VA-123, I-495 OL between MD-193 and MD-650, DC-295 SB at Benning Rd, I-270 Spur SB between Democracy Blvd and I-495 and AL Bridge)</p> <p>2. New northern crossing across Potomac River</p>	<p>2. Expanded ITS: Automated traffic incident management, advanced traveler information systems, integrated corridor management (ICM), active traffic management (ATM), and TSP.</p>	<p>Separate the new northern crossing, which is qualitatively different from the "hot spots," from this bundle. AL Bridge, on the other hand, is a hot spot.</p>	
R8	Technology and Design Improvements	<p>1. Reversible lanes on key highways, along with improved arterial design such as turn movement treatments</p>	<p>2. Expanded ITS: Automated traffic incident management, advanced traveler information systems, integrated corridor management (ICM), active traffic management (ATM), and TSP.</p>	<p>Add TSP to strengthen this a little.</p>	

Comments from Dan Emerine, DC Office of Planning (page 3 of 5)

R9	Increase Accessibility – Stage 1: Optimize Land-Use/Regional Balance			1. More balanced jobs/housing distribution throughout the region via incentivizing job growth on the eastern side of the region and higher density development around underutilized rail stations	this should explicitly move development across jurisdictional lines (same comment applies to R10)
R10	Increase Accessibility – Stage 2: Support Underserved Communities (encompasses R9)	1. Address east-west divide through projects connecting Equity Emphasis Areas, such as light rail connecting Silver Spring to Branch-Eisenhower Avenue, expanding streetcars in DC (cross-Anacostia connections), and transitway-to-Waldorf . Full build-out of PCN on east side of region, plus upgrades to local bus network on east side (doubling of frequencies, at least in Activity Centers that qualify as EEAs?)	2. Subsidized/free transit fares for low income population, and greater accessibility for persons with disabilities (e.g., regionally accessible taxi network)	3. More balanced jobs/housing distribution throughout the region via incentivizing job growth on the eastern side of the region and higher density development around underutilized rail stations	There should be some way to account for the benefit a regional accessible taxi program would bring to WMATA's operating expenses, since this would dramatically reduce need for MetroAccess in its current delivery profile. Transit connections in the current staff bundle are not well-defined, and some of them have weak connections to EEAs or would attract few riders. Changes are suggested to strengthen these connections and Add the grid of streets in activity centers.
R11	Travel Demand Management	1. Construct grids of local streets in all activity centers.	4. 2. Implement employer-based trip reduction programs such as pricing parking, parking cash-out, transit subsidies, telework and flexible schedules		
R12	Shared Mobility Focus		1. Develop integrated plan for shared alternative modes (e.g. Uber, Lyft) and shared autonomous vehicles; subsidize ride-share; bikeshare expansion		n/a
R13	Increase Price of Driving		1. Price parking at major Activity Centers and CBDs	2. Higher gas tax or VMT tax	n/a

Comments from Dan Emerine, DC Office of Planning (page 4 of 5)

R14	Cordon Pricing			1. Cordon charge to access regional core (toll bridges) and/or Activity Centers	n/a
R15	NEW Potomac Crossing comparison - Metro tunnel	1. Rosslyn tunnel and Metro inner loop.		2. Redistribute growth between jurisdictions to increase TOD around new and underused stations	New proposed bundle
R16	NEW Potomac Crossing comparison - Legion Bridge expansion	1. HOT lanes on 495 between Tysons and I-270, including Legion Bridge			New proposed bundle
R17	NEW Potomac Crossing comparison - Outer Bridge	2. Express bus on 495 1. Dulles-to-Gaithersburg Potomac bridge		2. Redistribute growth between jurisdictions to increase greenfield development in Loudoun, Montgomery, & Frederick counties	Most realistic way to put Outer Bridge "by itself" for analysis
R18	NEW More housing			1. Add more housing to the region (not redistributing, adding to the total)	Improves jobs-housing balance, reduces or eliminates "super-commuters" with high VMT

Comments from Dan Emerine, DC Office of Planning (page 5 of 5)

From: Emerine, Dan (OP) [<mailto:Dan.Emerine@dc.gov>]

Sent: Monday, June 26, 2017 10:05 AM

To: Lyn Erickson <lerickson@mwkog.org>

Cc: Kanti Srikanth <ksrikanth@mwkog.org>

Subject: RE: LRP Task Force: comments/changes for staff bundles

One other point I forgot to add – I am still a little unclear on the precise nature of WMATA’s upcoming submission, but the gist of it seems to be that their new submissions (i.e., not currently in the CLRP) are necessary SOGR, and perhaps model-able. If that is the case, then I recommend those projects represent a “WMATA SOGR bundle” (call it “R0”) that should have priority in the list of 6-10 initiatives.

More broadly, with respect to Wednesday’s meeting: I’m extremely sympathetic to the challenge you face as staff in managing 2 years of work in about 7 months of time. I think part of the frustration and angst we saw on Wednesday was a manifestation of the compressed time line. There are multiple dynamics occurring here that are complicating the TF’s ability to give staff proper direction. Key among these are that TF members are angling to strategically position the process to advantage their preferred initiatives, and that TF members appear to lack a common vocabulary for the components of the process.

A suggestion for the latter issue is that staff could attempt a short glossary of key concepts that we have bandied about (“projects,” “bundles,” “policies”), along with some principles to delineate them. For example, “A ‘project’ consists of one or more capital improvement projects. Multiple capital projects may be considered a single “project” if they are very similar in the travel mode or problem addressed.” That may be too vague, perhaps you can do better. I think without some clearer definitions the TF process is going to continue to look like pinning Jell-o to the wall.

That’s not a silver bullet, but I hope it’s a helpful suggestion ...

Principles for Selecting Bundles: Metro SGR and going beyond what is currently assumed in the CLRP

- *WMATA Position:* It must be in the 6-10 projects/policies.
 - Why? At its most basic, the LRP will get boiled down to two lists – funded and unfunded – with maps and analysis of the elements on the lists. All the other written documentation will be extraneous. Advocacy for items on the unfunded list will begin, especially for the projects that are there. By not having full funding of Metro as one of the 6-10 projects/policies, the region runs the very real risk of it not ending up anywhere.
 - Work Around: As Allison shared with Eric and Lyn in an email on 6/22, the projects listed in Bundle R4 (8-car trains, station expansion, Rosslyn station) are incorporated in the new needs that we are submitting as part of the CLRP. While this does not fully comprise the new needs listed in the CNI, it does list the rail elements included that are model-able and relevant to the LRPTF. Some, but not all, of the PCN corridors are incorporated in the new needs as well.

Overall Comments on Bundles

- None of the project based bundles (R1-R8) include shifting land use across jurisdictional boundaries. We think that should be modified. As we noted in ConnectGreaterWashington, the distribution of jobs/HH within a jurisdiction has significantly less impact than balancing jobs/HH across the region. It's the imbalance now (and the perpetuation in perpetuity) that creates and maintains long commutes, congestion, etc.
- There needs to be an explicit recommendation that TPB work closer with the COG Planning Directors in an iterative process to arrive at future land use scenarios that are “solvable” within a certain amount of transportation budget. This “policy/program” might be linked to any of the bundles, but needs to be part of the fiscal constraint for the region.

Specific Comments on Bundles

- R1: Regional Express Travel Network
 - Edit: Remove the redistribution of forecast growth to Activity Centers served by the Express Toll Network. There's no evidence that jobs and HH would shift to be closer to HOT lanes. If anything, land-use should be redistributed to be less dense since this, in theory, makes driving easier.
- R2: Regional Rapid Bus System and R10: Increase Accessibility – Stage 2
 - In R2, PCN and streetcar can be combined, but local BRT network is worth its own bundle.
 - In R10, rail is not going to increase accessibility on the east side of the region – there's too much area that needs to be better and faster connected and the proposed projects are too limited. Keep extension of Purple Line from New Carrollton to Branch Avenue, but extend to cross Wilson Bridge to Eisenhower. Remove DC streetcar and instead add the local BRT network that was originally in R2, paying special attention to the east side.
 - Note that this is likely the least expensive way to improve transit reliability and service, improve the reach of transit, and to improve it for all communities, including the underserved.
 - WMATA's 2011 RTSP analysis showed that creating a similar bus network increased transit ridership more than building the new loop line, resulting in changes to mode share, VMT, etc.
- R4: Metrorail Core Expansion – Stage 1
 - Edit: Add the new line in the core that is listed in R5. It is currently labeled "new tunnel at Rosslyn", but should be renamed to be "New Metrorail core line to add capacity across Potomac River between DC and Virginia and to Union Station". (The “loop line” didn't resonate with many)

- Why: Sums up Metro's "new needs" from Momentum, which are in the CNI, as well as has a land use component. This essentially maximizes what the region has already invested in. It also ensures that there is enough capacity in the core to support extensions.
- R5: Metrorail Extensions – Stage 2
 - Edits: Change from "Expansion" to "Extensions"
 - Maintain the R4/R5 connection that R4 has to be selected if R5 is selected.
- R6: Circumferential Light Rail System
 - Edits: This seems like a "beltway" line, since the river crossings would have to be the Legion and Wilson Bridges. Therefore, combining with R1 could be done and instead of Express bus services, the transit component could be "high capacity transit". The analysis in ConnectGreaterWashington showed very little difference in ridership and other measures between BRT and LRT on these links. Hence why "high capacity transit" was the outcome.
- R7: Cross-Region Connection - Option 1
 - Edits: This is where expanding the Legion Bridge should go since that is a significant bottleneck. Remove the outer Potomac Crossing
 - Edits: Land-use should be redistributed to be less dense on the western side of the region to accommodate expanded Legion Bridge and better flowing hotspots
- R8: Technology and Design Improvements
 - Edits: Without better definition/specificity, the projects should be removed and just keep the programs
- R9: Increase Accessibility – Stage 1
 - Edits: Add "Build enough housing in the region to match available jobs" e.g. simply state that we will remove the housing constraint from the Cooperative forecast and seek a 1:1 housing/jobs balance from new employment growth added
- R13 or R14 – Pricing
 - No edits – we think that keeping the two options separate is a plus and fully believe that pricing, beyond HOT lanes, must be included in analysis. R13 affects all drivers in the region, but those drivers don't necessarily have other viable options for getting around. R14 targets the typical transit market, which provides an option to drivers, but it also means that DC takes a pretty substantial risk as the region's major job center.
- R15 (New): Potomac River Crossing Outer Bridge
 - Bundle: New northern Potomac River bridge (project) + redistribute growth in Loudoun/Frederick/upper MoCo to increase greenfield development and reduce development in Activity Centers