

# ***2006 Update to the Financially Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP)***

## ***Status Report***

Presentation to the  
National Capital Region Transportation Planning  
Board

April 19, 2006

1

## **What is the Financial Constraint?**

- (1) The Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) can include only projects for which funding “can reasonably be expected to be available”**
- (2) For air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas, projects can be included in the first two years of the TIP only if funds are “available or committed”**

US Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Planning Rule,  
Sections 450.322 (Plan), 450.324 (TIP)

2

## **How is the Financial Constraint Applied to the CLRP?**

**Every three years, the CLRP Financial Plan is updated by an Interagency Working Group:**

- (1) Update revenue forecasts through outyear of the CLRP (currently 2030)**
- (2) Update expenditure estimates for system expansion preservation, and operation through outyear**
- (3) Ensure consistency between proposed transportation investments and already available and projected sources of revenue through outyear**

\* In intermediate years, amendments are made to the CLRP Financial Plan to reflect new revenue sources, cost estimates, and projects (e.g., ICC in 2004, Beltway HOT lanes in 2005)

3

## **What is the Status of the CLRP Financial Plan for 2006?**

- \* Previous updates completed in 1994, 1997, 2000, and 2003**
- \* Update for 2006 still underway**
  - \* Draft revenue and expenditure projections reviewed February 28, April 4, next meeting May 2**
  - \* Only five significant new projects are being advanced relative to the CLRP adopted in October 2005**
  - \* Particular focus on updating project cost estimates**
  - \* Explicit delineation of what's addressed in the 2006 CLRP, and what's not yet addressed**

4

## **What is not yet addressed in the 2006 CLRP?**

- **Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC) changes still uncertain**
  - **No BRAC-related changes proposed to Round 7 land activity forecasts (approved in October 2005)**
  - **No proposed new transportation improvements associated with BRAC**
- **Prospects for dedicated Metro funding and for additional transportation funding in Virginia still uncertain – no new projects at this time**
- **Transit capacity still insufficient to meet demand in the outyears – ridership into and through the core area for 2020 and 2030 still constrained to 2010 levels**

5

## **How is the 2006 CLRP Addressing Congested Locations?**

- **On February 15, 2006 the TPB was briefed on current freeway congestion in the Washington Region**
- **The “Top Ten” most congested locations were identified based on traffic density and speed**
- **Both short run and longer run strategies for tackling freeway congestion were proposed**

6

## **Tackling Recurring Freeway Congestion – Short Run**

- **Capacity Increases To Address Bottlenecks**
  - **Adequate freeway to freeway, freeway to arterial, and arterial to freeway connections**
  - **High Occupancy Toll (HOT) or Express Toll Lanes (ETL)**
- **Transit and Demand Management**
  - **Adequate transit funding and capacity**
  - **Ridesharing and telecommuting**

7

## **Tackling Recurring Freeway Congestion – Longer Run**

- **Ensure new highway, toll lane, and transit facilities are integrated with plans for concentrated, mixed use development**
- **Look at Alternative Land Use/Transportation Futures: What if job and housing growth were shifted, in coordination with new roads or transit?**
- **In 2000, the TPB initiated the “Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study” to analyze alternative land use/transportation futures**

8

## **The Regional Mobility and Accessibility “Scenario” Study**

- \* On January 18, 2006 TPB was briefed on results to date of this study, and the COG Board was briefed on February 8
- \* Study identified two key longer-run strategies that would significantly increase transit use, walking and biking and decrease driving and congestion for 2030:
  - \* Increase household growth in the region, and concentrate that growth in regional activity centers, with supporting transit improvements
  - \* Encourage more development on the eastern side of the region, with supporting transit improvements

9

## **Next Steps for Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study**

- **Test a network of variably priced lanes, including bus transit improvements**
  - Present status report to TPB Value Pricing Task Force at May 17 meeting (10 am to 11:30 am)
- **Develop one or two combined scenarios that would:**
  - incorporate promising elements of scenarios tested to date
  - focus on what changes realistically could be made to the CLRP and to local land use plans and forecasts
- **More public outreach forums in conjunction with the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee**

10

## **How Can the TPB Strengthen Support for Promising Land Use/Transportation Strategies?**

- **Support planning studies and transportation improvements for promising land use initiatives**
- **Perhaps adapt “Transportation for Livable Communities” Programs from other Metropolitan Planning Organizations (e.g. San Francisco, Atlanta, Burlington, Philadelphia)**

11

## **Metropolitan Transportation Commission (San Francisco)**

- **Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) - 1997**
- **Trend-setting program emulated by others**
- **Uses federal transportation funds sub-allocated to metro area to support planning activities and capital projects, including:**
  - **Pedestrian circulation improvements around transit stations**
  - **Bicycle routes connecting to stations**
  - **New or improved entrances to stations**
  - **Transportation infrastructure improvements to facilitate higher residential density near stations**
- **Focus is on smart growth/livability**

12

## **Atlanta Regional Commission**

- Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) - 1999
- Selects qualifying “communities” to receive planning assistance rather than specific projects
- A portion of annual transportation funding is earmarked for projects from these communities:
  - Public plaza improvements
  - Pedestrian hazard elimination
  - Street lighting
  - Bicycle lanes and sidewalks
- Focus is on concentrated development in activity centers

13

## **Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization (Burlington)**

- Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) - 1999
- Modeled after San Francisco program
  - Much smaller scale
  - Grants for planning activities only
  - Technical assistance role
  - Focus on bicycle/pedestrian accommodation and community involvement process

14

## Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (Philadelphia)

- ✱ Transportation and Community Development Initiative (TCDI) - 2002
- ✱ Multi-state program
  - ✱ Single project selection committee, but funding is pre-divided among states (2/3 PA, 1/3 NJ)
- ✱ Grants for planning activities only
- ✱ Focus on revitalization, with list of eligible communities with demonstrable need
  - ✱ Population loss, low median income
  - ✱ Regional transportation efficiency and growth management as side benefits

15

## Summary of Transportation – Land Use Incentive Programs

Metropolitan Area	Multi-State	Inception Year	Eligible Activities	Annual Planning Grant Budget	Maximum Planning Grant	Annual Capital Grant Budget	Seed Funding Source(s)	Program Emphasis
San Francisco	No	1997	Planning and Capital	\$500,000	\$50,000	\$29.5 million	TE, CMAQ, STP, State	Livability and Housing
Atlanta	No	1999	Planning and Capital*	\$1 million	\$150,000	\$30 million*	STP (Q23)	Land Development and Density Concentration
Burlington	No	1999	Planning Only	\$50,000	\$20,000		TE, STP	Community Process and Bike/Ped
Philadelphia	Yes	2002	Planning Only	\$1.5 million	\$100,000		STP	Revitalization and Community Development

\* The Atlanta grant program is for planning activities only, but an amount is earmarked in the TIP for use on projects in program communities

16

## Next Steps

COG/TPB staff currently reviewing:

- ✱ Transportation/land use incentive programs in other areas
- ✱ Experience to date in promoting transit-oriented development strategies in the Washington region
  - ✱ Would incentive programs have helped in earlier applications?
  - ✱ What kinds of incentive programs are currently in place at the state and local levels?

17

## 2004 Transportation Research Board (TRB) Report

- ✱ “Transit-Oriented Development in the United States: Experiences, Challenges and Prospects” 500 pages, 21 chapters
- ✱ Includes 10 case studies:

Boston	Dallas
Colorado	Chicago
New Jersey	Portland
Washington Region	San Francisco
Miami	Southern California

18

## **Chapter 12 of TRB Report: “Washington, DC: Model for the Nation”**

- ✱ Lists numerous TOD projects around Metro stations
- ✱ “Metropolitan Washington DC is a true success story in part because shaping land use was a goal of the original transit investment”
- ✱ “Signature TODs abound in the District of Columbia, surrounding cities, and increasingly in outlying suburbs”

19

## **Outlook**

- ✱ COG/TPB staff plan to develop alternative transportation/land use incentive approaches for consideration by the TPB and the COG Board
- ✱ Alternatives will be presented to TPB and COG Board in July/September of this year

20