

# **National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board**

777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20002-4290 (202) 962-3310 Fax: (202) 962-3202 TDD: (202) 962-3213

Item #3

## **MEMORANDUM**

TO: Travel Management Subcommittee

FROM: Andrew J. Meese, AICP  
Systems Management Planning Director

DATE: September 19, 2008

SUBJECT: Congestion Management Process in the Constrained Long Range Plan  
(CLRP) Call for Projects, Including the Congestion Management  
Documentation Form

---

### **Introduction**

Early in 2008, the Travel Management Subcommittee requested the opportunity to revisit the portions of the Call for Projects addressing the Congestion Management Process (CMP), prior to the next issuance of the Call for Projects. This month, TPB staff is starting the Call for Projects process for the FY2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program and FY2009 CLRP. We can now look at the CMP content in the Call for Projects, and the Subcommittee can consider recommending changes.

### **Background**

The inclusion of the CMP in the CLRP and the Call for Projects has its origins in the Congestion Management Systems (CMS) requirements of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991. ISTEA, its successor laws, and associated federal regulations all include CMP (formerly CMS) requirements for air quality non-attainment major metropolitan areas including the Washington region. One of those requirements is that, in association with any major federally-funded highway capacity increase, the region must demonstrate that congestion management alternatives were considered, and, if feasible, integrated into the capacity increasing project.

This requirement was addressed in our CLRP process by the Congestion Management Documentation Form in the Call for Projects. The form and associated criteria were developed under the guidance of a special CMS Task Force convened under the TPB in the early-to-mid 1990s. The CMS Task Force developed a definition of "major" capacity increasing projects by adopting criteria on what projects would require a Congestion Management Documentation Form, including limiting consideration to projects on freeways and other principal arterials that generated no less than one lane mile of new capacity and whose construction costs were no less than \$5 million. Other "exemption criteria" clarified what was in the law and regulations, confirming that non-construction

projects, non-highway projects, and projects grandfathered under the law were not subject to the CMS requirements.

Though there were a number of changes to federal law and regulations addressing management systems in the years between ISTEA and SAFETEA-LU, there was no change to the basic requirement for considering CMS in non-attainment areas, addressed here by the Congestion Management Documentation Form. SAFETEA-LU brought changes in federal emphasis areas (with a heightened focus on management and operations), but retained the basic requirements being addressed by the form. Nevertheless, given the length of time that has passed since the development of the form and associated criteria, it is prudent to reexamine the process and criteria.

### **Considering Updates and Changes**

The September 23 Travel Management Subcommittee meeting will be the main opportunity to consider changes to the Call for Projects CMP components. Attached to this memorandum are documents in support of that discussion:

- The first attachment is a table displaying the CMP-related text of the overall Call for Projects submission form. For the table, the existing text from the form is shown in the leftmost column. The center column provides staff comments on background or related issues. The right column notes any updates or changes that staff suggests. Of course, participants are welcome to suggest other changes for consideration by the Subcommittee.
- The next attachment is a blank CLRP form from the Call for Projects, for reference.
- The final attachment is a blank Congestion Management Documentation Form. The Subcommittee can also take a look at this form at the September 23 meeting. Note that staff has not identified any suggested changes to this form.

### **Schedule**

The TPB is scheduled to approve the Call for Projects document at its October 15, 2008 meeting; the TPB Technical Committee is scheduled to endorse the document on October 3 for forwarding to the Board. Therefore, it is important for the Travel Management Subcommittee to come to consensus on any comments at the September 23 meeting if at all possible. Recommendations from the Subcommittee will be transmitted to the TPB Technical Committee in the form of a memorandum. Staff will incorporate recommended changes into the draft Call for Projects document and Congestion Management Documentation Form as advised by the committees, prior to their transmission to the TPB for approval.

Attachments

**REVIEW OF CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS QUESTIONS IN THE CLRP DRAFT CALL FOR PROJECTS**  
Travel Management Subcommittee

REF NUM	EXISTING TEXT	COMMENTS	SUGGESTED CHANGES
-1- (p. 33)	<p><b><i>Congestion Management Process Documentation</i></b></p> <p>The following section has been revised to address the new SAFETEA-LU component called the Congestion Management Process. Please see the discussion on Congestion Management Documentation in Section 2 of this document for more information. Questions 25 and 26 should be answered for every project. Questions 26 through 28 still apply to any new projects that propose an increase in SOV capacity. In addition, a Congestion Management Documentation Form should be completed for each project or action proposing an increase in SOV capacity.</p>	<p>Minor revisions are suggested since SAFETEA-LU is no longer new.</p>	<p><b><i>Congestion Management Process Documentation</i></b></p> <p>The following section <del>has been revised to address the new</del> <b><i>addresses the</i></b> SAFETEA-LU component called the Congestion Management Process. Please see the discussion on Congestion Management Documentation in Section 2 of this document for more information. Questions 25 and 26 should be answered for every project. Questions 26 through 28 <del>still</del> apply to any new projects that propose an increase in SOV capacity. In addition, a Congestion Management Documentation Form should be completed for each project or action proposing an increase in SOV capacity.</p>
-2-	<p><i>25. Do traffic congestion conditions on this or another facility necessitate the proposed project or program?</i></p> <p>Check "Yes" if this project is being planned specifically to address congestion conditions.</p>	<p>This question helps regionally demonstrate that projects are programmed specifically to address congested conditions. In 2008, a total of 101 out of 1,199 responses were "yes".</p>	<p>No change.</p>
-3-	<p>a. If so, is the congestion recurring or incident-related non-recurring in nature?</p> <p>Use the checkboxes to identify either option.</p>	<p>This question helps regionally demonstrate that projects are programmed specifically to address both recurring and non-recurring congested conditions. Of 101, 88 responded "recurring", 1 responded "non-recurring", and 12 did not answer.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

**REVIEW OF CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS QUESTIONS IN THE CLRP DRAFT CALL FOR PROJECTS**  
Travel Management Subcommittee

REF NUM	EXISTING TEXT	COMMENTS	SUGGESTED CHANGES
-4-	<p><i>b. If the congestion is on a different facility, please identify it here:</i></p> <p>Identify the name of the congested parallel or adjacent route that this project is intended to relieve.</p>	<p>This question allows for the instance that an improvement may primarily be for alleviating congestion on a different facility. In 2008, submitters selected this option only 4 times.</p>	<p>Delete this entire sub-question.</p>
-5-	<p><i>c. What is the measured or estimated 2007 Level of Service on this facility?</i></p> <p>Use the drop-down menu to select the level of service (LOS) and indicate whether this is a measured or estimated LOS.</p>	<p>This question intended to collect performance measurement information on programmed projects. In 2008, there were 50 responses to this question. To date it has not proven to be useful in regional analyses.</p>	<p>Delete this entire sub-question.</p>
-6- (p. 34)	<p><i>26. Is this a capacity-increasing project on a limited access highway or other principal arterial?</i></p> <p>Check "Yes" if the project will increase capacity on an SOV facility of functional class 1, 2 or 5.</p>	<p>In 2008, there were 27 "yes" responses to this question.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

**REVIEW OF CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS QUESTIONS IN THE CLRP DRAFT CALL FOR PROJECTS**  
Travel Management Subcommittee

REF NUM	EXISTING TEXT	COMMENTS	SUGGESTED CHANGES
-7-	<p>a. <i>If yes, does this project require a Congestion Management Documentation form under the given criteria?</i></p> <p>The following categories of projects require a congestion management form, except if they fall under one or more of the exemption criteria listed under part b:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>New limited access or other principal arterial roadways on new rights-of-way</i></li> <li>• <i>Additional through lanes on existing limited access or other principal arterial roadways</i></li> <li>• <i>Construction of grade-separated interchanges on limited access highways where previously there had not been an interchange.</i></li> </ul> <p>Click on the link provided to download a blank Congestion Management Documentation Form.</p>	<p>There seemed to be uncertainty among submitters on whether widening of an existing road would count. It does. In 2008, 7 projects provided Congestion Management Documentation Forms, 11 cited exemption criteria, and 9 provided neither.</p>	<p>Insert an addition to the middle bullet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Additional through lanes on existing limited access or other principal arterial roadways (e.g., road widening)</i></li> </ul>
-8-	<p>b. If no, please identify the criteria that exempt the project from CMP requirements:</p> <p>Use the checkboxes to identify the exemption criteria:</p>		No change.
-9-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of lane-miles added to the highway system by the project totals less than 1 lane-mile</li> </ul>	<p>In 2008, 3 projects cited this exemption criterion.</p>	No change.
-10-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project is an intersection reconstruction or other traffic engineering improvements, including replacement of an at-grade intersection with an interchange</li> </ul>	<p>A minor grammar change is suggested. In 2008, 2 projects cited this exemption criterion.</p>	<p>Replace “improvements” with “improvement”.</p>

**REVIEW OF CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS QUESTIONS IN THE CLRP DRAFT CALL FOR PROJECTS**  
Travel Management Subcommittee

REF NUM	EXISTING TEXT	COMMENTS	SUGGESTED CHANGES
-11-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project will not allow motor vehicles, such as bicycle or pedestrian facilities</li> </ul>	<p>There seemed to be uncertainty among submitters on whether a transit project would count. It does not. In 2008, no projects cited this exemption criterion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project will not allow motor vehicles, such as <i>exclusive</i> bicycle or pedestrian facilities, <i>or is entirely as transit project (e.g. light rail construction)</i></li> </ul>
-12-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project consists of preliminary studies or engineering only, and is not funded for construction</li> </ul>	<p>This was the most commonly cited exemption criterion in 2008 (8 instances).</p>	<p>No change.</p>
-13-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any project that received NEPA approval on or before April 6, 1992</li> </ul>	<p>Pre-ISTEA grandfathered projects have long since worked their way through the system, and it appears this exemption, while technically still true, no longer needs to be listed.</p>	<p>Delete this entire criterion.</p>
-14-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any project that was already under construction on or before September 30, 1997, or for which construction funds were committed in the FY98-03 TIP. Note that funds being committed in the FY99-04 TIP does not exempt a project.</li> </ul>	<p>Pre-ISTEA grandfathered projects have long since worked their way through the system, and it appears this exemption, while technically still true, no longer needs to be listed.</p>	<p>Delete this entire criterion.</p>

**REVIEW OF CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS QUESTIONS IN THE CLRP DRAFT CALL FOR PROJECTS**  
Travel Management Subcommittee

REF NUM	EXISTING TEXT	COMMENTS	SUGGESTED CHANGES
-15-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any project whose construction cost is less than \$5 million.</li> </ul>	<p>\$5 million was chosen in the mid-1990s by the TPB's CMS Task Force as a rule-of-thumb separating a major construction project from a minor one. No specific limit such as this appears in federal law or regulations.</p> <p>According to a TPB staff review of the federal producer price index for civil engineering construction projects, \$5 million in construction costs in the mid-1990s would equate to approximately \$8 million in 2007 construction costs (the last full yearly estimate available), with estimated prices rising rapidly since then (estimated at over \$9 million).</p> <p>Note that no submissions in 2008 were exempted under this criterion.</p>	<p>Increase the \$5 million rule-of-thumb amount to \$10 million.</p>
-16-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project will not use any Federal funds in any phase of development or construction.</li> </ul>	<p>This criterion did not appear in the instructions of the 2009 Call for Projects, but was added to the form itself at the request of the TPB Technical Committee during the Call for Projects process as a clarification.</p>	<p>Confirm that this be kept on the list of exemption criteria, and ensure that it appears in the Call for Projects instructions and any other location where it may be necessary.</p>

**REVIEW OF CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS QUESTIONS IN THE CLRP DRAFT CALL FOR PROJECTS**  
Travel Management Subcommittee

<b>REF NUM</b>	<b>EXISTING TEXT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>SUGGESTED CHANGES</b>
<p>-17- (p. 37)</p>	<p>Congestion Management Documentation Form for SOV Projects</p> <p>A Congestion Management Documentation Form should be completed for each project or action intended for the Plan that involves a significant increase in single-occupant vehicle (SOV) carrying capacity of a highway.</p> <p>Brief and complete answers to all questions are recommended. A reference to an external document or an attachment without further explanation on the form itself is not recommended; findings of studies, Major Investment Studies, for example, should be summarized on the form itself. References to other documents can be made if desired in addition to the answer provided on the form.</p> <p>As a rule of thumb, the scale and detail in the responses to the questions should be in proportion to the scale of the project. For example, a relatively minor project needs less information than a major, multi-lane-mile roadway construction project.</p> <p>The form can summarize the results of EISs or other studies completed in association with the project, and can also summarize the impact or regional studies or programs. It allows the submitting agency to explain the context of the project in the region's already-adopted and implemented programs, such as the Commuter Connections program, and to go on to explain what new and additional strategies were considered for the project or corridor in question.</p>	<p>Requirements for Major Investment Studies were removed federally prior to SAFETEA-LU.</p>	<p>Delete reference to Major Investment Studies.</p>



# CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

## SAFETEA-LU PLANNING FACTORS

23. Please identify any and all planning factors that are addressed by this project:
- a.  Support the **economic vitality** of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.
  - b.  Increase the **safety** of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users.
    - i. Is this project being proposed specifically to address a safety issue?  Yes;  No
    - ii. If yes, briefly describe (in quantifiable terms, where possible) the nature of the safety problem:
  - c.  Increase the ability of the transportation system to support **homeland security** and to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.
  - d.  Increase **accessibility and mobility** of people and freight.
  - e.  Protect and enhance the **environment**, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
  - f.  Enhance the **integration and connectivity** of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.
  - g.  Promote efficient system **management and operation**.
  - h.  Emphasize the **preservation** of the existing transportation system.

## ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION

24. Have any potential mitigation activities been identified for this project?  Yes;  No
- a. If yes, what types of mitigation activities have been identified?  
 Air Quality;  Floodplains;  Socioeconomics;  Geology, Soils and Groundwater; Vibrations;  
 Energy;  Noise;  Surface Water;  Hazardous and Contaminated Materials;  Wetlands

## CONGESTION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

25. Do traffic congestion conditions necessitate the proposed project or program?  Yes;  No
- a. If so, is the congestion recurring or non-recurring?  Recurring;  Non-recurring
  - b. If the congestion is on another facility, please identify it:
  - c. What is the measured or estimated 2007 LOS on this facility? \_\_\_\_ ;  Measured;  Estimated
26. Is this a capacity-increasing project on a limited access highway or other principal arterial?  Yes;  No
- a. If yes, does this project require a Congestion Management Documentation form under the given criteria (see page 34 of the *Call for Projects* document)?  Yes; [Click here to access a Congestion Management Documentation Form](#).
  - b. If not, please identify the criteria that exempt the project here:
    - The number of lane-miles added to the highway system by the project totals less than 1 lane-mile
    - The project is an intersection reconstruction or other traffic engineering improvement, including replacement of an at-grade intersection with an interchange
    - The project will not allow motor vehicles, such as a bicycle or pedestrian facility
    - The project consists of preliminary studies or engineering only, and is not funded for construction
    - The project received NEPA approval on or before April 6, 1992
    - The project was already under construction on or before September 30, 1997, or construction funds were already committed in the FY98-03 TIP.
    - The construction costs for the project are less than \$5 million.
    - The project will not use any Federal funds in any phase of development or construction.

# CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

## INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

27. Is this an Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) project as defined in federal law and regulation, and therefore subject to Federal Rule 940 Requirements?  Yes;  No
- a. If yes, what is the status of the systems engineering analysis compliant with Federal Rule 940 for the project?  Not Started;  Ongoing, not complete;  Complete
- b. Under which Architecture:
- DC, Maryland or Virginia State Architecture
  - WMATA Architecture
  - COG/TPB Regional ITS Architecture
  - Other, please specify:
28. Completed Date:
29.  Project is being withdrawn from the CLRP.
30. Withdrawn Date:
31. Record Creator:
32. Created On:
33. Last Updated by:
34. Last Updated On:
35. Comments

# Congestion Management Documentation Form for Projects in the 2030 CLRP



## **BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION**

1. Agency: \_\_\_\_\_ Secondary Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

	Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier
4. Facility:				
5. From ( _ at):				
6. To:				

7. Jurisdiction(s): \_\_\_\_\_

8. Indicate whether the proposed project's location is subject to or benefits significantly from any of the following in-place congestion management strategies:

- Metropolitan Washington Commuter Connections program (ridesharing, telecommuting, guaranteed ride home, employer programs)
- A Transportation Management Association is in the vicinity
- Channelized or grade-separated intersection(s) or roundabouts
- Reversible, turning, acceleration/deceleration, or bypass lanes
- High occupancy vehicle facilities or systems
- Transit stop (rail or bus) within a 1/2 mile radius of the project location
- Park-and-ride lot within a one-mile radius of the project location
- Real-time surveillance/traffic device controlled by a traffic operations center
- Motorist assistance/hazard clearance patrols
- Interconnected/coordinated traffic signal system
- Other in-place congestion management strategy or strategies (briefly describe below:)

9. List and briefly describe how the following categories of (additional) strategies were considered as full or partial alternatives to single-occupant vehicle capacity expansion in the study or proposal for the project.

a. Transportation demand management measures, including growth management and congestion pricing

b. Traffic operational improvements

c. Public transportation improvements

d. Intelligent Transportation Systems technologies

e. Other congestion management strategies

f. Combinations of the above strategies

10. Could congestion management alternatives fully eliminate or partially offset the need for the proposed increase in single-occupant vehicle capacity? Explain why or why not.

11. Describe all congestion management strategies that are going to be incorporated into the proposed highway project.

12. Describe the proposed funding and implementation schedule for the congestion management strategies to be incorporated into the proposed highway project. Also describe how the effectiveness of strategies implemented will be monitored and assessed after implementation.