Memorandum

TO: Regan Hammond, John Orr

FROM: Tracy Selin

DATE: July 23, 2010

RE: Performance Framework Workshop #2

Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) staff and the Cambridge Systematics (CS) General Planning Consultant team held the second stakeholder workshop on the performance framework currently under development for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) element of Plan 2040. The workshop was held Monday, July 12, from 9:00AM-12:00AM at ARC offices. Attendees included Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC) and Land Use Coordinating Committee (LUCC) members as well as a number of key stakeholder invitees. Workshop material included an overview of revisions made to the performance framework based on feedback received as a result of the first stakeholder workshop and facilitated discussion on proposed KDP2 policy filters and Benefit/Cost (B/C) evaluation methods.

Below is a general summary of workshop material and attendee comments and questions.

Workshop Summary

1. An overview of key revisions to the framework was provided. These included:

    −   Framework graphic was revised to reflect separate lump sum funding levels for Road Preservation and Transit Preservation based on results of KDP1 analysis.

    −   Project level evaluation at KDP3 was removed as a step for both Management and Operations (M&O) and Bike/Ped programs. In the future, individual projects for these programs can be evaluated using a process developed in consultation with stakeholders and project sponsors, but there is not enough time for Plan 2040 to develop and vet these processes effectively. Priority for Plan 2040 is to maintain existing TIP projects that pass the KDP2 policy filter as line items, with remaining TIP balances programmed for M&O and bike/ped lump sums.

    −   A step will be included in the framework at the end of KDP4 to compare final results to decisions made at KDP1, to assess if there is a disjoin between KDP1 and KDP4 results.

    Comments/Questions:

- Where does land use/footprint of a project become part of the evaluation? Response: It could be applied as part of the land use policy screen at KDP2, but that level of detail would likely not be addressed until the plan management element of the framework which will involve tracking projects more closely as more detailed scope information becomes available.

- Where are air quality/greenhouse gas emissions evaluated? Response: At KDP4, network level measures.

2. A detailed overview of the proposed KDP2 policy filters was provided, followed by facilitated discussion. Policies reflect a combination of:

   – Transportation systems review

   – Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM) consistency check

   – Additional consideration for safety, Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan (SSTP) priority, project development activities

   Comments/Questions:

- Several attendees commented that ARC should consider connectivity through UGPM areas and general project proximity to UGPM area types as opposed to specifying that is must be located within an area type. Response: Yes, ARC will reconsider this.

- Will project readiness and project development thresholds for currently programmed projects (project "pipeline" filter) be re-addressed for Plan 2040? Response: No, there is no plan to reconsider the existing Envision6 policy.

- Will projects be tracked as they move through the framework? Response: Yes.

- Does the Station Community UGPM place type include proposed station communities? Response: Yes, if included as part of Concept3.

- Does Concept3 include supplementary feeder bus routes? Response: Yes, via its financial planning assumptions. As a result, if feeder systems are defined that support Concept3, they could be considered for evaluation.

- Does project sponsor commitment to fund long-term transit O&M need to be included in the KDP2 policy filter for transit? Response: ARC will discuss with RTC.

- For Bike/Ped policies, ARC should consider roads parallel to the Regional Strategic Transportation System (RSTS) for consideration because people are more likely to travel on facilities with less demand. ARC should evaluate in terms of catchment areas, as opposed to linear corridor travel.

CAMBRIDGE
SYSTEMATICS

- ARC should reconsider the threshold for safety need; may be too restrictive. Response: ARC will consider.

- UGPM filters are too restrictive. Response: ARC needs to be strategic with its application of policy filters given extremely limited resources.

3. An overview of changes to KDP3/project evaluation measures was provided. These included:

   – Combining the connectivity measure (roadway)

   – Using crash rate instead of crash reduction (roadway)

   – Change from facilitating intermodal to multimodal connection (transit)

   Comments/Questions:

   - There were several questions related to specifics of measures calculation, but no comments regarding their use or application.

4. An overview of potential revisions to current B/C methods was provided, followed by facilitated discussion. Potential revisions include:

   – Consideration of future operations and maintenance costs

   – Separating recurring delay from incident delay

   – Including safety benefits

   – Incorporating speed into fuel savings calculations

   – Considering work zone delay

   Comments/Questions:

   - There was general discussion on all proposed revisions and the technical methods to implement each.

   - The application of TIGER II B/C principles and criteria to long-range planning project evaluation was discussed. In general, TIGER B/C evaluation methods reflect a much more rigorous application of B/C intended for a smaller set of large-scale projects. Application of more data-intensive methods should be considered carefully in the update of B/C to be applied to a much larger project pool for Plan 2040 RTP evaluation.

5. The plan management element of the performance framework was introduced as the next key piece of the framework to be developed. The plan management element will reflect more detailed implementation and tracking mechanisms (and associated performance measures) for plan and project delivery.

CAMBRIDGE
SYSTEMATICS