

**Montgomery County Planning Department
Transportation Impact Study Technical Working Group (TISTWG)
Meeting #6– Multimodal Analysis Concept**

February 4, 2014

1:30 – 3:30 PM – MRO Auditorium

Introductions (1:30 – 1:40)

- 1) Meeting attendees

Plenary Session (1:40-2:00)

- 2) Update on White Oak / SSP Amendment #14-02
 - a) 14-02 Amendment schedule/process
 - b) Dan Wilhelm optional approach
- 3) VMT concept follow-up from TRB
 - a) Broad summary: adopted in plans (with caveats); still a work in progress for development review
 - b) Specific exception: Pasadena Council action to accept VMT as one of several considerations (similar to Seattle)
 - c) Potential approach: Expand 50% NADMS Alternative Review Procedure (SA-1) to exempt low(er) per-capita VMT developments with two tiers (with “Low VMT” to be defined):
 - i) “Soft” TMAg / monitoring for Very Low VMT cases
 - ii) “Hard” TMAg / 2x Impact Tax for Low VMT cases
- 4) Next steps/schedule
 - a) Today: breakout sessions on cross-cutting procedural topics
 - i) timing/details of TIS mitigation proposals,
 - ii) multimodal assumptions/candidate projects provided by public sector
 - iii) addressing background development and bicycle/pedestrian project value
 - b) Tomorrow: Planning Board Roundtable update
 - c) Develop track-changes LATR Guidelines proposal for April 1 meeting
 - d) Transition from current study / TISTWG to Planning Board/Council review

Breakout sessions (2:00-3:15)

See topics under 4a above, summary of LATR Concepts Status, and procedural topics options matrices

Plenary report-out session (3:15-3:30)

**Montgomery County Planning Department
Transportation Impact Study Technical Working Group (TISTWG)
Meeting #5 – Response to Initial Concepts and Next Steps**

**January 7, 2015
1:30 – 3:30 PM**

Introductions

- 1) Meeting attendees (see attachment for sign-in sheet)

Pro-Rata Share Concept and Coordination with White Oak / Amendment #14-02

- 2) Current 14-02 proposal
 - a) Concern that the proposal is predicated on a complete analysis yet to be performed, but the understanding of the community was that traditional LATR was to be one safeguard against the adoption of an “incomplete” or “unbalanced” White Oak Science Gateway (WOSG) master plan. The adopted plan didn’t reflect the subsequent Countywide Corridor Functional Master Plan removal of the New Hampshire Avenue BRT. Concern that Sabra Wang proposed geometrics for BRT at New Hampshire/Powder Mill requires two many turning lanes so that walkability is affected.
 - b) Other issues discussed by group:
 - i) Need to define “full buildout” – what are the assumptions and would there be ceilings on development established in the plan per the assumptions developed and used in the pro-rata approach (which would reasonably be lower than full theoretical zoning capacity...)?
 - ii) Need final WOSG Plan definition for network (both what the definitions are for master planned facilities and assumptions for lower-scaled facilities like turn lanes or sidewalk connections not explicitly described in the plan
 - iii) Perhaps two studies are needed - one with BRT and one without – to bracket the needed “local” infrastructure and costs. Similar assumption is needed regarding state, County, and/or private sector contribution to the five planned interchanges at roughly \$100M each.
 - iv) Is pro-rata share for the full area appropriate or should it be divided into geographic areas, since land uses, travel demands, and operating conditions on New Hampshire Avenue are not directly related to those along Cherry Hill Road?
 - v) What would the monitoring be instead of traffic study – biennial study, perhaps?
 - vi) One option would be to do the proposed pro-rata share study first, and then determine what the LATR policy for implementation should be.
 - vii) White Flint may be a useful precedent for the pro-rata share approach:
 - (1) Is there consensus among decision makers that White Flint can now be described as a success, or is it too early to tell?
 - (2) The White Flint Special Taxing District approach was developed in conjunction with the Sector Plan and was the subject of several process-related public hearings at both Planning Board and County Council.
 - (3) Maybe collect the dollars from smaller development and then County partners with Percontee to build the major infrastructure
 - viii) Level of TMD requirement and monitoring: the County is establishing a Transportation Management District, but so far the anticipation is that developers would do “soft” Traffic Mitigation Agreements (TMAGs) that require participation in TMD activities, rather than “hard” TMAGs with performance measures, monitoring, and performance backed by bonds or letters of credit
 - ix) Equity of GOSC versus adjacent plan area stakeholders not yet documented (example of Leggett’s proposed transit authority not favored as extra tax by those in areas with fewer documented benefits)
 - x) Assumptions regarding amoritization and phasing of improvements

**Montgomery County Planning Department
Transportation Impact Study Technical Working Group (TISTWG)
Meeting #5 – Response to Initial Concepts and Next Steps**

**January 7, 2015
1:30 – 3:30 PM**

Introductions

- 1) Meeting attendees (see attachment for sign-in sheet)

Pro-Rata Share Concept and Coordination with White Oak / Amendment #14-02

- 2) Current 14-02 proposal
 - a) Concern that the proposal is predicated on a complete analysis yet to be performed, but the understanding of the community was that traditional LATR was to be one safeguard against the adoption of an “incomplete” or “unbalanced” White Oak Science Gateway (WOSG) master plan. The adopted plan didn’t reflect the subsequent Countywide Corridor Functional Master Plan removal of the New Hampshire Avenue BRT. Concern that Sabra Wang proposed geometrics for BRT at New Hampshire/Powder Mill requires two many turning lanes so that walkability is affected.
 - b) Other issues discussed by group:
 - i) Need to define “full buildout” – what are the assumptions and would there be ceilings on development established in the plan per the assumptions developed and used in the pro-rata approach (which would reasonably be lower than full theoretical zoning capacity...)?
 - ii) Need final WOSG Plan definition for network (both what the definitions are for master planned facilities and assumptions for lower-scaled facilities like turn lanes or sidewalk connections not explicitly described in the plan
 - iii) Perhaps two studies are needed - one with BRT and one without – to bracket the needed “local” infrastructure and costs. Similar assumption is needed regarding state, County, and/or private sector contribution to the five planned interchanges at roughly \$100M each.
 - iv) Is pro-rata share for the full area appropriate or should it be divided into geographic areas, since land uses, travel demands, and operating conditions on New Hampshire Avenue are not directly related to those along Cherry Hill Road?
 - v) What would the monitoring be instead of traffic study – biennial study, perhaps?
 - vi) One option would be to do the proposed pro-rata share study first, and then determine what the LATR policy for implementation should be.
 - vii) White Flint may be a useful precedent for the pro-rata share approach:
 - (1) Is there consensus among decision makers that White Flint can now be described as a success, or is it too early to tell?
 - (2) The White Flint Special Taxing District approach was developed in conjunction with the Sector Plan and was the subject of several process-related public hearings at both Planning Board and County Council.
 - (3) Maybe collect the dollars from smaller development and then County partners with Percontee to build the major infrastructure
 - viii) Level of TMD requirement and monitoring: the County is establishing a Transportation Management District, but so far the anticipation is that developers would do “soft” Traffic Mitigation Agreements (TMAGs) that require participation in TMD activities, rather than “hard” TMAGs with performance measures, monitoring, and performance backed by bonds or letters of credit
 - ix) Equity of GOSC versus adjacent plan area stakeholders not yet documented (example of Leggett’s proposed transit authority not favored as extra tax by those in areas with fewer documented benefits)
 - x) Assumptions regarding amoritization and phasing of improvements

M-NCPPC TESTING
1/7/15

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORG</u>	<u>E-MAIL</u>
DAN HARDY	RENAISSANCE	dhardy@citiesthatwork.com
Kate Ange	Renaissance	kange@citiesthatwork.com
Rebecca Torma	MCDOT	rebecca.torma@montgomeryplanning.org
GREG LECK	"	greg.leck@montgomeryplanning.org
ERIC GRAY	M-NCPPC	eric.gray@montgomeryplanning.org
E. Finnegan	MCCF	finnegan2090@yahoo.com
CHERIAN EAPEN	COA/TEMOSS, LLC	cherian@temoss.com
DAN WILHELM	CIVIC	DJWILHELM@VERIZON.NET
David Anspach	M-NCPPC	david.anspach@montgomeryplanning.org
Ed Axler	M-NCPPC	ed.axler@montgomeryplanning.org
Edward Papazian	Kimley-Horn	ed.papazian@kimley-horn.com
Mike Garcia	M-NCPPC	Michael.Garcia@montgomeryplanning.org
TOM ANTHONY	M-NCPPC	THOMAS.ANTHONY@MONTGOMERYPLANNING.ORG
Ben Ross	ACT	benedisposalset@yahoo.com
Andrew Bossi	MCDOT	ANDREW.BOSSI@MONTGOMERYCOUNTYM.D.GOV
Rob Kaufman	MBIA	robkaufman@paulkathart.com
Harnet Quinn (not on panel)	MCCF	wpcattraffic@yahoo.com

**Montgomery County Planning Department
Transportation Impact Study Technical Working Group (TISTWG)
Meeting #6– Cross Cutting Procedural Topics**

Station #1 Discussion: Evolution of Recommendations from Transportation Impact Study (TIS) from Study Submittal to Building Permit

The table below presents a conceptual starting point for conversations at the 2/4 TISTWG for aligning each type of multimodal improvement with appropriate levels of information available at each step in the process.

	TDM / trip reduction	Bicycle/pedestrian improvement	Transit improvement	Roadway capacity improvement
Basis for proposing multimodal improvements in TIS	Alternative Review (SA-1) TM	\$12K/trip (AS-2) Ped/bike system measurement (AM-1, AM-2) Gap ID/contribution (AS-3)	\$12K/trip (AS-2) Transit System Measurement (AM-3).	CLV (AM-4) or operational (AM-5) need. Safety need (SHA/MCDOT)
Level of documentation at each stage				
Transportation Impact Study	Proposed concept objective and level of performance monitoring	Proposed concept text/stick figure description	Proposed concept text/stick figure description	CLV / lane use schematic
DRC Meeting	TMAg Concept Plan	Ped/bike Improvement Concept Plan	Transit Improvement Concept Plan	Schematic Concept Plan
Estimated capital/operating costs				
Preliminary Plan Approval	TMAg basic elements and timeframe for TMAg agreement delivery (before site plan, if applicable, or building permit)	30% design	Transit Improvement Agreement (TIAg) with appropriate agencies	30% design
Building permit (whether first permit or phased permits as appropriate)	Executed TMAg	Record of substantial completion	Record of substantial completion/funding agreement	Record of substantial completion

LATR Process Questions - TISTWG Meeting #6 - February 4, 2015
Station #1. Timing/Details Available at Traffic Study

	Pros	Cons	Support (dots)
How can the value of a TDM program be simplified to equate that of a turn lane improvement at time of TIS submittal?			
Greater definition of submission requirements at each stage in process			
Extend TDM program term to better reflect life-cycle "permanence"			
Define performance bond requirements for different types/levels of "hard" TMAgs			
Tax impact credit			
Other			
How can the value of a transit improvement be simplified in a manner similar to that of a turn lane improvement at time of TIS submittal?			
Greater definition of submission requirements at each stage in process			
Tax impact credit			
Other			
Other			
How can the value of a ped/bike improvement be simplified in a manner similar to that of a turn lane improvement at time of TIS submittal?			
Greater definition of submission requirements at each stage in process			
M-NCPPC provides list of candidate projects			
Equate to unitary (linear feet) or monetary value (\$12K/veh trip) with details TBD			
Payment in lieu of construction default if subsequent implementation complexities arise			
Other			

LATR Process Questions - TISTWG Meeting #6 - February 4, 2015
Station #3. Background Traffic / Bike-Ped Network Performance

	Pros	Cons	Support (dots)
What tools would improve background traffic processes to recognize that proposed de minimis changes would result in fewer traffic studies?			
Allow new de minimis background site traffic to be considered negligible (as is traffic from sites beyond study limits)			
Develop commensurate background traffic growth factors in lieu of specific site distribution/assignment			
M-NCPPC develop/maintain master list of countywide background traffic assignments in intersection database			
Other			
Definition of value of increased pedestrian or bicycle network coverage (options in LATR Concepts AM-1 and AM-2)			
Accessibility - calculation of increased area			
Accessibility - quantification of increased destinations			
Accessibility- decay-weighted calculation of increased destinations			
Defining walked/biked by time as opposed to distance			
Use of Mineta Institute level of bicycle stress approach			
Achievement of designated Quality of Service objectives			
Change in Quality of Service			
Other			

LATR Process Questions - TISTWG Meeting #6 - February 4, 2015
Station #2. Operational Assumptions and Direction

	Pros	Cons	Support (dots)
What elements of operational improvement analysis should be maintained/specified by M-NCPPC (or others)?			
Type of software to be used (Synchro, VISSIM, etc.)			
Definition of roadway segments where delays warrant a 1450 CLV operational threshold			
Definition of network study area (extension beyond study intersections, side street/sink-source volumes, etc.)			
Assumptions such as heavy vehicle percentage, pedestrian volumes/growth, transit vehicle conditions (frequency, dwell times), diurnal/shoulder hour volumes			
Ability to adjust signal phasing / timing parameters for background conditions			
Ability to adjust signal phasing / timing parameters for total traffic conditions / mitigation			
Definition of auto LOS (delays for critical movement, intersection, intersection cluster, and/or network; queuing)			
Definition of effects on pedestrian delays			
Treatment of "unserved vehicles"			
Treatment of "Protected Intersections" - identify improvements?			
Other			